# I

## I. H. S[[@Headword:I. H. S]]

             is an inscription or monogram which has probably been used by the Christian Church from an early date among the sacred symbols on church furniture, and in painted windows of the house of God, but its use has by no means been confined to ecclesiastical buildings. On tombs, roofs, and walls of houses, on books, and on other possessions of Christians, this monogram has been, and is even now, frequently impressed, especially  among the adherents of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican churches. The interpretations which have been given of this mystic title are threefold. One is that they are the initials of the words “In Hoc Signo,” borrowed from the luminous cross which it is said was miraculously displayed in the sky before Constantine and his army. Others make them the initials of the words “Jesus Hominusm Salvator,” especially the Jesuits, who use it for their badge and motto in the form I.H.S; and still another, that they are the first three letters of the Greek ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, Jesus. This last opinion has been espoused by the late “Cambridge Camden Society” in a work which they published on this subject: Argument for the Greek Origin of the Monogram L H. S. (London, 1841).

The earliest Christian emblems found also seem to confirm this opinion, as they are in every case written in the Greek language, and “the celebrated monogram inscribed by Constantine's order on the labarum, or standard of the cross, was undoubtedly Greek.” Eusebius (Eccles. Hist.), in describing the famous standard, says, “A long spear, overlaid with gold, formed the figure of the cross by means of a piece laid transversely over it. On the top of the whole was fixed a crown, formed by the intertexture of gold and precious stones; and on this two letters indicating the name of Christ symbolized the Savior's title by means of its first characters, the letter P being intersected by a X exactly in its center; and these letters the emperor was in the habit of Wearing on his helmet at a later period.” In regard to the shape of the letter S being Roman, and not (reek, The Church, a paper of the Church of England in Canada, says, “It might easily have become corrupted (i.e. the Greek Σ into a Latin S) —it would not, indeed, have been intelligible except to a few of the best scholars unless it were corrupted-and so could scarcely have escaped transmutation when the knowledge of the Greek tongue, which we are certified was the case, perished, or very nearly so, during the Middle Ages in the Western Church.” — Staunton, Eccl. Dict. p. 382; Blunt, Eccles. Dict. 1, 375. SEE LABARUM.

## I.N.R.J[[@Headword:I.N.R.J]]

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

## Iacchagogi[[@Headword:Iacchagogi]]

             those who were appointed to carry the statue of lacchlus (the mystic Bacchus) in solemn procession at the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries (q.v.). Their heads were crowned with myrtle, and they beat drums and brazen instruments, dancing and singing as they marched along.

## Iaian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Iaian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The laian is a dialect spoken in Uvea, one of the Loyalty islands. A translation of Luke for the twelve hundred Protestants of Uvea, and two tribes in New Caledonia, was prepared by Reverend S. Ella, and printed in 1868. Mr. Ella has continued since, assisted by a native pundit, in the preparation of the New Test., which was printed at Sydney in 1878, and to which were added the Psalms in 1879. (B.P.)

## Ialdabaoth[[@Headword:Ialdabaoth]]

             (prob. for יִלְדָּא בָהוֹת), the name given by the Ophites, in the 2d century, to the Demiurge or world-former. SEE OPHITES.

## Iamblichus[[@Headword:Iamblichus]]

             SEE JAIMBLICHUS.

## Ibarra, Joaquin[[@Headword:Ibarra, Joaquin]]

             a Spanish printer celebrated for his magnificent editions (of the Bible and Arabic liturgies, was born at Saragossa in 1725, and died at Madrid in 1785. His printing-house was established at the latter place. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 724.

## Ibas[[@Headword:Ibas]]

             (῎Ιβας), bishop of Edessa, in Syria, from 435 to 457, distinguished himself by the translation of the works of Theodore of Mopsuestia into the Syriac. His lenient policy towards the Nestorians and the fact that he distributed the translation of Theodore extensively throughout Persia and Syria, caused several priests of his diocese to accuse him before the emperor Theodosius II, and before the archbishops of Antioch and Constantinople, for favoring Nestorianism. The emperor appointed the bishops Uranius of Himera, Photius of Tyre, Eusthate of Berytus, and the prefect of Damascus a commission to try-him. Two Synods, held respectively at Berytus and Tyre in 448, failed to convict him, and he was left undisturbed until the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), when he was finally deposed from his diocese. He appealed to the Council of Chalcedon, and was restored to his bishopric in 451. Long after his death, in 553, the fifth general Council of Constantinople condemned him as a Nestorian, in spite of the efforts of pope Vigilius. The principal ground for this accusation was a letter written by him to the Persian bishop Maris, in which he blames his predecessor, Rabulas, for having condemned Theodore of Mopsuestia. The greater part of this letter is contained in the Recueil des Conciles, 4, 661. See Baronius, Annales, an. 448, 449, 451, 553; Dupin, Biblioth. eccles. duc 5me Sicile; Cave, Hist. litter.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 727: Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v. Chalcedon; Neander, Church History, 2, 538- 552.

## Ibbetson, James, D.D[[@Headword:Ibbetson, James, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born in 1717, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He filled successively the rectorate of Bushey, in Hertfordshire, and the archdeaconry of St. Alban's, and died in 1781. His works are, Epistola ad Phil-Hebrceos Oxonienses (1746): — Short History of the Province of Canterbury; and several other theological treatises and sermons. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. 6, 241.

## Ibbot Benjamin, D.D[[@Headword:Ibbot Benjamin, D.D]]

             a learned English divine, born at Beachamwell, Norfolk, in 1680, was educated at Clare Hall and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He became treasurer of Wells Cathedral and rector of St. Vedast, London, in 1708; was some time after appointed rector of St. Pald, Shadwell; chaplain of George I in 1716; and, finally, prebendary of Westminster in 1724. He died April 15, 1725. His principal works are, A Course of Sermons preached for the Boyle Lecture (1713, 1714), in which he refutes the infidel objections of Collins (Lond. 1727, 8vo): — Thirty-six Discourses on practical Subjects (Lond. 1776, 2 vols. 8vo); and a translation of Puffendorf's De Habitu Religionis Christiance ad vitam civilem (1719). See Chalmers, Genesis Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 727; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, 2, 1601.

## Iberians[[@Headword:Iberians]]

             an Asiatic nation inhabiting the Caucasian isthmus, described by Virgil, Horace, and Lucan as a warlike, cruel, and uncivilized people, while Strabo speaks of them as a very quiet and religious people. Rufinus and Moses of Chorene relate that, during the reign of the emperor Constantine, the great Christina, probably a Christian woman (some call her Nino, others Nunia), was made prisoner by the Iberians, and became a slave. Her piety soon won for her the esteem and consideration not only of her master, but of the Iberians generally; and being on one occasion asked to cure a sick child of royal rank, she told the people that Christ her God, alone could effect the cure. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. She is next said to have cured the queen by her prayers. The king, Miraus, and his queen were converted, and did their utmost to spread Christianity through their dominions. The country has since remained Christian, though the true religion was long mixed with many old superstitions. Some claim that Christina was from Byzantium, on the ground that Procopius (5, 9)  mentions an old convent preserved in Jerusalem, and rebuilt by Justinian in the 6th century, which was called Iberian or Iwerian. Moses of Chorene, moreover, says that she was an Armenian, and that teachers were demanded of the Armenian bishop Gregory, not of Rome. The Iberians spread Christianity among the surrounding nations. Their country is now called Georgia (q.v.), and they hold ecclesiastical relations with the Greek Church (q.v.).Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, s.v.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 6, 27 sq.

## Ibex[[@Headword:Ibex]]

             the ancient name of the Boeuquetin or Steinbok of the Alps, an animal generally thought to be designated by the Heb. רָעֵל, yaél' (always in the plur., A.V. “wild goats”), represented as well known, and inhabiting the highest and most inaccessible steeps (see Job 31:1; Psa 104:18). Several species have been described by naturalists as inhabiting the different mountain ranges of the East (e.g. Arabia, Forskal, Descrip. Animr. praef. 4; Ruppell, Abyss. 1, 126; and Palestine, Seetzen, 18, 435), all of them slightly varying from the European form (Cepra ibex), and known among the Arabs by the general name of beden. Among the Sinai mountains the chase is pursued in much the same manner and under much the same circumstances as that of the chamois in the Alps and the Tyrol. The hunters exercise great vigilance and hardihood, taking vast circuits to get above their quarry, and especially aiming to surprise them at early day. Like most mountain quadrupeds that are gregarious, they have a leader who acts as sentinel, and gives the alarm on the occurrence of any suspicious sight, sound, or smell, when the whole flock makes off for a loftier peak. Their numbers are said to have much decreased of late years; for the Arabs report them so abundant fifty years ago, that if a stranger sought hospitality at a Bedouin's tent, and the owner had no sheep to kill, he would without hesitation take his gun and go confidently to shoot a beden. The flesh is excellent, with a flavor similar to that of venison. The Bedouins make water bottles of their skins, as of those of the domestic goats, and rings of their horns, which they wear on their thumbs. Dogs easily catch them when surprised in the plains, but in the abrupt precipices and chasms of the rocks the ibex is said to elude pursuit by the tremendous leaps, which it makes. It is likely that this species is identical with that which bears the name of poseng (Caprus aegagrius), and which inhabits all  the loftier ranges that traverse Asia, from the Taurus and Caucasus to China. It is very robust, and much larger than any domestic goat; its general color iron-gray, shaded with brown with a black line down the back and across the withers, and a white patch on the crupper. The horns of the male are very large, compressed, and slightly diverging as they arch over the back; their front side makes an obtuse edge, and is marked by a series of knobs, with deep hollows between. SEE WILD GOAT; SEE HIND, etc.

## Ibhar[[@Headword:Ibhar]]

             (Heb. Yibcha-r', יַבְחָר, chosenz; Sept. Ι᾿βεάρ, Ι᾿εβαὰρ [cod.Vat. Ε᾿βεάρ, Εβααρ]; Josephus Ι᾿εβάρ, Ant. 7, 3, 3), one of the sons of David (by a secondary wife, 1Ch 3:9) born to him in Jerusalem, mentioned next after Solomon and before Elishua (2Sa 5:15; 1Ch 3:6; 1Ch 14:5). B.C. post 1044. SEE DAVID.

## Ibhar (or Ebur, Lat. Tberius), bishop[[@Headword:Ibhar (or Ebur, Lat. Tberius), bishop]]

             of the island of Bergery, in Wexford Harbor, Ireland, where he died in 503, is commemorated April 23, and famous for having driven away the rats from. Leinster.

## Ibis[[@Headword:Ibis]]

             a genus of birds of the family Ardeidae, or, according to some ornithologists, of Scolopacidae, and perhaps to be regarded as a connecting link between them. The bill is long, slender, curved, thick at the base; the point rather obtuse; the upper mandible deeply grooved throughout its length. The face, and generally the greater part of the head, and sometimes even the neck, are destitute of feathers, at least in adult birds. The neck is long. The legs are rather long, naked above the tarsal joint, with three partially united toes in front and one behind; the swings are moderately long; the tail is very short. The Sacred or Egyptian ibis (Ibis religiosa) is an African bird, two feet six inches in length, although the body is little larger than that of a common fowl. It was one of the birds worshipped by the ancient Egyptians, and called by them Hab or Hib, and by the modern Egyptians Abtu-Hesnes (i.e. Father John). It is represented on the monuments as a bird with long beak and legs, and a heart-shaped body, covered with black and white plumage. It was supposed, from the color of its feathers, to symbolize the light and shade of the moon, its body to represent the heart: its legs described a triangle, and with its beak it performed a medical operation; from all which esoterical ideas it was the avatar of the god Thoth or Hermes (q.v.), who escaped in that shape the  pursuit of Typhon, as the hawk was that of Ra, or Horus, the sun. Its feathers were supposed to scare, and even kill, the crocodile. It appeared in Egypt at the rise, and disappeared at the inundation of the Nile, and was thought, at that time, to deliver Egypt from the winged and other serpents which came from Arabia in certain narrow passes.

As it did not make its nest in Egypt, it was thought to be self-engendering, and to lay eggs for a lunar month. According to some, the basilisk was engendered by it. It was celebrated for its purity, and only drank from the purest water, and the most strict of the priesthood only drank of the pools where it had been seen; besides which, it was fabled to entertain the most invincible love of Egypt, and to die of self-starvation if transported elsewhere. Its flesh was thought to be incorruptible after death, and to kill it was punishable with death. Ibises were kept in the temples, and unmolested in the neighborhood of cities. After death they were mummied, and there is no animal of which so many remains have been found at Thebes, Memphis, Hermopolis Magna, or Eshmun, and at Ibiu or Ibeurn, fourteen miles north of the same place. They are made up into a conical shape, the wings flat, the legs bent back to the breast, the head placed on the left side, and the beak under the tail; were prepared as other mummies, and wrapped up in linen bandages, which are sometimes plaited in patterns externally. At Thebes they are found in linen bandages only; well preserved at Hermopolis in wooden or stone boxes of oblong form, sometimes in form of the bird itself, or the god Thoth; at Memphis, in conical sugar-loaf-shaped red earthenware jars, the tail downwards, the cover of convex form, cemented by lime. There appear to be two sorts of embalmed ibises-a smaller one of the size of a corncrake, very black, and the other black and white-the Ibis Nuenzius, or Ibis religiosa. This last is usually found with its eggs, and sometimes with its insect food, the Pimlelia pilosa, Akis reflexa, and portions of snakes, in the stomach. (Wilkinson, Manners and Customs, 5, 7, 217; Passoloegua, Catalogue Raisone, p. 255; Pettigrew, History of Mummies, p. 205; Horapollo, 1, c. 30,. 36.)

## Ibleam[[@Headword:Ibleam]]

             (Heb. Yibleaim', יַבְלְעָם, people-waster; Sept. Ι᾿αβλαάμ, Ι᾿εβλαάμ [but some codd. occasionally omit]), a city (with suburban towns) within the natural precincts of Issachar, but (with five others) assigned to Manasseh (Jos 17:11, where it is mentioned between Beth-shean and Dor), but from which the Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites (Jdg 1:27, where it is mentioned between Dor and Megiddo); lying near the pass of Gur, in the vicinity of Megiddo, where Jehu slew Ahaziah (2Ki 9:27). It was assigned as a Levitical city to the family of Kohath (1Ch 6:70, where it is less correctly called BILEAM and mentioned along with Aner as lying within Manasseh); compare Jos 21:25, where it is called GATH-RIMMON (apparently by error; see the Sept., and comp. 1Ch 6:69). According to Schwarz (Palest. p. 148), it is the modern village Jubla, south-west (north-west) of Beth-shean, and about two English miles south of the village Kefrah; but no map has this place, and the indications require a different position. SEE GUR. The site is probably represented by that of Jelanseh, a small village about two and a half miles north of Jenin (Robinson, Researches, 3, 161).

## Ibleam (2)[[@Headword:Ibleam (2)]]

             The modern site, Jeclameh (or Belnmeh, as Tristram, Bible Places, page 221, and Conder, Tent Work, 2:337, incorrectly write), is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:84): "It stands in the plain, surrounded with arable land, and is supplied by cisterns. It has a kubbeh (domed place of prayer). on the north side. This place seems not improbably the Kalusuna of the lists of Thothmes, mentioned in the same group with Saanach, Anohareth, and other places on the plain (Quar. Statement of the Pal. Explor. Fund, July 1876, page 147)."

## Ibn-Aknin, Joseph ben-Juhudah[[@Headword:Ibn-Aknin, Joseph ben-Juhudah]]

             called in Arabic Abulhagag Jussuff ibn-Jahja Ibn-Shimun Alsabti Almaghrebi, a Jewish philosopher and commentator of some note, was born at Ceuta (Arab. Sebta), in Arabia, about 1160. His first religious training was, at least to all outside appearances, in the Mohammedan religion, but he was at a very early age also taught Hebrew, and instructed in the Talmud and Hebrew Scriptures, so that, as soon as he arrived at years of maturity, he might forsake the religion forced upon him by the law of the country that gave him birth, and return to the faith of his forefathers. About 1185, having previously decided in favor of the Jewish religion, he fled to Alexandria, and there became a zealous disciple of the great Moses Maimonides, whose attention had been called to Ibn-Aknin by a scientific work of his, and by his Makamen, which he had sent to Maimonides. Although he remained with this celebrated Jewish savant only a little over a year, then removing to Aleppo to practice medicine, he had nevertheless endeared himself so much to him that Maimonides loved him as his own son, and ever afterwards labored to promote the interests of his beloved disciple, and the philosophical work Moreh-Nebochim (Doctor perplecorum), which Maimonides (q.v.) published in 1190, is often asserted to have had for its principal aim the removal of certain sceptical opinions which Ibn-Aknin cherished at that time. In 1192, notwithstanding the frequent counsels of Maimonides to the contrary, Ibn-Aknin went to Bagdad, and there founded a rabbinic college. After the decease of his great master he figured quite prominently at the court of the sultan Azzahir Ghasi of Damascus, and he delivered lectures at the high schools on medicine and philosophy. He died about 1226. Besides a number of works  on medicine and metaphysics, he wrote Commentary on the Song of Songs (in Arabic), now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Pococke, p. 189). He espouses the notion of the Talmud, that the Song of Songs is the most sacred of all the twenty-four canonical books of the O.T., and accordingly explains it allegorically as representing the relationship of God to his people Israel. “There are,” he says, “three different modes of explaining this book:

1. The literal, which is to be found in the philologians or grammarians, e.g. Saadia, Abu Sacharja Jahja ben-Davi — el Fasi (Chajug), Abulvalid Ibn Ganach of Saragossa (Ibu--Ganach), the Nagid R. Samuel Ha-Levi ben- Nagdilah, Abn-Ibi-ahim ben-Baran (Isaac ben-Joseph), Jehudah ben- Balaam (Ibn-Balaam), and Moses Ibn-Gikatilla Ita-Cohen (Gikatilla);

2. The allegorical, to be found in the Midrash Chasit, the Talmud, and in some of the ancient interpretations; and,

3. The philosophical interpretation, which regards this book as referring to the active intellect [νοῆς ποιητικός], here worked out for the first time, and which, though the last in point of time, is the first of all in point of merit. These three different explanations correspond, in reverse order, to the three different natures of man, namely, to his physical, vital, and spiritual natures.” Ibn-Aknin always gives the first and second explanations first, and then the philosophical interpretation. The commentary is invaluable to the history of Biblical literature and exegesis, inasmuch as all the interpreters therein enumerated have, with the exception of Saadia, hitherto not been known as commentators of the Song of Songs. These expositors form an important addition to the history of interpretation given by Ginsbrg (Historical and Critical Commentary of the Song of Songs, Longman, 1857). See Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 6, 354, 362; 7, 7, 43; Jost, Geschichte d. Judenthums u.s. Setesn, 2, 457; 3, 11; Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Liter. ii, 349 sq.; the ably written monograph of Munk, Notice sur Joseph b.-Jeihsda (Paris, 1842); and the very elaborate article of Steinschneider, in Ersch und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyklopadie, s.v. Joseph Ibn-Aknin.

## Ibn-Al-Athir[[@Headword:Ibn-Al-Athir]]

             an Arabian historian, was born in 1160 at Jazirat Ibn-Omar, in Mesopotamia, and died at Mosul in 1231. He is the author of a large historical work, giving the history of the world to the year 1230, which was edited by Tornberg, under the title, Ibn-el-Athiri Chronicon quod Perfectissimum Inscribitur (Leyden, 1858-71, 12 volumes). (B.P.)

## Ibn-Amid[[@Headword:Ibn-Amid]]

             SEE ELMACIN.

## Ibn-Balaam, Jehudah[[@Headword:Ibn-Balaam, Jehudah]]

             (in Arabic Jaola Abu Zakaria), a very distinguished Jewish philologian and commentator, was born at Seville, in Spain about 1030. He was especially  prominent as a defender of the authority of the Massora (q.v.). He died about 1100. His works (in Hebrew) are:

1. On the Accents of the Bible, edited by Jo Mercer (De accentibus scripturce prosaicis, Paris, 1565). Some portions of this book Heidenheim (q.v.) incorporated in his הִטִּעֲמַים מַשְׁפְּטֵי: —

2. One the poetical Accents of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms (Paris, 1556). It has recently been reedited, with remarks of the most ancient grammarians upon these peculiar accents, notes, and an introduction, by J. G. Polak (Amsterdam, 1858): —

3. On the denominative Verbs in the Hebrew Language. The denominatives are arranged in alphabetical order, and commented upon in Arabic. This work has not yet been published, but specimens of it, in Hebrew, have been printed by Leopold Dukes in the Literaturblatt des Orients, 1846, No. 42: —

4. A Treatise on the Hebrews Particles, in alphabetical order. This work, too, has not as yet been printed, but specimens of it have been published both by Dukes and Furst in the Literaturblatt des Orients, Nos. 29 and 42: —

5. A Treatise on the Hebrew Homonyms, in alphabetical order, of which extracts have been published by Dukes in the Literaturblatt des Orients, 1846, No. 4

6. Commentary on the Pentateuch, written in Arabic. Though this work has long been known through AbenEzra, who quotes it in his commentary on Gen 49:6; Exo 5:19, yet it is only lately (1851) that Dr. Steinschneider discovered a MS. in the Bodleian Library containing a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy. “Ibln-Balaam always gives the grammatical explanation of the words first; he then enters into a minute disquisition on Saadia's translation and exposition of the Pentateuch, which he generally rejects, then explains the passage according to its context, and finally sets forth the Halachic and the judicial interpretation of the Talmud. A specimen of this commentary, which is extremely important to the Hebrew text and the Massora, has been communicated by Adolph Neubauer in the Journal Asiatique of December, 1861. It is on Deu 5:6, upon which Ibn-Balaam remarks, ‘As to the different readings of the two Decalogues (i.e. Exo 20:2-17, and  Deu 5:6-21), Saadia is of opinion that they contain two different revelations. He entertains the same view respecting those Psalms which occur twice, with some verbal variations (e.g. Psalms 14, 51), and respecting the different readings of the Babylonian and Palestinian codices.' We thus learn of a remarkable variation between the Western and Eastern codices which is not mentioned elsewhere, namely, that the words ביום ההוא(Zec 14:2) are omitted in the latter; we discover why the Syriac version has not these words; and we, moreover, see in what light Saadia and others regarded the various readings” (Ginsburg in Kitto):-

7. Commentary on the Psalms, frequently quoted by Aben-Ezra: —

8. Commentary on the Song of Songs, which, according to Ibn-Aknin (q.v.), who quotes it, gives a literal exposition of this book: —

9. Commentary on Isaiah, quoted by Joseph Albo (Ikarin, sec. 1, 1). “Ibn- Balaam, here, contrary to the generally received opinion, explains away the Messianic prophecies, and interprets Isaiah 11 as referring to Hezekiah. From AbenEzra's quotation on Zec 9:7 and Dan 10:1, it seems as if he had also written commentaries on these books. Ibn-Balaam is one of the most liberal interpreters, and quotes Christian commentators and the Koran in his expositions.” See Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 6:83 sq.; Jost, Geschichte ces Judenthums u. s. Sekte?, 2, 406; Fürst, Biblioth. ud. 1, 81; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1292-1297; He-Chaluz (Lemberg, 1853), 1, 60 sq.; Leopold Dukes, Betrage zur Geschichte der alfesten Auslegung - Spracherklarung des Aifen Testamentes (Stuttgart, 1844), 2, 186 sq.; Geiger, in the Judische Zeitschrift fur Wissenschaft und Leben, 1862, p. 292 sq.

## Ibn-Baruch, Baruch[[@Headword:Ibn-Baruch, Baruch]]

             a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished at Venice in the 16th century. But little is known of the history of his life. He published a twofold commentary on Ecclesiastes, called both קֹהֶלֶת יִצִקֹב; (the Congregation of Jacob) and יַשְׂרָאֵל קֹדֶשׁ. (Holy Israel) (Venice, 1599), the first of which is discursive and diffuse, and the second exegetical and brief. “Based upon the first verse, ‘the words of Coheleth, son of David, king in Jerusalem,' he maintains that two persons are speaking in its book, a skeptic named Coheleth, and a believer called Ben-David, and accordingly treats the whole as a dialogue, in which these two characters  are shown to discuss the most important problems of moral philosophy, and the philosophic systems of Greece and Arabia are made to furnish the two heroes of the dialogue with the necessary philosophic materials.” — Gisburg in Kitto. The ‘Quaestiones disputat de d'Animna of Thomas Aquinas, which were translated into Hebrew by Ali Xabillo, are used in this work both to put objections into the mouth of the skeptic and to furnish the believer with terse replies (comp. also Commentary, 65, a; 71, b; 96, a; 97, c; 117, a; 118, b; 119, a). It is a very valuable aid to the study of Jewish philosophy. See Jellineck, Thoman s v. Aquino i. d. jüd. Lit. (Lpz. 1853), p. 2 (13) and 7. (J. H.W.)

## Ibn-Caspi or Caspe, Joseph ben-Abba Mari[[@Headword:Ibn-Caspi or Caspe, Joseph ben-Abba Mari]]

             (also called Bonafoux de l'Argentiere), an able Jewish writer, was born of r. wealthy family about 1280 at Argentiere, in France. He removed while quite young to Tarascon, and devoted his time mainly to Biblical studies. When only seventeen years old, he published as a result commentaries on Aben-Ezra's exposition of the Pentateuch, and on Ibn-Ganach's grammatical work. When about thirty years old he extended his range of study to metaphysical subjects, and thereafter became an ardent admirer of Maimonides, whose method of interpretation he also adopted. Indeed, so far was he carried away in his admiration for the great philosopher that he emigrated to Egypt, having decided to study under the descendants of Maimonides. But he failed to meet there that great fountain of knowledge which he supposed the followers of the second great Moses capable of supplying, and, after a few months' travel in Egypt and the East, he returned to France. In 1327 he again set out on a journey to promote his studies by a residence at foreign high-schools, and he visited Catalonia, Mallorca, Aragonia, and Valencia, and at one time even desired to go to Fez, having been informed that in that African city several noted Jewish scholars resided, whose instructions he coveted. Towards the latter part of 1332 Ibn-Caspi returned to his native country, and devoted himself to the production of a number of valuable exegetical works. He died about 1340. In all he wrote some thirty-six works, most remaining to us only in MS. form, of which lists may be found in S. Jellineck, דברים עתיקים, vol. 2, 1846; Delitzsch and Zunz, Catal. MS.; and in Fiurst, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 147.

Besides a commentary on Maimonides's Alore Nebochim, his most valuable works are, כס שרשות(or שרשותonly, the word כס,ֹ silver, being an allusion to his own name, כספי, which is found in the titles of all  his works) (small silver chains or roots), a Hebrew Dictionary, which is one of his most interesting and important works. “He starts from the principle that every root has only one general idea as its basis and logically deduces from it all the other shades of meaning. A copy of this work in MS., 2 vols. 4to, is in the Paris library, and another in the Angelica at Rome. Abrabanel frequently quotes it in his commentary on the Pentateuch (comp. p. 7), on Isaiah (comp. Isa 45:3; Isa 66:17), etc.; Wolf gives a specimen of it (Bibliotheca Hebrcea, 1, 1543); Richard Simon used the Paris MS. (Hist. Crit. lib. 1, cap. 31), and Leopold Dukes printed extracts from it (Literturblatt des Orients, 1847, p. 486): — A Commentary on Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. “Of the commentary on Proverbs, which is one of Ibn-Caspi's most valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis, the beginning and end have been published by Werblumer (comp. קבוצת כס, 1846, p. 19, etc.); an analysis of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given by Ginsburg (compare Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes, Longman, 1861, p. 60, etc.), and the brief commentary on, or, rather, introduction to the Song of Songs, which was published in 1577, but which is rarer than the MSS., has been reprinted with an English translation by Ginsburg in his Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs (London, 1857, p. 47, etc.):”- מטות כס(silver staves), or commentary on eight prophets, in which he attacks with great severity those who explain these prophecies as referring to the Messiah SEE IBN-DANAN:-- גכיע כס (a silver cup), or commentary on the miracles and other mysteries found in the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hagiographa. His principles' of interpretation he laid down clearly in his commentary on the Proverbs above mentioned in these words: “The sacred Scriptures must be explained according to their plain and literal sense; and a recondite meaning can as little be introduced into them as into Aristotle's writings on logic and natural history.

Only where the literal meaning is not sufficient, and reason rejects it, a deeper sense must be resorted to. If we once attempt to allegorize a simple and intelligible passage, then we might just as well do it with the whole contents of the Bible.” “The logical division of sentences is the most indispensable and best auxiliary to the right understanding of the Bible, and the criterion to the proper order of the words are the Massora and the accents.” It is evident from this extract that Ibn-Caspi anticipated the hermeneutical rules of modern criticism at a time when the schoolmen and the depositaries of Christian learning were engaged in hair-splitting and in allegorizing every  fact of the Bible. It is greatly to be regretted that most of his exegetical works are left unpublished. See Ginsburg, in Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 351 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:361 sq.; Kirchheim, Werblumler's Edition of Ibn-Caspi's Commentary an Maimonides's More Nebochim (Frankfort- on-the-Maine, 1848), p. 10 sq.; Leopold Dukes, in the Litersaturb. des Orients, 1848; and Schneider, in Ersch u. Gruber's Allgen. Encyklop. sec. 2, 31:58 sq.

## Ibn-Chajim, Aaron[[@Headword:Ibn-Chajim, Aaron]]

             a Jewish commentator, was born at Fez, Africa, about 1570. But little is known of his personal history. His works are, a Commentary on Joshua (Venice, 1608-9), from which a selection was made by Frankfurter (q.v.) in his great Rabbinic Bible: — a commentary on Sifra (tradition of Leviticus), published under the title of The Oblation of Aaron (Venice, 1609-11.): — The Rules of Aaron, a treatise on R. Ishmael's (q.v.) thirteen rules for interpreting the O.T. Scriptures (Ven. 1609, Dres. 1712). — Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 352.

## Ibn-Darnan, Saadia ben-Maimon[[@Headword:Ibn-Darnan, Saadia ben-Maimon]]

             a Jewish writer of some distinction, was Rabbi to the congregation at Granada previous to the cession of this country by the Moors to Ferdinand and Isabella, and the expatriation of the Jews. He was born in the first half of the 15th century, and flourished at Granada from 1460 to 1502. He was especially given to the study of the Talmud and history, and as a result of the former we have several works on the interpretation of the O.T. Scriptures, and the elucidation of the language of the original. His exegetical works are, a Commentary on Isaiah 53:13 (MS. Michael, 412), in which he takes ground against Ibn-Caspi (q.v.): — a Hebrew Lexicon (written in Arabic). This work, which he is thought to have completed in 1468, also remains only in MS. form, but an extract from it has been printed by Pinsker in his Likute Kadmonioth (Vienna, 1860), p. 74. His historical works are, A short History of the Jews to the Days of Moses Maimonides (פאר הדור), which he originally intended for his own pupils, of whom he seems to have had a number. See Gritz, Geschichte d. Juden, 8, 345 sq.: Edelmann, Chemda Genuzsa, Introd. p. 17 sq., and Text, p. 13 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 352. (J. H. W.)

## Ibn-Daud[[@Headword:Ibn-Daud]]

             SEE CHAUG.

## Ibn-Djanah[[@Headword:Ibn-Djanah]]

             SEE IBN-GANACH.

## Ibn-Ezra[[@Headword:Ibn-Ezra]]

             SEE ABEN-EZRA.

## Ibn-Ganach, Abulwalid Merwan or Jonah Djanah[[@Headword:Ibn-Ganach, Abulwalid Merwan or Jonah Djanah]]

             (in Hebrew called Jonah), one of the most distinguished Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cordova about 995. While yet a boy he evinced his fondness for Hebrew by writing verses in that language, but as he continued in his studies he determined to devote his whole life to the advancement of the Hebrew as a philological study, and even abandoned the practice of medicine, which he had chosen as his profession after his removal to Saragossa in 1015, whither he had been forced by the persecutions which the Jews of Cordova suffered at the hand of Al- Mostain Suleimall since his occupation of that place in 1013. He soon acquired a proficiency, which even in our day has not been excelled, and he deserves greater praise than any other Jewish scholar on account of the impulse he gave both to his contemporaries and to his immediate successors (among them the two Kimnchis and AbeonEzra), who have frequently acknowledged their obligations to him. The thorough manner in which he conducted his investigations enabled him to accomplish much more than his illustrious predecessor Chajug (q.v.), and by his criticism of Chajug's works, in which he readily acknowledged all that was meritorious, he frequently encountered the ardent followers of that great master, and became entangled in a number of controversies, which finally resulted beneficially to Hebrew philology. He died about 1050. His first great work in linguistics is his Kitab el-Tankieh (“book of inquiry”), written in Arabic (the native tongue in his day of that part of Spain),  consisting of two great parts, the first, Kitub el-Leuma' (“book of variegated fields”), treating at length of Hebrew grammar, and the second, Kitacb el-Azul (“book of roots”), a Hebrew Dictionary, which was afterwards translated into Hebrew by several Jewish scholars, but of which only the translations made by Ibn-Parchon and by Ibn-Tibbon are preserved. The original is at Oxford (MS. Ure, No. 456, 457), and was extensively used by Gesenius in his Thesazurus. Specimens of it, which Gesenius gave in his Dict. of the Heb. Lezan. were translated by Dr. Robinson, and published in the Amec Bib. Repository, 1833.

That part of this work which refers to Hebrew grammar was published by Kirchheim (Frankf. A.M. 1856, 8vo). “This gigantic work is the most important philological production in Jewish literature of the Middle Ages. The mastery of the science of the Hebrew language in all its delicate points which Ibn-Ganach therein displays, the lucid manner in which he explains every grammatical difficulty, and the sound exegetical rules which he therein propounds, have few parallels up to the present day. He was not only the creator of the Hebrew syntax, but almost brought it to perfection. He was the first who pointed out the ellipses and the transposition of letters, words, and verses in the Hebrew Bible, and explained in a simple and natural manner more than two hundred obscure passages, which had up to his time greatly perplexed all interpreters, by showing that the sacred writers used abnormal for normal expressions (compare ספר הרקמה, ch. 28; Aben-Ezra's Commentary on Dan 1:1, and ספר צחית, ed. Lippmann, p. 72, note).

Though his faith in the inspiration of the Hebrew Scriptures was absolute, yet he maintained that, being addressed to men, they are subject to the laws of language, and hence urged that the abnormal expressions and forms in the Bible are not to be ascribed to the ignorance of transcribers and punctuators, nor to willful corruption, but are owing to the fact that the sacred writers, being human, paid the tribute of humanity.” But also in metaphysics Ibn-Ganach was no tyro, and he speaks of Plato and Aristotle like one who had studied them diligently. He wrote a work on logic, Aristotelian, in principle, and strenuously opposed the efforts of his contemporaries, especially Ibn-Gebirol, in their metaphysical investigations on the relation of God to the world, holding that these inquiries only endangered the belief in the Scriptures. See Munk, Notice sur A. i1. Ibn-Djanah (Paris, 1851); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6, 25 sq., 205 sq.; Furst, Hebr. Dict. Introd. p. 30 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. 2, 354 sq.; First Biblioth. Jud. 1, 315.

## Ibn-Gebirol or Gabirol, Salomon ben-Jehrdah[[@Headword:Ibn-Gebirol or Gabirol, Salomon ben-Jehrdah]]

             a very distinguished Jewish philosopher, commentator, and grammarian, as well as hymnologist, was born at Malaga, in Spain, about 1021. When only nineteen years of age he evinced his great skill as a poet, and his thorough acquaintance with Hebrew grammar by writing a grammar of the Hebrew language in Hebrew verse. It has never been printed entire, but parts of it have been published by Parchon in his Hebrew Lexicon (Paris, 1844), and by Leop. Dukes, in his Shire Shelomo (Hannov. 1858). About 1045 Ibn- Gebirol published his first philosophical work, which was translated by Ibn- Tibbon into Hebrew, entitled תַּקּוּן מַדּוֹת הִנֶּפֶשׁ(published in 1550 and often). He propounds in this work “a peculiar theory of the human temperament and passions, enumerates twenty propensities corresponding to the four dispositions multiplied by the five senses, and shows how the leaning of the soul to the one side may be brought to the moral equipoise by observing the declarations of Scripture, and ethical sayings of the Talmud, which he largely quotes, and which he intersperses with the chief sayings of ‘the divine' Socrates, his pupil Plato, Aristotle, the Arabic philosophers, and especially with the maxims of a Jewish moral philosopher called Chefez Al-Kute, who is the author of an Arabic paraphrase of the Psalms in rhyme (Steinschneider, Jewish Literature [Lond. 1857], p. 101).”

But as this work contained also personal allusions to some leading men of Saragossa, he was expatriated in 1046. After traveling from one place to another, he finally found a protector in the celebrated Samuel Ha-Nagid, a Jew also, then prime minister of Spain, and he was enabled to continue his philosophical studies, as the result of which he produced The Fountain of Life, his greatest work. Fragments of a Hebrew translation and an entire Latin version of it were published by Munk in his Melanges de philosophie Nizte et Ara be (Paris, 1857-59). He died in 1070. The influence which Ibn-Gebirol exerted on Arabian and Jewish philosophy cannot be too highly estimated. He certainly deserves to be called “the Jewish Plato,” as Graitz chooses to name him; but the assertion that he was the first philosopher of the Middle Ages, and that his philosophical treatises were used by the scholastic philosophers, is an error, as Lewis (History of Philosophy, ii, 63) fully proves, although Imunk, and after him Gratz, fell into the same mistake, as also Ginsburg, the writer of the article on Ibn- Gebirol in Kitto (Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 356). From frequent quotations in Aben- Ezra's commentaries, it seems that Ibn-Gebirol must also have written some expositions of the Old-Test. Scriptures, though none such are known  to us at present existing. Ibn-Gebirol also had a natural talent for verse making. One of his hymns, entitled The royal Diadem, “a beautiful and pathetic poetical composition of profound philosophical sentiments and great devotion, forms an important part of the divine service on the evening preceding the great Day of Atonement with the devout Jews to the present day.” See Gratz, Geschichte de. Jude, 6, 31 sq.; Sachs, Religiise Poesie d. Juden i. Spanien (Berl. 1845), p. 3 sq. 213, etc.; Ztuz, Syncacogcale Poesie der Mittelalters, p, 222; First, Biblioth. Jud. i, 320 sq.

## Ibn-Giath, Isaac ben-Juhudah[[@Headword:Ibn-Giath, Isaac ben-Juhudah]]

             a Jewish Rabbi of a very distinguished family who resided in Lucena, not far from Cordova, was born about 1030. He was a very able philosopher and hymnologist, and well conversant with the Talmud. He is said to have written a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, which has not as yet come to light. From the frequent quotations made from it by the best interpreters and lexicographers, it appears that it contained important contributions to the critical exposition of this difficult book. From the references to his writings made by Aben-Ezra (comp. comment. on Deu 10:7; Psa 147:3), Kimchi (Lexicon, under articles שרק, ענה, עמת, סור, נבע, זכר), and Solomon ben-Melech (comment. on 2Sa 22:36), it is evident that Ibn-Giath most have also written some other exegetical and grammatical treatises, and that he materially contributed to the development of Biblical exegesis. This devotional poetry, which is rather inferior to Ibn-Gebirol's (q.v.), is used in the Jewish service to the present day. He lied in 1089. See Zunz, Synagogale Poesie d. Mittelalters, p. 225 sq.; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 1, 332 sq.; Sachs, Die Religiose Poesie d. Juden in Spanien (Berlin, 1845), p. 46, etc., 255, etc.; Landshut, Amude Aboda (Berl. 1857), fasciculus 1, 111, etc.; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 6, 74.

## Ibn-Gikatilla[[@Headword:Ibn-Gikatilla]]

             SEE JOSEPH IBN-CHIQUITILLA.

## Ibn-Jachja, David[[@Headword:Ibn-Jachja, David]]

             a Jewish scholar, was born about 1440. He was a Rabbi at Lisbon, in Portugal, and had gained great celebrity by his scholarship when he was suddenly accused of giving aid to the Spanish Maranes (q.v.), who, having witnessed the peculiar practices of the Spanish disciples of Christ, preferred to return to the faith of their fathers. Ibn-Jachja was condemned to death, and barely escaped the punishment by a flight to Naples. Later, he removed to Constantinople, and taught the sciences. He died in 1504. His works are, Leshon Limmodim, a large Hebrew grammar; and Shekel Hakkodesh, on the metric and poetical laws of the new Hebrew dialect. See Carmoly, Die Jachjiden, p. 17; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 9, 3; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 462; First, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:2 sq.

## Ibn-Jachja, Gedalja[[@Headword:Ibn-Jachja, Gedalja]]

             a Jewish historian, was born at Imola about 1515. He deserves mention here on account of his work Shalsheleth Hakkabala, or Chain of Tradition (Zolkiew, 1804). It is a history of the Jews, and is divided into three parts, of which part first only is the Shalsheleth, or literary chronicle of rabbinism; the other parts treat not only of history proper, but include also natural history, pneumatology, and economics. He died about 1587. — Carmoly, Die Jachjiden, p. 33 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 9, 435; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 452; Furst, Biblioth. Jud 1:2-3.

## Ibn-Jachja, Joseph b.-David[[@Headword:Ibn-Jachja, Joseph b.-David]]

             a distinguished Jewish commentator, was born at Florence in 1494. His ancestors were citizens of Spain, but had fled from the Iberian Peninsula on account of the religious persecutions which the Jews had to suffer, especially under John II. His education he received first at Verona, then at Imola and Padua, and he settled at Imola. He died, exhausted by excessive studies, in 1539. His works are, commentaries on the Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther; Psalms, Proverbs, and Daniel (transl. into Latin by Constantin l'Empereur [Amsterdam, 1633], with the Hebrew text and a refutation of anti-Christian passages). A special feature of these commentaries, which are all inserted in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible, is the midrashic lore contained in them, which is valuable to the historicocritical exegetist. Ibn-Jachja wrote also Torah, or “The Law of Light” (Bologla, 1538), a very valuable work on the theology of Judaism, in which he rejects the introduction of philosophy in the consideration of  religious topics. See Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 9, 235; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Lit. p. 452; Jost, Israelitische Annalen, 2, 393 sq.; Ersch u. Gruber's Algem. Encyklop. sec. 2, 31:81 sq.;. Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. 2, 356; First, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:4.

## Ibn-Jaish, Baruch[[@Headword:Ibn-Jaish, Baruch]]

             a Jewish scholar, flourished at Cordova, in Spain, in the 15th century. He wrote commentaries on the Song of Songs (The blessed Fountain, etc., Constantinople, 1576), and on Ecclesiastes and Job (The blessed Fountain of Job and Ecclesiastes, Constantinople, 1576). “He generally gives the literal explanation of every passage according to the context, and tries to solve the grammatical difficulties of the text.” — Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Literature, 2, 357; Furst, Biblioth. Jud 1:2; Jud 1:12.

## Ibn-Kastor[[@Headword:Ibn-Kastor]]

             SEE ITZCHAKI.

## Ibn-Koreish, Jehudah[[@Headword:Ibn-Koreish, Jehudah]]

             one of the earliest Jewish lexicographers, flourished in the latter half of the 9th century at Tuhart or Tahort, in Africa, and was one of the first who wrote on comparative philology. He was thoroughly conversant not only with the Berber tongue, but also with the three Shemitic languages; he had carefully studied the traditions of the Jews and the Mohammedans, and was eminently qualified to write on the Hebrew language, and introduce frequent comparisons with the other Shemitic tongues. His works are,

אַגָּרוֹן, a Hebrew Lexicon in alphabetical order, but with that peculiar arrangement which all works of this class were subject to at that time, viz. each group of words belonging to a letter was accompanied by introductions, one on those words which have only the letter in question for a radical theme, and another on the changes of that letter. The work has been lost, but its existence is attested by the fact that not only the author himself refers to it in another of his works, but also the great scholars of his and subsequent periods; — Risalet (Heb. רסאלה), or a letter addressed to his Jewish brethren at Fez, in which he exhorts them to continue the study of the Aramaic Targum, and of the Aramaic as well as the Shemitic languages, without a thorough knowledge of which the Old-Test. Scriptures can only be imperfectly comprehended. After the introduction he divided the work into three parts. In Part I he arranged in alphabetic  order all difficult Hebrew words that could only be properly understood from the Chaldee paraphrases of Onkelos and Jonathan ben-Uziel. Pait II contained an explanation of Biblical Hebrew words found also in the Mishna and the Talmud. In Part III he instituted a comparison with the Arabic of all analogous Hebrew roots, forms of expressions, prefixes and suffixes, etc.

This work is certainly a very important contribution to Hebrew philology, and it is only to be regretted that we do not possess it completely, since the first part breaks up with letter כ, and does not begin again till letter ת, from which Furst (Hebr. Dict. vol. 23) infers that the author intended it only as a continuation of his (lost) Hebrew Dictionary. It has lately been published in the Arabic under the title Epistola de studii Targum cutilitate et de linguce Chaldaicae, Misnicae, Talmudice, Arabicae, vocabulorum item nonnullorum barbaricorum convenientia cum Hebrea; ediderunt J. J. L. Barges et D. R. Goldberg (Paris, 1857). The introduction, with specimens from the work, have been published in Arabic, with a German translation by Schnurrer, in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek d. Biblisch. Literatur (Lpz. 1790), 3:951 sq.; the introduction has also been published with a German translation by Wetstein in the Literaturblatt des Orients (1845), 3:2; and extracts are given by Ewald and Dukes, Beitrage zur Geschichte d. Aeltesten Auslegeng und Spracherklairung d. A. Test. (Stuttgart, 1844), 1, 116-23; 2, 117, 118. He wrote אלססֵפֶר דַּקְדּוּקוֹ a Hebrew grammar, which Aben-Ezra used in the preparation of his own work. See, besides the works already referred to, Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 293; Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Lit. 2, 357; First, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 203.

## Ibn-Latifor Allatif, Isaac ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Ibn-Latifor Allatif, Isaac ben-Abraham]]

             a Jewish philosopher, was born in Southern Spain about 1270. But little is known of his personal history. He devoted much of his time to the study of the Cabala, and became one of its most celebrated exponents in Spain. With greater correctness than Cabalists who preceded him, he advocated the doctrine that the worlds of spirit and of matter are closely allied, and likewise God and his creation. The divine is in everything, and everything in the divine. He also believed in the power of prayer, but that man, in order to be accepted of God, must approach at least perfection; hence the most perfect of men, the prophets, interceded by prayer for the people. The development of the self-revelation of the divinity in the world, of' the spirits, spheres, and bodies, Ibn-Latif explains by mathematical formulas.  He died about 1290. Of his works, which are quite numerous, the following have been printed: Iggereth hat-Toshubah, replies to the questions of Judah ben-Naason (Prague, 1839, 8vo): — a Heb. Commentary on Ecclesiastes (Constantinople, s. a. 8vo). See Gratz, Geschichte d. Juden, 7, 220; Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2, 224; Carmoly, Revue Orientale, 1, 61 sq.

## Ibn-Librat[[@Headword:Ibn-Librat]]

             SEE DUNASH.

## Ibn-Sabba[[@Headword:Ibn-Sabba]]

             SEE SABBA IBN.

## Ibn-Saktar[[@Headword:Ibn-Saktar]]

             SEE ITZCHAKI.

## Ibn-Sargado, Aaron[[@Headword:Ibn-Sargado, Aaron]]

             also called AAROS HACOHEN BEN-JOSEPH, a Jewish scholar, flourished in Bagdad towards the middle of the 10th century. He was a wealthy merchant, but very fond of study, and, taking ground against Saadia (q.v.), for whose deposition from the “Gaonate” he expended large sums of money, shortly after Saadia's decease he was elected Gaon (spiritual head) of the academy at Pumbadita (943), and by his zeal for learning and his great wealth greatly furthered the interests of this academy at the expense of the Suran school, over which Saadia had presided. Ibn-Sargado, during the eighteen years of his presidency, devoted himself not only to the exposition of the O.-Test. Scriptures, but also quite extensively to the study of philosophy (comp. Munk, Guide des egares, 1, 462). He wrote a philosophical work and a Commentary on the Pentateuch, but they are not as yet known to us. From the fragments of the latter preserved by Aben- Ezra (Gen 18:28; Gen 34:30; Gen 49:6-7; Exo 10:12; Lev 18:6), we see that, though abiding by the traditional explanation of the Hebrew Scriptures, Ibn-Sargado was by no means a slavish follower of ancient opinions. See Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, v, 335 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. 2, 357; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 246; Geiger, Judische Zeitschrifufur Wissenschaft und Leben (1862), p. 297; Zunz, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, vol. 4 (Stuttg. 1839), p. 389, etc.

## Ibn-Saruk[[@Headword:Ibn-Saruk]]

             SEE MENACHEM

## Ibn-Shem-Tob[[@Headword:Ibn-Shem-Tob]]

             SEE SHEM-TOB.

## Ibn-Shoeib, Joel[[@Headword:Ibn-Shoeib, Joel]]

             a Jewish commentator, flourished at Tudela in the latter half of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history. His works show him to have been a man of considerable culture and great liberality of mind. He wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, entitled The Holocaust of Sabbath (Ven. 1577); on the Psalms, entitled Fearful in Praises (Salonaica, 1568- 69); on the Song of Songs, entitled A brief Exposition (Sabionetta, 1558); and an Exposition of Lamentations (Venice, 1589). In his commentary on the Psalms he maintained that pious Gentiles would have a share in the world to come, which, when we consider the severe persecutions they inflicted at this time on the Jews, is by no means a small concession on the part of Ion-Shoeib. — Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. 2, 358; Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Literatur (Berl. 1845), p. 384. (J. H.W.)

## Ibn-Sitta[[@Headword:Ibn-Sitta]]

             (בן זיטא), a distinguished Jew, flourished at Irak towards the close of the 9th century. He wrote a commentary on the Scriptures, of which fragments only are left. Such we find in Aben-Ezra (on Exo 21:24; Exo 21:35; Exo 22:28). Saadia Gaon thought Ibn-Sitta of sufficient importance to refute his interpretations, while Aben-Ezra exercises his withering sarcasm upon him. — Kitto, Cyclop. of Bibl. Lit. 2, 358; Pinsker, Likkute Kadmonioth (Vienna, 1860), p. 43; Furst, Gesch. d. Karaerthums (Lpz. 1862), p. 100,173.

## Ibn-Thofeil[[@Headword:Ibn-Thofeil]]

             an Arabian philosopher who flourished in the 12th century, wrote a work in which the existence of God is proved in so able a manner that the arguments remain unrefuted to this day. It was translated into Persian, Hebrew, and Latin. The last-named, by Ed. Pococke, was entitled Philosophus autodidactus, sive epistola Abi Jaafor Ebn-Tophail de Hai Ebbn-Yokdham (Oxf. 1671 and 1700, 4to; and also in English by S. Ockley, Lend. 1708, 1731, 8vo, and other modern languages). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 752.

## Ibn-Tibbon, Jehudah ben-Saul[[@Headword:Ibn-Tibbon, Jehudah ben-Saul]]

             a Jewish scholar of Spanish descent, was born at Lunel, France, about 1120. He was educated a physician, but his ardent love for the study of  Hebrew led him to abandon the practice of his profession, and he devoted himself mainly to the translation into Hebrew of some of the most valuable works of able Jews written in Arabic. He died about 1190. His translations are The Duties of the Heart of Joseph b.-Bechai, the Ethics of Ibn-Gebiroi, the Kusari of Judah Ha-Levi, the A Moral Philosophy of Saadia Gaon, and the grammatical and lexicographical work of Ibn-Ganach (q.v.). All his translations bear his own pedantic character: they are literal, and therefore clumsy, and we can hardly see why he should have gained the surname of prince of translators, unless it was for the service which he rendered by presenting the Jews translations of works not otherwise accessible to them. He is also said to have written a work on the purity of the Hebrew language (הלשון סוד צחות), which Is lost. See Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. 2, 358; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana (col. 1374-76); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6, 241; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 401 sq.

## Ibn-Tibbon, Samuel[[@Headword:Ibn-Tibbon, Samuel]]

             son of the preceding, was born about 1160. He was educated by his father both in the Hebrew and cognate languages, and followed him in the practice of medicine. He was wild and even reckless in his youth, but finally became interested in his studies, and evinced greater skill as a translator than his father. He died about 1230. Besides translating philosophical works both of Jewish and heathen authors, among whom were Aristotle and Alfarabi he wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (קהלת פירוש), which exists in MS. in several of the European libraries; and a commentary on Gen 1:1-9, entitled מאמר יקוו המים(Presburg, 1837), being a dissertation on the creation, Gratz Gesch. d. Juden, 6, 242; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. 2, 358; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 402 sq.

## Ibn-Tumart, Abdullah[[@Headword:Ibn-Tumart, Abdullah]]

             a religious enthusiast, flourished in the second half of the 12th century in Northern Africa. He appeared before the simple-minded hordes of Barbary, and preached against the Sunnitical doctrine of the Mohammedan orthodoxy SEE SUNNITES, and the literal interpretation of the verses of the Koran, and the Mohammedan belief that God feels and acts like man. His followers, on account of their belief in the strict unity of God without corporeal representation (Tauchid),. called themselves Almowachids, or Almohads. Ibn-Tumart they recognized as Mahdi, or the God-sent Imam  of Islam. Like Mohammed, he went forth to conquer by the sword the territories of the Almoravids, and his doctrine soon found followers throughout Northwest. Africa. SEE MOHAMMEDANS. (J. H.W.)

## Ibn-Wakkar[[@Headword:Ibn-Wakkar]]

             SEE WAKKAR.

## Ibneiah[[@Headword:Ibneiah]]

             (Heb. Yibneqah', יַבְנְיָה, Jehovah will build him up; Sept. Ι᾿εβναά), a son of Jeroham, who, with other Benjamites, returned to Jerusalem after the Captivity (1Ch 9:8). B.C. 536.

## Ibnijah[[@Headword:Ibnijah]]

             (Heb. Yibniyah', יַבְנַיָּה, i.q. Ibneiah; Sept. Ι᾿εβανααί), the father of Reuel, which latter was the grandfather of the Meshullam, another Benjamite, who settled in Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (1Ch 9:8). B.C. long ante 536.

## Ibo Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Ibo Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This dialect is spoken by the Ibos on the banks of the Niger, in West Africa. The first part of the New Test., the gospel of Matthew, was published in this dialect in 1859, and since that time other parts were added. Up to date there are published only eight books of the New Test. In linguistic respects the language has been treated by J.F. Schon, in Oku Ibo, Grammatical Elements of the Ibo Language (1861). (B.P.)

## Ibri[[@Headword:Ibri]]

             (Heb. Ibri', עַבְרַי, an. Eberite or “Hebrew;” Sept. has ᾿Ωβδί v.r. Α᾿βαϊv), the last named of “the sons of Merari by Jaaziah,” i.e., apparently a descendant of Levi in the time of David (1Ch 24:27). B.C. 1014.

## Ibum[[@Headword:Ibum]]

             is a name for the Jewish ceremony of the marriage of a childless widow by the brother of the deceased husband. SEE LEVIRATE LAW.

## Ibzan[[@Headword:Ibzan]]

             (Heb. Ibtsan', אַבְצָן, from אָבִוֹ, to shine, hence illustrious; but accord. to Gesen. perh. of tin, or grievous, from the Chald.; Sept. Ε᾿βεσάν v.r. Α᾿βαισσάν; Joseph. Α᾿ψάνης, Ant. 5, 7, 13), the tenth “judge of Israel” (Jdg 12:8-10). He was of Bethlehem probably the Bethlehem of Zebulun (so Michaelis and Hezel), and not of Judah (as Josephus says). He governed seven years, B.C. 1249-1243. The prosperity of Ibzan is marked by the great number of his children (thirty sons and thirty daughters), and his wealth by their marriages-for they were all married. Some have held, with little probability, that Ibzan was the same with Boaz.-Kitto.

## Icard, Charles[[@Headword:Icard, Charles]]

             a French Protestant divine, was born at St. Hippolyte, Languedoc, in February, 1636. He attended school at Anduze, Orange, and Nimes, and concluded his theological studies at Geneva from 165558, and in 1659 went to Paris. After ordination by the provincial synod of Ay he was appointed pastor of La Norville, where he remained until 1668, when he accepted a pastorship at Nimes. Under the influence of the persecutions which heralded the approaching revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Protestants, at the suggestion of Claude Brousson, formed a central committee for the protection of their general interests, and Icard was chosen to represent it at the Synod of Lower Languedoc, assembled at Uzes in 1632. In the mean time, the population of a part of Vivarais and  Lower Languedoc having risen in arms to resist the persecution, the insurrection was extinguished in blood, and the members of the central committee, accused of being the instigators, were proceeded against with the utmost severity. Icard succeeded in reaching Geneva, and thence went to Neufchatel for greater security. While on his way, at Yverdun, he learned that he had been condemned, June 26, 1682, as contumacious, to die on the rack. He remained as pastor at Neufchatel until 1688, when he went to Bremen, and supplied a French congregation there. He died June 9,1715. Icard wrote two Sermons, Avis salutaire aux Eglises reformees de France (Amst. 1685, 12mo), exhorting the Protestants not to give way under persecution. He also edited an edition of the Institutions de Calvin (first two books, Bremen, 1696,1697, to the whole, Bremen, 1713, fol.); and an edition of the Entretiens d'un Pere et de son Fils sur le Changement de Religion, par Josue de La Place. See Hossat, Detail abrgi de la Vie de Charles Icard (in Hist. crit. de la Republique des Lettres (1717), 14, 283301; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 768.

## Ice[[@Headword:Ice]]

             (קֶרִח, ke'rach, so called from its smoothness, Job 6:16; elsewhere cold, “frost,” Gen 31:40; Jer 36:30; i.e. ice, Job 37:10; but “crystal” in Eze 1:22; or קֹרִח, ko'rach, id., poet. for hail, Psa 147:17). See the above terms, and climate under SEE PALESTINE.

## Iceland[[@Headword:Iceland]]

             an island belonging to Denmark, situated between the North Atlantic and the Arctic Oceans, distant 130 miles from the south-east coast of Greenland, and about 850 miles west of Norway, extending between lat. 630 24' and 660 33' N., and long. 130 31' and 240. The area is 39,756 square miles, of which only 15,300 are cultivated. The total population of Iceland was, according to the statistics of 1888, about 72,000 souls.

As early as 795 the eastern coast of Iceland was inhabited by some Irish monks, but it did not receive a settled population until 860, when king Harald Harfagr, of Norway, after conquering the other kings, made himself sole sovereign of the country, and induced large numbers of the malcontents to emigrate to Iceland. Nearly all the newcomers were pagans,  and thus the republic which was established by them was thoroughly pagan. The legislation of Ulfliot (about 927) created the Althing, an assembly of the wisest men of all districts, which met annually to discuss the affairs of the country, and to give the necessary laws. The first Christian missionary among the Icelanders was Thorvaldr Kodransson (981-985), with the same Vidforli (“who has made wide journeys”), who was supported by Frederick, according to the legend, a Saxon bishop. With great vigor the missionary work was subsequently continued by king Olaf Tryggvason of Norway, who not only tried by persuasion, bribery, and intimidation to gain for the Christian religion all the Icelanders who came to Norway, but also sent missionaries to Iceland, and supported their labors by the whole influence which he could command. The first to go was the Icelander Stefnir Thorgilsson (996-997), followed by the Saxon priest Dankbrand, who, after many adventures, had become court chaplain of the king (997-999); two noble Icelanders, the “White Gizur,” and Hjalti Skegjason, succeeded finally in effecting a compromise with the pagan chief functionary of the island, Thorgair of Ljosavatu, according to which Christianity was made the state religion of Iceland, while many reservations were made in favor of paganism (1000). The whole people were then baptized, part of them reluctantly, yet without open resistance.

A few years later, king Olaf Haraldsson caused the last remnants of paganism to be effaced from the laws. Some traces, however, of the former religion remained in the faith and usages of the Christian Icelanders, particularly in their Church constitution. During the pagan period the erection and possession of a temple had been a private affair; as there was no separate order of priests, divine worship had been held in every temple by its owner; subsequently, when the political constitution of the island was regulated (965), a limited number (thirty-nine) of temples obtained a political importance, and every Icelander was obliged to connect himself with the owner of the principal temple as his subject, and to pay a contribution for the maintenance of the temple. Private temples were maintained beside the public, and the latter remained likewise the private property of the chiefs. The idea of chief temples ceased with the introduction of Christianity but erection, donation, and maintenance of the temples remained a private affair. The law only provided that the erection of a church involved the duty of maintaining it; and the clergy could compel the dotation of a church by delaying its consecration until dotation was provided for.

Otherwise the administration of the property of the church by its owner was very arbitrary, and he had only to take care of the maintenance of the church  and of the holding of divine worship. He either could take orders himself or hire another priest. In the former case the priest was more of a peasant, merchant, or a judge than a clergyman; in the latter he was financially dependent upon the owner of the temple, and, like other servants, obliged to perform domestic or military services. Iceland received its own and native bishop in 1055, having up to that time been only visited by missionary bishops. The bishop enjoyed the benefit of the old temple duties; otherwise he had to live out of his own means. Under the second bishop, Gizur, the see was endowed, and permanently established at Skalahold; subsequently (about 1106) a second see was established at Holar, to which was given the jurisdiction of the northern district, while the three other districts remained subject to the bishop of Skalahold. The bishops were elected by the people; the priests by the owners of the several churches. Thus the clergy were less independent than in other countries, and consequently less powerful. Their influence somewhat increased when bishop Gizur, in 1097, prevailed upon the National Assembly to introduce the tithe, and when the bishops Thorlakr Runolfson and Retill Thorsteinson, by compiling the Church laws, gained a firm basis (1123: it was published in 1776 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title Jus ecclesiasticum vetus, sive Thorlaco-Ketillianum, or Kristinreur him gamli). Still the condition of the Icelandic Church continued to remain in many particulars different from that of other churches. Lay patronage was recognized to its fullest extent; no celibacy separated the clergy from the people; even the bishops were generally married. The bishops, though they had a seat in the National Assembly, had no sepal rate ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and marriage and other affairs were regulated contrary to Church law.

The Church of Iceland was at first subordinate to the archbishopric of Bremen and Hamburg; when the archoishopric of Lund was established (1103), Iceland was transferred to it finally, it was transferred to the new archbishopric of Nidaros. About the middle of the 11th century the island became subject to the crown of Norway, and was consequently affected by the war between Church and State, which took place in that country. This chiefly concerned the patronage of laymen, and sided with the adoption of a new Church law introduced about 1297 by bishop Arni. (This Church law was published in 1777 by Grim Joh. Thorkelin, under the title Jus ecclesiasticusm novum sive Arncanum, or Kristinnrettr inn nyi.)  The inner condition of the people was anything but satisfactory, as immorality and other vices appear to have prevailed to a large extent among the laity as well as among the clergy. The convents which had arisen since the 12th century fully participated in the general degeneration. Externally all classes of the people showed a strong attachment to the Church of Rome, and three natives of the island obtained a place among the saints of the Church-Thorlakr, Jon, and Gutdmundr; the last named, however, was not formally canonized.

The Reformation soon found a number of adherents; among the earliest and most devoted was Oddr Gottschalksson, the author of the first translation of the New Testament into Icelandic (printed at Roeskilde, 1540). The Danish government, of which Iceland formed a dependency since the union of Norway with Denmark (1397), endeavored to introduce the Reformation, which in 1536 had been declared to be the religion of the state by the Diet of Copenhagen, by force; but the bishops, especially bishop Arason of Holar, made a determined, and at length an armed opposition, which, however, finally (1550) ended in his capture and execution. This put an end to the Church of Rome in Iceland, and in the next year (1551) the Reformation was fully carried through.

The real improvement in the condition of the Church was, however, only gradual. Many of the customs of the mediaeval Church, such as the use of the Latin language at divine service, maintained themselves for a long time; and the same was the case with the ignorance and the immorality of the clergy and the people. But gradually these defects were remedied by the establishment of learned schools in connection with the two cathedrals (1552); by the establishment of a printing-press at Holar by the excellent bishop Gudbrandr Thorlakson (1574); and in particular by the new translation of the Bible by this bishop, a service that contributed largely to a thorough reform of the Church, which now belongs to the best-educated portions of the Protestant world.

As regards the present constitution of the Church of Iceland, it resembles in its principal features that of Denmark, yet not without preserving some of its own peculiarities. The sovereign is the chief bishop (summus episcopus), who exercises his authority partly through the bishops, partly through secular officers. The bishops, in the election of whom the people take part, occupy the position of superintendents, and still have an extended jurisdiction. At the close of the 18th century the see of Skalahold  was transferred to Reykjavik, and somewhat later (1825) a cathedral was established at Langanies, near Reykjavik. The episcopal see of Holar had previously (in 1801) been abolished, and the whole island placed under one bishop. Next to the bishops are the provosts, whose office was in the Middle Ages chiefly of a financial nature, and therefore I sometimes occupied by laymen. Since the Reformation (1573-1574) the dignity has been wholly of an ecclesiastical character, and includes the right and duty of superintending large districts. On the whole, there are 19 provosts, each of whom is placed over a number of parishes. The pastors were at first appointed by the bishops, contrary to the provisions of the Danish Church constitution, but since 1563 they have been elected, in accordance therewith, by the congregation, under the superintendence of the provost. To the royal bailiff was reserved the right of investing the pastor elect with his office. Subsequently the manner of appointment was somewhat modified, the appointing power being given to the bailiff, and a right of co- operation to the bishop. To the king of Denmark was reserved the right of sanctioning the appointment to one of the forty-seven benefices, whose yearly income is from 40 to 100 dollars annually. Only five of the 299 churches yield an income higher than 100 dollars. Some clergymen have an income of no more than five dollars annually. All have therefore to depend for their support chiefly on fees and on the proceeds of the lands connected with the churches. See Maurer, in Herzog, Real-Encylopadie, 7:90; Finnus Johannaeus, Histor. Eccles. Islandice (tom. 4:Havnise, 1772-78; extending to the year 1740, and continued till 1840 under the same. title by Petur Peturson, Copenhagen, 1841); M'tinter, Kirchengesch. von Denmark u. Norwegen, vol. 1-3 (Leipzig, 1823-33); Maurer, Die Bekehrung des norweg. Stammes zum Christenhume (Munich, 1855-56, 2 vols.); Harbon, Om reformationen i Island (Copenh. 1843). (A. J. S.).

## Icelandic Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Icelandic Version Of The Scriptures]]

             SEE SCANDINAVIAN VERSIONS.

## Ichabod[[@Headword:Ichabod]]

             (Heb. I-kabdd' אַיאּכָבוֹד, Where is the glory? i.q. There is no glory, i.e. inglorious; Sept. Ι᾿ωχαβήδ v.r. Ε᾿χαβώδ, and even Οὐαιχαβώδ, etc.), the son of Phinehas and grandson of Eli. The pains of labor came upon his mother when she heard that the ark of God was taken, that her husband was slain in battle, and that these tidings had proved fatal to his father Eli. They were death-pains to her; and when those around sought to cheer her, saying, “Fear not, for thou hast borne a son,” she only answered by giving him the name of Ichabod, adding, “The glory is departed from Israel” (1  Samuel 4:19-22). B.C. 1125. The name again occurs in 1Sa 14:3; where his son Ahitub is mentioned as the father of the priest Ahiah.

## Icheri[[@Headword:Icheri]]

             in the mythology of the Caribbeans, are the good protecting spirits- accompanying fishermen and hunters.

## Ichthys[[@Headword:Ichthys]]

             (Greek, ἰχθύς, a fish), in Christian archeology a symbol of Christ. The word is found en many seals, rings, lamps, and tombstones belonging to the earliest Christian times. It is formed of the initial letters of our Savior's names and titles in Greek: Ι᾿ησοῦς Χριστός, Θεοῦ ῾Υιός, Σωτήρ, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Savior. Tertullian speaks of Christians accustomed to please themselves with the n-me pisciculi; “fishes,” to denote that they were born again into Christ's religion by water. He says, “Nos pisciculi se, cundum ἰχθύν, nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur” (De Bapt. 1, 2). SEE FISH.

Baptismal fonts were often ornamented with the figure of a fish; several such remain in French cathedrals. Optatus, bishop of Milesia, in the 4th century, first pointed out the word ἰχθύς as formed of the initials of Christ's titles as above given, and from that time forward “Oriental subtlety repeated to satiety” religious similitudes drawn from the sea. Julius Africanus calls Christ “the great fish taken by the fish-hook of God, and whose flesh nourishes the whole world.” Augustine says that “ἰχθύς is the mystical name of Christ, because he descended alive into the depths of this mortal life-into the abyss of waters” (De Civit. Dei). See Didron, Christian Iconography, 1, 344 sq.; Munter, Sinnbilder d. alt Christen I (Alt. 1825); Augusti, Archaöl. 1, 121 sq.; Pearson, On the Creed; Riddle, Christ. Antiquit. p. 184. SEE ICONGRAPHY.

## Iconium[[@Headword:Iconium]]

             (Ι᾿κόνιον, of unknown derivation), a town, formerly the capital of Lycaonia (according to Ptol. 5, 6,16; but Phrygia according to Strabo, 12, 568; Xenoph. Anab. 1, 2, 19; Pliny, 5, 25; and even Pisidia according to Ammian. Marcel. 14, 2), as it is now, by the name of Koniyeh, of Karamania, in Asia Minor. It is situated in N. lat. 37° 51, E. long. 320 40', about 120 miles inland from the Mediterranean. It was on the great line of communication between Ephesus and the western coast of the peninsula on one side, and Tarsus, Antioch, and the Euphrates on the other. We see this indicated by the narrative of Xenophon (i.e.) and the letters of Cicero (ad Famz. 3, 8; 5, 20; 15:4). When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important roads intersected one another at this point, as  may be seen from the map in Leake's Asia Minor. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Act 13:50-51).

There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (14:1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (ibid.). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (Act 14:3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia (Act 14:6). Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (Act 14:19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and encouraging the Church which he had founded there (Act 14:21-22). A.D. 47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2Ti 3:11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the Syrian Antioch, in company with Silas (Act 15:40), on his second missionary circuit; and, traveling through Cilicia (Act 15:41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (Act 16:1-2). Though apparently a native of Lystra, Timothy was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (Act 16:2); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (Act 16:3) and ordination (1Ti 1:18; 1Ti 4:14; 1Ti 6:12 : 2Ti 1:6) took place there. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party traveled to the northwest; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited by the apostle again in the early part of his third circuit (Act 18:23). From its position it could not fail to be an important center of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be entirely passed by. The “Acta Pauli et Theclae” are given in full by Grabe (Spicil. vol. 1), and by Jones (On the Canon, 2, 353- 411); and in brief by Conybeare and Towsons (St. Paul, 1, 197). The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish (Hierocles, p. 675) until, by the persecutions of the Saracens, and afterwards of the  Seljukians, who made it one of their sultanies, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

Koniyeh is situated at the foot of Mount Taurus (Mannert, 6:1, p. 195 sq.), upon the border of the lake Trogitis, in a fertile plain, rich in valuable productions, particularly apricots, wine, cotton, flax, and grain. The circumference of the town is between two and three miles, and beyond these are suburbs not much less populous than the town itself, which has in all about 30,000 inhabitants, but according to others 80,000. The walls, strong and lofty, and flanked with square towers, which, at the gates, are placed close together, were built by the Seljukian sultans of iconium, who seem to have taken considerable pains to exhibit the Greek inscriptions, and the remains of architecture and sculpture belonging to the ancient Iconium, which they made use of in building the walls. The town, suburbs, and gardens are plentifully supplied with water from streams which flow from some hills to the westward, and which, to the north-east, join the lake, which varies in size with the season of the year. In the town carpets are manufactured and blue and yellow leathers are tanned and dried. Cotton, wool, hides, and a few of the other raw productions which enrich the superior industry and skill of the manufacturers of Europe, are sent to Smyrna by caravans. The most remarkable building in Koniyeh is the tomb of a priest highly revered throughout Turkey, called Hazrit Mevlana, the founder of the Mevlevt Dervishes. The city, like all those renowned for superior sanctity, abounds with dervishes, who meet the passenger at every turning of the streets, and demand paras with the greatest clamor and insolence. The bazaars and houses have little to recommend them to notice. (Kinneir's Travels in Asia Minor; Leake's Geography of Asia Minor; Arundell's Tour in Asia Minor; Niebuhr, Trav. 1, 113, 149; Hassel, EL'rdbeschlr. Asiens, 2, 197; Rosenmuller, Bib. Geog. 1, 1, p. 201, 207; Hamilton's Researches in Asia Minor, 2, 205 sq.; etc. For the early and Grecian history of this place, and the fanciful etymologies of the name, see Anthon's Class. Dict. s.v.)

## Iconoclasm, or Image-breaking[[@Headword:Iconoclasm, or Image-breaking]]

             (εἰκών, image; κλάζειν, to break), is a name for the struggle in the Christian Church in the Middle Ages., which, as its name indicates, had for its object the destruction of all images used for worship in the churches. From the age of Constantine the reverence for pictures and images constantly increased, as they were supposed to possess a certain sanctity or miraculous power; and at so early an age as that of Augustine we hear him confess that many had fallen into the superstition of adoring pictures rather than the Deity. But the Iconoclastic controversy assumed a more serious aspect in the 8th century, when the emperor Leo III, the Isaurian (717741), who, previous to his accession to the throne, had associated much with Jews and Mohammedans, on talking the side of the Iconoclasts in the tenth year of his reign, issued an edict against the use of images in churches. He was influenced, no doubt, by a desire to draw into the Christian Church the Mohammedans and Jews, who, aside from their simple theistic faith, were debarred from joining the Christians by an aversion to the use of images. But the people-who felt that “it swept away from their churches objects hallowed by devotion, and supposed to be endowed with miraculous agency; objects of hope and fear, of gratitude and immemorial veneration” rose up in masses against the edict, and violent disturbances, especially at Constantinople, where the patriarch himself sided with them, were of daily occurrence. The superior power of the government, however, soon made itself felt, the pictures were destroyed, the insurrectionists slain or banished, and order restored, after a fearful massacre.

Yet, notwithstanding all the penalties which, by order of Leo, were inflicted on the opponents of Iconoclasm, champions in favor of the use of images in churches rose up. Among them was the great John of Damascus (q.v.), who, after adducing the ordinary arguments for images with greater elegance and ingenuity than any other writer of his day, went forth in bitter invectives against the Iconoclasts as enemies of Christ, the Virgin, and the saints. “Pictures are standing memorials of triumph over the devil; whosoever destroys them is a friend of the devil, a Manichean, and a Docetist.” The pope himself, Gregory III, put all the opposers of images under ban; but, despite this and other efforts on his part, Leo's successor, Constantinus Copronymus, went even further than Leo. Having obtained the condemnation of image worship in the Synod of Constantinople in A.D. 754, he enforced it against the clergy and the most noted of the monks. Many monks, who, together with the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were in favor of  the images, and were unwilling to subscribe to the decrees of the council, were cruelly persecuted. The emperor Leo IV also enforced this law; but his widow, Irene, one of the basest of women, used the tendency of the people in favor of image worship to enable her to ascend the throne. With the aid of the newly elected patriarch of Constantinople, Terasios, she called a synod at Nicaea in 787, wherein the adoration of images by prostration, kissing, and incensing was reestablished. Matters remained in this state during the reigns of the emperors Nicephorus and Michael (802- 813), although there still were Iconoclasts to be found. But as, during the strife, the adoration of images had passed into the grossest idolatry, Leo V (813-821) caused it to be abolished by the Synod of Constantinople, and punished those who persisted in it (mostly monks, with Theodoros Studita at their head). Michael II (821-824), who overthrew Leo, tolerated the worship of images without thereby satisfying the image worshippers; but Theophilus, his son (829-842), on his sole accession to the government, renewed all the edicts against them. After his death, his widow restored image-worship in 842, and instituted the festival of the Orthodoxy, which is yet kept by the Greek Church in remembrance of this restoration (see Buddaeus, De festo orthodoxo, Jena, 1726).

The Greek Christians have since retained images in their churches, but without worshipping them. The Latins also decided that the images should be retained, but not worshipped; while the French Church declared most positively against image-worship in the Synod of Gentiliacum in 767, and in 790 Charlemagne presented to the Council of Nicaea a memorial, De inmpio imne qunzcum cultu (Libri Carolini). Thereupon images were allowed to be retained for purposes of education only. At the Synod of Frankfort in 794, Charlemagne, with the assent of the English Church, caused image-worship to be condemned. After the 9th century the popes were gradually more inclined towards image-worship, and it soon became general throughout the West. The Roman Catholic Church continued to favor the practice, an-d the Council of Trent decided formally in its twenty-fifth session that the images of Christ, of the holy Virgin, and of other saints are to be placed in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent; so that the people, by kissing the images, bowing to them, etc., pray to Christ and honor the saints whom the images represent. This image-worship led to pilgrimages to the shrines of saints great in repute for their power. The Greek Church admits only the painted and raised images, not carved figures, like the Church of Rome. All the  Christian sects in the East are given to image-worship with the exception of the Nestorians, the Christians of St. Thomas, and the Russian Roskolniki. The German Reformers, although opposing image-worship, held somewhat different opinions on the subject: thus Luther tolerated images as an ornament, and also as edifying mementoes, and condemned the destruction of the images and the altars at Wittenberg in 1522. The Swiss Reformers opposed images in any shape or for any purpose, and had them taken out of all the churches-often with great violence, as in the Netherlands. They are not even now tolerated in the Reformed Church, nor in the particular denominations that have sprung from it. Mohammedanism proscribes image-worship; it even forbids the reproduction of the image of any living being, though it be not for the purpose of worshipping it. See Wessenberg, Die christlichen Bilder, ein Beforderungs mittel d. christ. Sinnes (Constanz, 1827, 2 vols.); Schlosser, Gesch. der Bilderstürmenden Kaiser (Frankf. ad. M. 1812); Marx, Der Bilderstreit der Byzantinischen Kaiser (Trier, 1839); Ketzer Lex. 2, 287; Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of Romans Emp. 5, 10 sq.; Milman, Latin Christianity, 2, 293 sq.; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, s.v. Bilder; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book 8, ch. 8; Butler, Eccles. Hist. (Phila. 1868), 1, 860 sq. Ranke, History of the Popes, 1, 19-25. SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP. (J. H.W.)

## Iconoclasts[[@Headword:Iconoclasts]]

             SEE ICONOCLASM.

## Iconodulists[[@Headword:Iconodulists]]

             SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.

## Iconography[[@Headword:Iconography]]

             (εἰκών, image, and γράφω, I describe), the science of so-called “Christian art” in the Middle Ages. It includes, therefore, the history and description of images, pictures, mosaics, gems, emblems, etc. There exist in our day many exquisite specimens of Christian iconography, which are preserved in libraries and museums, and are invaluable to us in determining the exact history of this “Christian art.” The character of the illustrations, the form of the letters, suffice to determine the age and country where the work was produced. Thus a comparison of MSS. of Eastern and Western Europe brings before us the several stages which mark the growth of Christian iconography. SEE ILLUMINATION, ART OF.

The most important modem  work on the subject is Didron, Manuel d'Iconographie Chretienne (Paris, 1845, 8vo); trans. into English, Christian Iconography, vol. 1 (London, 1851, 12mo). Older works are, Paleotti, De Imag. sacr. et profanis (Ingolst. 1594, 4to); Molanus, De Pict. et Imagg. Sacris (Louv. 1570); De Historia Sacr. Imagg. et Picturarum (1619, 12mo); Miinter, Sinnbilder der Alten Christen (Altona, 1825, 2 vols. 4to); Wessenberg, Die Christl Bilder (Constance, 1827). SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP. (J. H.W.)

## Iconolatry[[@Headword:Iconolatry]]

             (εἰκών, image, and λατρεία, worship), the worship or adoration of images. Hence image-worshippers are called Iconolatrce, or Iconolaters. SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.

## Iconomachy[[@Headword:Iconomachy]]

             SEE ICONOCLASM. Iconostasis (εἰκονόστασις) is that part of an Eastern church which corresponds to the altar-rails in English churches. It is often mistaken for the roodscreen (q.v.), which in its general arrangement it resembles, only (the mysteries being absolutely to be veiled from the eyes of the people) the panels are solid to the top. The roodscreen separates nave and choir; the iconostasis, however, separates choir and bema. “It has three doors; that it the center conducting directly to the bema; that to the right to the diaconicon; that of the left to the prothesis, through which, of course, the great entrance is made. On the right of the central door, on entering, is the icon of our Lord; on the left, that of the mother of God; the others are arranged according to the taste or devotion of the architect or founder.” The earliest iconostasis is believed to be the one remaining in the Arian crypt-church of Tepekerman, in the Crimea, which probably dates from about A.D. 350. — Neale, Hist. Eastern Church, Introd. 1, 191 sq.

## Icoxis[[@Headword:Icoxis]]

             a sect of religionists in Japan, who celebrate the festival of their founder annually in a peculiar manner. Under the impression that he who first sets foot in the temple is entitled to peculiar blessings, they all rush towards the same spot, and persons are often killed in the press.

## Ida[[@Headword:Ida]]

             first abbess of the convent of Argensoles, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. She was a remarkable woman, very learned, and acknowledged to have disputed on the most intricate theological questions with great ability. She died in 1226. Her life was written by a monk of Citeaux, but remains in MS. form. — Histoire Litt. de la France, 18, 251; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 174.

## Idacius of Lamego[[@Headword:Idacius of Lamego]]

             (Lamecenzsis), who became bishop of Gallicia in 427, distinguished himself by his opposition to the Manichaeans, whom he sought to drive from Spain. He is supposed to have died is 469. He is the author of a history, a continuation of the Chronicles of St. Hieronymus, beginning with the year 379 and ending with 468. The assertion that this work originated with  Pelagius, bishop of Osiedo, in the 12th century, is by no means satisfactorily proved. It has often been printed and annotated, as by Sirmond, Opp. vol. 2; Bouquet, Script. Franc. vol. 1; and best by Florez Espann. Sagradca, 4, 345 sq. He is also supposed to be the author of Fasti consulares. — Aschbach, Kirch. — Lex. 3, 402.

## Idacius or Idathius[[@Headword:Idacius or Idathius]]

             surnamed CLARUS, a Spanish prelate, was born in the first half of the 4th century. After his accession to the bishopric of Emerida he distinguished himself by the intemperate zeal with which, together with Ithacius (q.v.), bishop of Ossonoba, he opposed the heresy of Priscillian (q.v.). He wrote a refutation of the latter's doctrine under the title Apologeticus, which is now lost. In 388, after the death of the emperor Maximus, who had persecuted the Priscillianists, Idacius resigned his bishopric. Having subsequently attempted to regain it, he was exiled, and died about the year 392. According to Sulpitius Severus, Idacius's conduct was less severely judged by his contemporaries than that of Ithacius. The writings ascribed to him are given in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. 5. See Sulpitius Severus, Historia Sacra; Isidore of Seville, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis; Antonio, Bibl. Hispana vetus, 1, 172; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 29:775; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 111 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. Hist. 1, 214 sq. SEE PRISCILLIANISTS.

## Idalah[[@Headword:Idalah]]

             (Heb. Yidalah', יַדנְאֲלָה, probably exalted; Sept. Ι᾿αδηλά), a city near the western border of Zebulon, mentioned between Shimron and Bethlehem (Jos 19:15). According to Schwarz, it is called Chirii in the Talmud, and is identical with the village Kelluh al. Chire, six English miles southwest of Shimron or Semunie (Palestine, p. 172). He doubtless refers to the niace marked on Robinson's map as Kulat el-Kireh, in the valley of the Kishon, south-west of Semunieh or imonias; a position not improbable. especially if marked by the ruins on the north side of the river. Dr. Robinson, who afterwards visited it, calls it “Jeida, a miserable village with no traces of antiquity” (Later Researches, p. 113); but Van de Velde shows that it actually has many marks, although now much obliterated, of being an off site (Memoir, p. 322).

## Idalah (2)[[@Headword:Idalah (2)]]

             For this site Tristram (Bible Places, page 242) and Conder (Tent Work, 2:337) propose ed-Dalieh, on Carmel, eight and a half miles south-east of Haifa, and. thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (2:281): "A stone village of moderate size, on a knoll of one of the spurs running out of the main water-shed (or ridge) of Carmel. On the south there is a well, and a few springs on the west. On the north is a little plain, or open valley, cultivated with corn. The inhabitants are all Druses, numbered by consul Rogers in 1859 at 300 souls." But this position is entirely beyond the bounds of Zebulon, and the modern name Dalieh is too indefinite for identification, being likewise applied to another village on the ridge of Carmel, six and a half miles farther south-east. The site Kefr Kireh (proposed by Schwarz) lying one and a quarter miles south by west from Tell Keimnn (Joknean), is described in the Memoirs (2:60) as "evidently an ancient site," with traces of ruins and broken pottery on the hill and tombs in the vicinity; a good supply of water, and a small mill. The village of Jeida is an entirely different locality, two and a half miles west of Semunieh, and destitute of antiquities (Memoirs, 1:270).

## Idaplan (or. Idafeld)[[@Headword:Idaplan (or. Idafeld)]]

             in Norse mythology, is the dwelling-place of the twelve great judges in Asgard, whom Odin had appointed to judge all things.

## Idbash[[@Headword:Idbash]]

             (Heb. Yidbash', יַדנְבָּשׁ, prob. honeyed; Sept. Ι᾿γαβής v.r. Ι᾿εβδάς, Vulg. Jedebos), a descendant of Judah, who, with his two brothers and a sister (the Tselelponite), are said (1Ch 4:3, according to the Auth. Vers.) to be “of the father of Etam,” probably meaning of the lineage of the founder of that place, or perhaps they were themselves its settlers. B.C. cir. 1612. SEE JEZREEL 2.

## Iddera Rabba[[@Headword:Iddera Rabba]]

             (אַדְּרָא רִבָּא). i.e., the Great Assembly, is the title of one of the many parts which compose the Sohar, the famous thesaurus of Jewish mysticism. It is called "Great Assembly," because it purports to give the discourses which rabbi Simon ben Jochai (q.v.) delivered to his disciples, who congregated around him in large numbers. Upon the summons of the Sacred Light, his disciples assembled to listen to the secrets and enigmas contained in the Book of Mysteries. Hence it is chiefly occupied with a  description of the form and various members of the Deity; a disquisition on the relation of the Deity, in his two aspects of the aged and the young, to the creation and the universe, as well as on the diverse gigantic members of the Deity, such as the head, the beard, the eyes, the nose, etc.; a dissertation on pneumatology, daemonology, etc. It concludes with telling us that three of the disciples died during these discussions. This part of the Sohar is translated in the second volume of Rosenroth's Kabbala Denudafa. (B.P.)

## Iddera Zutta[[@Headword:Iddera Zutta]]

             (אַדְּרָא זוטָּא) i.e., the Small Assembly, is, like the Iddera Rabba (q.v.), also one of the component parts of the Sohar. It derive is its name from the fact that many of the disciples of rabbi Simon benJochai had died during the course of the cabalistic revelations, and that this portion of the Sohar contains the discourses which the Sacred Light delivered before his death to a small assembly of six pupils, who still survived, and congregated to listen to the profound mysteries. It is to a great extent a recapitulation of the Iddera Rabba, occupying itself with speculations about the Sephiroth, the Deity, etc., and concludes with recording the death of Simon ben- Jochai, the Sacred Light, and the medium through whom God revealed the contents of the Sohar. The Iddera Zutta, too, is translated into Latin by Rosenroth, in the second volume of his Kabbala Denudata. (B.P.)

## Iddo[[@Headword:Iddo]]

             the name of several men in the Old Testament, of different forms in the Hebrew.

1. Iddo' (עַדּוֹ, timely, or born to a festival; Sept. Αδδί, Vulg. Addo), a Levite, son of Joah and father of Zerah (1Ch 6:21); called more accurately perhaps ANDAIA. in 1Ch 6:41.

2. Yiddo' (יַדּוֹ, lovely; Sept. Ι᾿αδδαϊv, Vulg. Jaddo), son of Zechariah, and David's viceroy of the half tribe of Manasseh east (1Ch 27:21). B.C. 1014.

3. Iddo' (עַדּוֹא, a prolonged form of No. 1; Sept. Αδδώ,Vulg. Addo), the father of Ahinadab, which latter was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Mahanaim (1Ki 4:14). B.C. cir. 995.

4. Iddo' (עַדּוֹ, same as first name, 2Ch 12:15; 2Ch 13:22; Sept. Α᾿δδώ, Vulg. Addo) or Yedo' (יֶעְדּוֹ, 2Ch 9:29, margin, but Yedi', יֶעְדַּוֹ, text; both less accurate forms for the last name; Sept. has Ι᾿ωήλ, Vulg. Addo, A. Vers. “Iddo”), a prophet of Judah, who wrote the history of Rehoboam and Abijah; or rather, perhaps, who, in conjunction with Seraiah, kept the public rolls during their reigns (2Ch 12:15); and who in that capacity recorded certain predictions against Jeroboam (2Ch 9:29; although Bertheau, ad loc., and Ewald, Isr. Gesch., 3rd ed., i, 216, think this a different person). B.C. post 953. It  seems from 2Ch 13:22 that he named his book מַדנְרָשׁ, Midradh, or “Exposition.” Josephus (Ant. 8:9, 1) states that this Iddo (Ι᾿αδών) was the prophet who was sent to Jeroboam at Bethel, and consequently the same that was slain by a lion for disobedience to his instructions (1 Kings 13) and many commentators have followed this statement Kitto. He is also identified with Oded (see Jerome on 2Ch 15:1).

5. Iddo' (עַדּוֹ, same name as last, Zec 1:1, elsewhere עַדּוֹא, id.; but עַדַּיא, Iddi', apparently by error, in Neh 12:16; Sept. Α᾿δδώ, but Α᾿δαϊvας in Neh 12:4, and Α᾿δαδαϊv in Neh 12:16; Vulg. Addo, but Adaja in Neh 12:16), the father of Barachiah and grandfather of the prophet Zechariah (Zec 1:1; Zec 1:7; comp. Ezr 5:1; Ezr 6:14; Neh 12:16). He was one of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh 12:4). B.C. 536.

6. Iddo' (אַדּוֹ, mishap; Sept. omits, Vulg. Eddo), chief of the Jews of the Captivity established at Casiphia, a place of which it is difficult to determine the position. It was to him that Ezra sent a requisition for Levites and Nethinim, none of whom had yet joined his caravan. Thirty- eight Levites and 250 Nethinim responded to his call (Ezr 8:17-20). B.C. 459. It would seem from this that Iddo was a chief person of the Nethinim, descended from those Gibeonites who were charged with the servile labors of the tabernacle and Temple. This is one of several circumstances which indicate that the Jews, in their several colonies under the Exile, were still ruled by the heads of their nations and allowed the free exercise of their worship.

7. SEE JADAN. Idealism (from idea) is a term given to several systems of philosophy, and therefore varying in its signification according to the meaning which they severally attach to the word idea. Until the 17th century, when Descartes came forward with his Discourse on Method (1637), it had the signification which Plato gave to it, and was understood to refer to the Platonic doctrine of eternal forms (ἰδέαι) existing in the divine mind, according to which the world and all sensible things were framed. “Plato agreed with the rest of the ancient philosophers in this-that all things consist of matter and form, and that the matter of which all things were made existed from eternity without form; but he likewise believed that there are eternal forms of all possible things which exist without  matter, and to those eternal and immaterial forms he gave the name of ideas. In the Platonic sense, then, ideas were the patterns according to which the deity fashioned the phenomenal or ectypal world” (Reid, Intellectual Powers. Ess. 1, chap. 2). The word was used in this sense not only in philosophy, but also in literature, down to the 17th century, as in Spenser, Shakspeare, Hooker, and Milton. Thus Milton in his Paradise Lost:

“God saw his works were good, Answering his fair idea.”

Sir William Hamilton, who informs us that the change of signification of idea was first introduced by David Buchanan in 1636, one year earlier than Descartes, says in his Discussions, p. 70: “The fortune of this word is curious. Employed by Plato to express the real forms of the intelligible world, in lofty contrast with the unreal images of the sensible, it was lowered by Descartes, who extended it to the objects of our consciousness in general. When, after Gassendi, the school of Condillac had analyzed our highest faculties into our lowest, the idea was still more deeply degraded from its high original. Like a fallen angel, it was relegated from the sphere of divine intelligence to the atmosphere of human sense, till at last ideologie (more correctly idealogie), a word which could only properly suggest an a priori scheme, deducing our knowledge from the intellect, has in France become the name peculiarly distinctive of that philosophy of mind which exclusively derives our knowledge from the senses.” Instead of employing the terms image, species, phantasm, etc., with reference to the mental representation of external things, as had previously been done, Descartes adopted the word idea. In this use of the word he was followed by other philosophers, as Leibnitz and Locke, who desired the word to stand for “whatever is the object of the understanding when a man thinks.” Jence the mental impression that we are supposed to have when thinking of the sun. without seeing the actual object, is called our idea of the sun. The idea is thus in contrast with the sensation, or the feeling that we have when the senses are engaged directly or immediately upon the thing itself. The sensation is the result of the pressure of the object, and declares an external reality; the impression persisting after the thing has gone, and recoverable by mental causes without the original, is the idea. Although the word in this application may be so guarded as to lead to no bad consequences, Reid (Intellectual Powers Ess. 1, chap. 1) most vehemently protested against its use in such a sense, holding that it gave countenance to the setting up of a  new and fictitious element in the operations of the mind.. But this raises the great question of metaphysics, namely, the exact nature of our knowledge of an external world. Bishop Berkeley (q.v.), however, must be regarded as the true representative of modern idealism. He held that “the qualities of supposed objects cannot be perceived distinct from the mind that perceives them; and these qualities, it will be allowed, are all that we can know of such objects. If, therefore, there were external bodies, it is impossible we should ever know it; and if there were not, we should have exactly the same reason for believing there were as we now have.

All, therefore, which really exists is spirit, or ‘the thinking principle' ourselves, our fellow-men, and God. What we call ideas are presented to us by God in a certain order of succession, which order of successive presentation is what we mean by the laws of nature.” This mode of speculation of bishop Berkeley, which he defended with so much acuteness, and which Lewis (Hist. of Philippians 2, 283) now goes forth to defend, claiming that the bishop's critics misunderstood him, he held to be the only possible true view of our nature and the government of God. But there is no question that, whatever benefits it may have bestowed upon the bishop and his immediate disciples, it has been found, practically, to lead to skepticism. “By taking away the grounds of a belief which is both natural and universal, and which cannot, at first, be even doubted without a severe exercise of thought, it shook men's faith in all those primary truths which are at once the basis of their knowledge and the guides of their conduct. It seemed to throw distrust on the evidence of the senses, as it really invalidated the spontaneous conclusions which every man inevitably forms from that evidence.” This theory is conclusively proved by the conduct of Hume; for, if a main pillar of the edifice could so easily be shaken, what was there to hinder from throwing down the whole fabric? Beginning where Berkeley began, Hume proceeded much farther, and left unassailed hardly one article of human faith. He denied the reality not only of the object perceived, but of the mind perceiving. He reduced all thinking existence to a succession of rapidly fleeting ideas, each one being known only at the instant of its manifestation to consciousness, and then fading away, leaving no surely recognizable trace of itself on the memory, and affording no ground for an anticipation of the future. We do not even know, he maintains, that any one thing depends upon another in the relation of an effect to its cause. We know no true cause whatever, and our only idea of power is a fiction and a blunder. The conclusion of the whole matter, according to his philosophy, is, not the mere negation of this or that positive belief, but universal distrust of the  human faculties, considered as means for the acquisition of truth. They contradict each other, and leave nothing certain except that nothing can be known. SEE HUME; SEE REID.

The German philosophers Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, who are often classed among the idealistic school, used the word idea in the Platonic or transcendental sense. Hegel, on the other hand, modified the use of the word to such an extent that his idealism does not only deserve to be called absolute-idealism, but much more properly pantheistic, no less than the doctrine of the Eleatics anciently, or of Spinoza in modern times. It is thus apparent, from the looseness of the application of the word idea, and the danger of its not conveying a definite signification, that we need a general word in the English language which may more accurately express the contrast to sensation or to actuality. But, as no better has yet been found, it is difficult to avoid the use of ideality, “being what is common to memory and to imagination, and expressing the mind as not under the present impression of real objects, but as, by its own tenacity and associating powers, having those objects to all practical ends before its view. Thus all our sensations, whether of sight, hearing, touch, taste, or smell, and all the feelings that we have in the exercise of our moving energies, become transformed into ideas when, without the real presence of the original agency, we can deal with them in the way of pursuit or avoidance, or can discriminate and compare them, nearly as if in their first condition as sensation.” Sir W. Hamilton, in his Lectures on Logic (1, 126), has endeavored to avoid employing the word, but other writers on mental philosophy have freely adopted it in the above acceptation. See Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 510 sq.; Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. p. 222 sq.; Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art, ii, 189; Morell, History of Philos. p. 55 sq.; Lewis, Hist. of Philos. (enlarged ed.), see Index; Farrar, Crit, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 422; M'Cosh, Intuitions of the Mind, p. 317 sq.; Morell's Tennemann, Hist. of Philos. see Index; N. A. Rev. No. 76, p. 60 sq.; Jour. Sac. Lit. 20, 298 sq. SEE NIHILISM; SEE REALISM. (J. H.W.)

## Ide, George Barton, D.D[[@Headword:Ide, George Barton, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Coventry, Vermont, in 1806, his father being a well-known Baptist clergyman, Reverend John Ide, who, in 1800, had removed from New York to northern Vermont. His father gave him the best education he could secure for him, and he decided to enter the profession of law, the study of which he commenced, without having taken a collegiate course, at the age of eighteen, in the village of Brandon. He graduated from Middlebury College with the highest honors in 1830; soon after was ordained at Derby, Connecticut; was invited, in 1834, to a church in Albany, N.Y.; in 1835 to the Federal Street Baptist Church in Boston, Massachusetts; in 1838 to the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and in 1852 to Springfield, Massachusetts, where he died, April 16, 1872. Dr. Ide was one of the most distinguished ministers of his denomination. He published several works, among which were Life  Sketches of Life Truths, and Bible Pictures. He also wrote several Sunday- school books. See The Watchman, April 1872. (J.C.S.)

## Ide, Jacob, D.D[[@Headword:Ide, Jacob, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Attleborough, Massachusetts, March 29, 1785. His pastor, Reverend Nathaniel Holman, assisted him in his preparatory studies, and he graduated from Brown University in 1809, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1812. He was ordained November 2, 1814, over the Church in West Medway, Mass., and died in office, January 5, 1880, although relieved from active service in 1865. Besides numerous sermons and other literary work, he edited the works of Dr. Nathaniel Emmons, in seven volumes. See Cong. Year-book, 1881, page 26.

## Identism[[@Headword:Identism]]

             (or Identity), the doctrine, advocated by Fichte and Schelling, of the entire identity of God and the universe, or of Creator and creation. This ultimately coincides with Pantheism (q.v.). See KrauthFleming, Vocab. of Phil. Sciences.

## Idini[[@Headword:Idini]]

             the term used by the Kaffirs to denote sacrifice. Sacrifices are offered to their ancestors, and not to God; and these only in cases where they wish to avert some apprehended evil.

## Idiomela[[@Headword:Idiomela]]

             (fully στιχηρὰ ἰδίομελα, i.e., peculiar strophes) are stichera that have no periods the rhythm of which they regularly follow. They are usually said at lauds and vespers on special occasions, sometimes at the burial of a priest. See Smith, Dict. of Christ. Antiq. s.v.

## Idiotae[[@Headword:Idiotae]]

             (ἰδιῶται, private men), a term applied by some early writers to laymen in distinction from ministers (κλῆροι). Chrysostom (Homil. 35) and Theodoret (Comm. in 1 Corinthians) employ the word in this signification, and show that the apostle Paul (1Co 14:16) thus designates a private person, whether learned or unlearned. So also Origen, Contra Cels. 7, p. 334. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 1, ch. 5, § 6. SEE LAITY.

## Idiotes[[@Headword:Idiotes]]

             (Gr. ἰδιότης) is a term sometimes used in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead to designate the properly (Lat. proprietas) of each divine person. This must, however, not be confounded with the divine attributes (eternity, omnipresence, omnipotence, etc.), for they are inherent in the divine essence, and are the common possession of all the divine hypostases, while the idiotes, on the other hand, is a peculiarity of the hypostasis, and therefore cannot be communicated or transferred from one to another. — Schaff. Ch. Hist. 3, 679. SEE TRINITY.

## Idle[[@Headword:Idle]]

             (רְמַיָּה, slothful, also deceitful; רָפָה, to be weak, in Niph. to be lazy, Exo 5:8; Exo 5:17; עִצְלוּת, indolence, Pro 31:27; שַׁפְלוּת, remissness, Ecc 10:18; שָׁקִט, to rest, Eze 16:49; ἀργός, not working, literally, Mat 20:3; Mat 20:6; 1Ti 5:13; unfruitful, 2Pe 1:8; stupid, Tit 1:12; morally, Mat 12:36; λῆρος, an “idle tale,” Luk 24:11). Of the foregoing instances of the use of this word, the only one requiring special consideration is Mat 12:36, “I say unto you. that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give an account thereof in the day of judgment,” where there has been considerable difference of opinion as to the interpretation of ρῆμα ἀργόν, translated “idle word.” To the ordinary explanation, which makes the phrase here equivalent to vain, and hence wicked language, J. A. H. Tittman, in an extended criticism (On the principal Causes of Forced Interpret. of the N.T., printed in the Amer. Bib. Repos. for 1831, p. 481- 484), objects that it violates the native meaning of the word, which rather denotes an empty, inconsiderate, and hence insincere conversation or statement, appealing to the context which is aimed at the hypocritical Pharisees. On the other hand, the usual interpretation is supported by the actual occurrence of πονηρόν, wicked, in the parallel Mat 12:35, and by the usage of other Greek writers, e.g., Symmachus in Lev 19:7, for פַּגּולּ, where Sept. ἄδυτον; Xenoph. Mem. 1,2,57; Cicero, de Fat. 12. (See Kuinol, ad loc.) The term is probably intended to be of wide signification, so as to include both these senses, namely, levity and calumny, as being both species of untruth and heedlessly uttered, yet productive of mischief.

## Idleness[[@Headword:Idleness]]

             aversion from labor. The idle man is, in every view, both foolish and criminal. He lives not to God. Idleness was not made for man, nor man for idleness. A small measure of reflection might convince every one that for some useful purpose he was sent into the world. Man is placed at the head of all things here below. He is furnished with a great preparation of faculties and powers. He is enlightened by reason with many important discoveries; even taught by revelation to consider himself as ransomed by the death of Christ from misery, and intended to rise to a still higher rank in the universe of God. In such a situation, thus distinguished, thus favored, and assisted by his Creator does he answer the end of his being if he aim at no improvement, if he pursue no useful design, if he live for no other purpose than to indulge in sloth, to consume the fruits of the earth, and spend his days in a dream of vanity? Existence is a sacred trust, and he who thus misemploys and squanders it away is treacherous to its author. Look around, and you will behold the whole universe full of active powers. Action is, so to speak, the genius of nature. By motion and exertion the system of being is preserved in vigor. By its different parts always acting in subordination to each other, the perfection of the whole is carried on. The heavenly bodies perpetually revolve. Day and night incessantly repeat their appointed course. Continual operations are performing oil the earth and in the waters. Nothing stands still. All is alive and stirring throughout the universe. In the midst of this animated and busy scene, is man alone to remain idle in his place? Belongs it to him to be the sole inactive and slothful being in the creation, when in so many ways he might improve his own nature, might advance the glory of the God who made him, and contribute his part to the general good? The idle live not to the world and their fellow-creatures anymore than to God. If any man had a title to stand alone, and to be independent of his fellows, he might consider himself as at liberty to indulge in solitary ease and sloth, without being responsible to others for the manner in which he chooses to live. But there is no such person in the world. We are connected with each other by various relations, which create a chain of mutual dependence that reaches from the highest to the lowest station in society. Without a perpetual circulation of active duties and offices, which all are required to perform in their turn, the order and happiness of the world could not be maintained. Superiors are no more independent of their inferiors than these inferiors of them. Each have demands and claims upon the other; and he who, in any situation of life,  refuses to act his part, and to contribute his share to the general stock of felicity, deserves to be proscribed from society as an unworthy member. “If any man will not work,” says Paul (2Th 3:10), “neither shall he eat.” If he will do nothing to advance the purposes of society, he has no right to enjoy its benefits.

The idle man lives not to himself with any more advantage than he lives to the world. Though he imagines that he leaves to others the drudgery of life, and betakes himself to enjoyment and ease, yet he enjoys no true pleasure. He shuts the door against improvement of every kind, whether of mind, body, or fortune. Sloth enfeebles equally the bodily and the mental powers. His character falls into contempt. His fortune is consumed. Disorder, confusion, and embarrassment mark his whole situation. Idleness is the inlet to licentiousness, vice, and immorality. It destroys the principles of religion, and opens a door to sin and wickedness. Every man who recollects his conduct must know that his hours of idleness always proved the hours most dangerous to virtue. It was then that criminal desires arose guilty passions were suggested, and designs were formed, which, in their issue, disquiet and embitter his whole life. Habitual idleness, by a silent and secret progress, undermines every virtue in the soul. More violent passions run their course and terminate. They are like rapid torrents, which foam, and swell, and bear down everything before them; but, after having overflowed their banks, their impetuosity subsides, and they return, by degrees, into their natural channel. Sloth resembles the slowly flowing putrid stream, which stagnates in the marsh, produces venomous animals and poisonous plants, and infects with pestilential vapors the whole surrounding country. Having once tainted the soul, it leaves no part of it sound, and, at the same time, it gives not to conscience those alarms which the eruptions of bolder and fiercer emotions often occasion, Nothing is so great an enemy to the lively and spirited enjoyment of life as a relaxed and indolent habit of mind. He who knows not what it is to labor, knows not what it is to enjoy. The happiness of human life depends on the regular prosecution of some laudable purpose or object, which keeps awake and enlivens all our powers. Rest is agreeable, but it is only from preceding labors that rest acquires its true relish. When the mind is suffered to remain in continued inaction, all its powers decay: it soon languishes and sickens; and the pleasures which it proposed to obtain from rest terminate in tediousness and insipidity. See Blair, Sermons, Sermon 39; Warner, System  of Divinity and Morality, 3, 151; Logan, Sermons, Sermon 4; Robinson, Theological Dictionary, s.v.

## Idol[[@Headword:Idol]]

             properly an outward object adored as divine, or as the symbol of deity. SEE IDOLATRY.

I. Classification of Scriptural terms having physical reference to such objects. — As a large number of different Hebrew words have been rendered in the A.V. either by idol or image, and that by no means uniformly (besides one or more in Greek more uniformly translated), it will be of some advantage to attempt to discriminate between them, and assign, as nearly as the two languages will allow, the English equivalents for each. SEE IMAGE.

(I.) Abstract terms, which, with a deep moral significance, express the degradation associated with idolatry, and stand out as a protest of the language against its enormities.

(1.) General terms of doubtful signification. —

1. אֵַליל, elil', is thought by some to have a sense akin to that of שֶׁקֶר, she'ker, “falsehood,” with which it stands in parallelism in Job 13:4, and would therefore much resemble aven, as applied to an idol. It is generally derived from the unused root אָלִל, to be empty or vain. Delitzsch (on Hab 2:18) derives it from the negative particle אִל, al, “die Nichtigen;” but according to Furst (Handw. s.v.) it is a diminutive of אֵל, “god,” the additional syllable indicating the greatest contempt. In this case the signification above mentioned is a subsidiary one. The same authority asserts that the word denotes a small image of the god, which was consulted as an oracle among the Egyptians and Phoenicians (Isa 19:3; Jer 14:14). It is certainly used of the idols of Noph or Memphis (Eze 30:13). In strong contrast with Jehovah, it appears in Psa 90:5; Psa 97:7, the contrast probably being heightened by the resemblance between elilim and elohim. A somewhat similar play upon words is observable in Hab 2:18, אֵַלילַים אַלֵּמַים, elilim illemim, A.V. “dumb idols.” See EL.  2. גַּלּוּלַים, gill'ulim', also a term of contempt, of uncertain origin (Eze 30:13), but probably derived from גָּלִל, to roll, as dung, hence refuse. The Rabbinical authorities, referring to such passages as Eze 4:2; Zep 1:17, have favored the interpretation given in the margin of the A.V. to Deu 29:17, “dungy gods” (Vulg. “sordes,” “sordes idolorum,” 1Ki 15:12). Jahn, connecting it with גָּלִל, galal, “to roll,” applies it to the stocks of trees of which idols were made, and in mockery called gilluim, “rolling things” (a volvendo, he says, though it is difficult to see the point of his remark).

Gesenius, repudiating the derivation from the Arabic jalla, “to be great, illustrious,” gives his preference to the rendering “stones, stone gods,” thus deriving it from גִּל, gal, “a heap of stones;” and in this he is followed by First, who translates gillil by the German “Steinhaufe.” The expression is applied, principally in Ezekiel, to false gods and their symbols (Deu 29:17; Eze 8:10, etc.). It stands side by side with other contemptuous terms in Eze 16:36; Eze 20:8, as, for example, שֶׁקֶוֹ, shekets, “filth,” “abomination” (Eze 8:10), and cognate terms. SEE DUNG.

May not גַּלּוּלַים, mean scarabaei, the commonest of Egyptian idols? The sense of dung is appropriate to the dung-beetle; that of rolling is doubtful, for, if the meaning of the verb be retained, we should, in this form, rather expect a passive sense, “a thing rolled;” but it may be observed that these grammatical rules of the sense of derivatives are not always to be strictly insisted on, for Sidon, צַידוֹן, though held to signify “the place of fishing,” is, in the list of the Noachians, the name of a man, “the fisherman,” Α᾿λιεύς, of Philo of Byblus. That a specially-applicable word is used may perhaps be conjectured from the occurrence of אלילים, which, if meaning little gods, would aptly describe the pigmy PTEH-SEKER-HESAR, Ptah- Sokari-Osiris, of Memphis. Ezekiel uses the term גלולים of the idols of Egypt which the Israelites were commanded to put away at or about the time of the Exodus, but did not, and seem to have carried into the Desert, for the same word is used, unqualified by the mention of any country, of those worshipped by them in the Desert (Exo 20:7-8; Exo 20:16; Exo 20:18; Exo 20:24); it is, however, apparently employed also for all the idols worshipped in Canaan by the Israelites (Eze 20:31; Eze 23:37). Scarabaei were so abundant among the Egyptians and Phoenicians that there is no reason why they may not have been employed also in the worship of the Canaanitish false gods;  but it cannot be safely supposed, without further evidence, that the idols of Canaan were virtually termed scarabtei. SEE BEETLE.

(2.) General terms of known signification. —

3. אָוֶן, a'ven, rendered elsewhere “nought,” “vanity,” “iniquity,” “wickedness,” “sorrow,” etc., and only once “idol” (Isa 66:3). The primary idea of the root seems to be emptiness, nothingness, as of breath or vapor; and, by a natural transition, in a moral sense, wickedness in its active form of mischief; and then, as the result, sorrow and trouble. Hence aven denotes a vain, false, wicked thing, and expresses at once the essential nature 3f idols, and the consequences of their worship. The character of the word may be learnt from its associates. It stands in parallelism with אֶפֶס. e'phes (Isa 41:29), which, after undergoing various modifications, comes at length to signify “nothing;” with הֶבֶל, he'bel, “breath” or “vapor,” itself applied as a term of contempt to the objects of idolatrous reverence (Deu 32:21; 1Ki 16:13; Psa 31:6; Jer 8:19; Jer 10:8); with שָׁוְא, shav, “nothingness, “vanity;” and with שֶׁקֶר, she'ker, “falsehood” (Zec 10:2): all indicating the utter worthlessness of the idols to whom homage was paid, and the false and delusive nature of their worship. It is employed in an abstract sense, to denote idolatry in general, in 1Sa 15:23. There is much significance in the change of name from Bethel to Beth-aven, the great centre of idolatry in Israel (Hos 4:15). SEE BETHAVEN.

4. שַׁקּוּוֹ, shik-k-ts', “filth,” “impurity,” especially applied, like the cognate שֶׁקֶוֹ, she'kets, to that which produced ceremonial uncleanness (Eze 37:23; Nah 3:6), such as food offered in sacrifice to idols (Zec 9:7; comp. Act 15:20; Act 15:29). As referring to the idols themselves, it primarily denotes the obscene rites with which their worship was associated, and hence, by metonymy, is applied both to the objects of worship and also to their worshippers, who partook of the impurity, and thus “became loathsome like their love,” the foul Baal-Peor (Hos 9:10). SEE ABOMINATION.

5. In the same connection must be noticed, though not actually rendered “image” or ‘idol,” בּשֶׁת, bo'sheth, “shame,” or “shameful thing” (A.V. Jer 11:13; Hos 9:10), applied to Baal or Baal-Peor, as characterizing the obscenity of his worship. SEE BAAL-PEOR.

6. אֵימָה, eynnzah', “horror” or “terror,” and hence an object of horror or terror (Jeremiah 1, 38), in reference either to the hideousness of the idols or to the gross character of their worship. In this respect it is closely connected with —

7. מַפְלֶצֶת.miphle'tseth, a “fright,” “horror,” applied to the idol of Maachah, probably of wood, which Asa cut down and burned (1Ki 15:13'; 2Ch 15:16), and which was unquestionably the- Phallus, the symbol of the productive power of nature (Movers, Phon. 1, 571 Selden, de Dis Syr. 2, 5), and the nature-goddess Ashera. Allusion is supposed to be made to this in Jer 10:5, and Epist. of Jeremiah 70. In 2Ch 15:16 the Vulg. render “simulacrum Priapi” (comp. Horace, “furum aviumque maxima formido”). The Sept. had a different reading, which it is not easy to determine. They translate, in 1Ki 15:13, the same word both by σύνοδος (with which corresponds the Syriac ‘ido, “a festival,” reading, perhaps, עֲצֶרֶת, ‘atsereth, as in 2Ki 10:20; Jer 9:2) and καταδύσεις, while in Chronicles it is εἴδωλον. Possibly in 1Ki 15:13 they may have read מְצֻלָּתָהּ, metsullathah, for מַפְלִצְתָּהּ, miphlatstah, as the Vulg. specum, of which “sinulacrum turpissimum” is a correction. SEE GROVE.

(II.) We now come to the consideration of those words which more directly apply to the images or idols as the outward symbols of the deity who was worshipped through them.

(1.) Terms indicating the form of idols. —

8. סֶמֶלor סֵמֶל, s'mel, with which Gesenius compares as cognate מָשָׁל mashal, and צֶלֶם, tselen; the Lat. sinilis and Gr. ὁμαλός, signifies a “likeness,” “semblance.” The Targum in Deu 4:16 gives צוּרָא, tsirda, “figure,” as the equivalent, while in Eze 8:3; Eze 8:5 it is rendered by צְלִם, tselan, “image.” In the latter passages the Syriac has koimto, “a statue” (the στήλη of the Septuagint) which more properly corresponds to matstsebah (see No. 13, below); and in Deuteronomy genes, “kind” (=γένος). The passage in 2Ch 33:7 is rendered “images of four faces,” the latter words representing the one under consideration. In 2Ch 33:15 it appears as “carved images,” following the Sept. τὸ γλυπτόν. On the whole, the Gr. εἰκών of Deu 4:16; 2Ch 33:7, and the “simulacrum” of the  Vulg. (2Ch 33:15) most nearly resemble the Heb. semel. SEE CARVED.

9. צֶלֶם, fse'lem (Chald. id. and צְלִם, tselam'), is by all lexicographers, ancient and modern, connected with צֵל, tsel, “a shadow.” It is the “image” of God in which man was created (Gen 1:27; comp. Wisd. 2, 23), distinguished from דְּמוּת, demuth, or “likeness,” as the “image” from the “idea” which it represents (Schmidt, De Imag. Dei in Hom. p. 84), though it would be rash to insist upon this distinction. In the N.T. εἰκών appears to represent the letter (Col 3:10; compare the Sept. at Gen 5:1), as ὁμοίωμα the former of the two words (Rom 1:23; Rom 8:29; Php 2:7), but in Heb 10:1, εἰκών is opposed to σκία as the substance to the substantial form, of which it is the perfect representative. The Sept. render demzth by ὁμοίωσις, ὁμοίωμα, εἰκών, ὅμοιος, and tselem most frequently by εἰκών, though ὁμοίωμα, εἴδωλον, and τύπος also occur. But, whatever abstract term may best define the meaning of tselem, it is unquestionably used to denote the visible forms of external objects, and is applied to figures of gold and silver (1Sa 6:5; Num 33:52; Dan 3:1), such as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as well as to those painted upon walls (Eze 33:14). “Image” perhaps most nearly represents it in all passages. Applied to the human countenance (Dan 3:19), it signifies the “expression,” and corresponds to the ἰδέα of Mat 28:3, though demuth agrees rather with the Platonic usage of the latter word. SEE GRAVEN.

10. תְּמוּנָה, temundh', rendered “image” in Job 4:16; elsewhere “similitude” (Deu 4:12), “likeness” (Deu 5:8): “form,” or “shape” would be better. In Deu 4:16 it is in parallelism with תִּבְנַית, tabnith', literally “build;” hence “plan” or “model” (2Ki 16:10; compare Exo 20:4; Num 12:8).

11. עָצָב, atsab', עֶצֶב, e'tseb (Jer 22:28), or עֹצֶב, o'tseb (Isa 48:5), “a figure,” all derived from a root עָצִב, atsab, “to work” or “fashion” (akin to חָצִב, chatsab, and the like), are terms applied to idols as expressing that their origin was due to the labor of man. The verb in its derived senses indicates the sorrow and trouble consequent upon severe labor, but the latter seems to be the radical idea. If the notion of sorrow were most prominent, the words as applied to idols might be compared with aven above. Isa 58:3 is rendered in the Peshito Syriac  “idols” (A.V. “labors”), but the reading was evidently different. In Psalm 129:24, דֶּרֶךְ עֹצֵבis “idolatry.”

12. צַיר, tsir, once only applied to an idol (Isa 45:16; Sept. νῆσοι, as if De, אַיַּים). The word usually denotes “a pang,” but in this instance is probably connected with the roots צוּר, tsar, and יָצִר, yatsar, and signifies “a shape” or “mould,” and hence an “idol.”

13. מִצֵּבָה, matstsebah', anything set up, a “statue” (=נְצַיב,! netsib, Jer 43:13), applied to a memorial stone like those erected by Jacob on four several occasions (Gen 28:18; Gen 31:45; Gen 35:14; Gen 35:20) to commemorate a crisis in his life, or to mark the grave of Rachel. Such were the stones set up by Joshua (Jos 4:9) after the passage of the Jordan, and at Shechem (Jos 24:26), and by Samuel when victorious over the Philistines (1Sa 7:12). When solemnly dedicated they were anointed with oil, and libations were poured upon them. The word is applied to denote the obelisks which stood at the entrance to the temple of the sun at Heliopolis (Jer 43:13), two of which were a hundred cubits high and eight broad, each of a single stone (Herod. 2, 11). It is also used of the statues of Baal (2Ki 3:2), whether of stone (2Ki 10:27) or wood (id. 26), which stood in the innermost recess of the temple at Samaria. Movers (Phon. 1, 674) conjectures that the latter were statues or columns distinct from that of Baal, which was of stone and conical (p. 673), like the “meta” of Paphos (Tacit. H. 2, 3), and probably, therefore, belonging to other deities, who were his πάρεδροι or σύμβωμοι. The Phoenicians consecrated and anointed stones like that at Bethel, which were called, as some think, from this circumstance, Baetylia. Many such are said to have been seen on Mt. Lebanon, near Heliopolis, dedicated to various gods, and many prodigies are related of them (Damascius in Photius, quoted by Bochart, Canaan, 2, 2). The same authority describes them as aerolites, of a whitish and sometimes purple color, spherical in shape, and about a span in diameter. The Palladium of Troy, the black stone in the Kaaba at Mecca, said to have been brought from heaven by the angel Gabriel, and the stone at Ephesus “which fell down from Jupiter” (Act 19:35), are examples of the belief, anciently so common, that the gods sent down their images upon earth. In the older worship of Greece, stones, according to Pausanias (7, 22, § 4), occupied the place of images. Those at Pharae, about thirty in number, and quadrangular in shape, near the statue of Hermes, received divine honors from the Pharians, and each  had the name of some god conferred upon it. The stone in the temple of Jupiter Ammon (“umbilico maxime similis”), enriched with emeralds and gems (Curtius, 4:7, § 31); that at Delphi, which Saturn was said to have swallowed (Pausan. Phoc. 24, § 6); the black stone of pyramidal shape in the temple of Juggernaut, and the holy stone at Pessinus, in Galatia, sacred to Cybele, show how widely spread and almost universal were these ancient objects of worship. SEE PILLAR.

Closely connected with these “statues” of Baal, whether in the form of obelisks or otherwise, were

14. חִמָּנַים, chammanim'. rendered in the margin of most passages “sun- images.” The word has given rise to much discussion. In the Vulg. it is translated thrice simulacra, thrice delubra, and oncefana. The Sept. gives τεμένη twice, εἴδωλα twice, ξύλινα χειροποίητα, βδελύγματα, and τὰ ὑψηλά With one exception (2Ch 34:4, which is evidently corrupt), the Syriac has vaguely either “fears,” i.e. objects of fear, or “idols.” The Targum in all passages translates it by חֲנַיסְנְסִיָּא, chanisnesaya', “houses for star-worship” (Furst compares the Arab. Chunnas, the planet Mercury or Venus), a rendering which Rosenmuller supports. Gesenius preferred to consider these chanisnesaya as ‘veils” or “shrines surrounded or shrouded with hangings” (Eze 16:16; Targ. on Isa 3:19), and scouted the interpretation of Buxtorf — ”status solares” — as a mere guess, though he somewhat paradoxically assented to Rosenmüller's opinion that they were “shrines dedicated to the worship of the stars.” Kimchi, under the root חמן, mentions a conjecture that they were trees like the Asherim, but (s.v. חמם) elsewhere expresses his own belief that the Nun is epenthetic, and that they were so called “because the sun-worshippers made them.” Aben-Ezra (on Lev 26:30) says they were “houses made for worshipping the sun,” which Bochart approves (Canaan, ii, 17), and Jarchi that they were a kind of idol placed on the roofs of houses. Vossius (De Idol. 2, 353), as Scaliger before him, connects the word with Amanus or Omanus, the sacred fire, the symbol of the Persian sun-god, and renders it pyraea (comp. Selden, ii, 8). Adelung (Mithrid. 1, 159, quoted by Gesenius on Isa 17:8) suggested the same, and compared it with the Sanscrit homa. But to such interpretations the passage in 2Ch 34:4 is inimical (Vitringa on Isa 17:8). Gesenius's own opinion appears to have fluctuated considerably. In his notes on Isaiah (I. c.) he prefers the general rendering “columns” to the  more definite one of “sun-columns,” and is inclined to look to a Persian origin for the derivation of the word. But in his Thesaurus he mentions the occurrence of Chainman as a synonym of Baal in the Phoenician and Palmyrene inscriptions in the sense of “Dominus Solaris,” and it's after application to the statues or columns erected for his worship. Spencer (De Legg. Hebr. 2, 25), and after him Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr. s.v.), maintained that it signified statues or lofty columns, like the pyramids or obelisks of Egypt. Movers (Phon. 1, 441) concludes with good reason that the sun-god Baal and the idol “Chamman” are not essentially different. In his discussion of Chammanim he says, “These images of the fire-god were placed on foreign or non-Israelitish altars, in conjunction with the symbols of the nature-goddess Asherah, or σύμβωμοι (2Ch 14:3; 2Ch 14:5; 2Ch 34:4; 2Ch 34:7; Isa 17:9; Isa 27:9), as was otherwise usual with Baal and Asherah.” They are mentioned with the Asherim, and the latter are coupled with the statues of Baal (1Ki 14:23; 2Ki 23:14). The chammanim and statues are used promiscuously (compare 2Ki 23:14, and 2Ch 34:4; 2Ch 14:3; 2Ch 14:5), but are never spoken of together. Such are the steps by which he arrives at his conclusion. He is supported by the Palmyrene inscription at Oxford, alluded to above, which has been thus rendered: “This column (חמנא, Chammaind), and this altar, the sons of Malchu, etc., have erected and dedicated to the sun.” The Veneto-Greek Version leaves the word untranslated in the strange form ἀκάβαντες. From the expressions in Eze 6:4; Eze 6:6, and Lev 26:30, it may be inferred that these columns, which perhaps represented a rising flame of fire and stood upon the altar of Baal (2Ch 34:4), were of wood or stone. SEE ASHERAH.

15. מִשְׂכַּית, maskith', occurs in Lev 26:1; Numbers 23:52; Eze 8:12 : “device,” most nearly suits all passages (compare Psa 73:7; Pro 18:11; Pro 25:11). This word has been the fruitful cause of as much dispute as the preceding. The general opinion appears to be that אֶבֶן מsignifies a stone with figures graven upon it. Ben-Zeb explains it as “a stone with figures or hieroglyphics carved upon it,'” and so Michaelis; and it is maintained by Movers (Phon. 1, 105) that the baetylia, or columns with painted figures, the “lapides effigiati” of Minucius Felix (c. 3), are these “stones of device,” and that the characters engraven on them are the ἱερὰ στποχεῖα, or characters sacred to the several deities. The invention of these characters, which is ascribed to  Taaut, he conjectures originated with the Seres. Gesenius explains it as a stone with the image of an idol, Baal or Astarte, and refers to his Mon. Poaen. p. 21-24, for others of a similar character. Rashi (on Lev 21:1) derives it from the root שׂכ,ִ to cover, “because they cover the floor with a pavement of stones.” The Targum and Syriac, Lev 26:1, give ‘stone of devotion,” and the former, in Num 33:52, has “house of their devotion” where the Syriac only renders “their objects of devotion.” For the former the Sept. has λίθος σκοπός, and for the latter τὰς σκοπιὰςαὐτῶν, connecting the word with the root שָׂכָה. “to look,” a circumstance which has induced Saalschuitz (Mos. Recht, p. 382-385) to conjecture that eben maskith was originally a smooth elevated stone employed for the purpose of obtaining from it a freer prospect, and of offering prayer in prostration upon it to the deities of heaven. Hence, generally, he concludes it signifies a stone of prayer or devotion, and the “chambers of imagery” of Eze 8:7 are “chambers of devotion.” The renderings of the last mentioned passage in the Sept. and Targum are curious as pointing to a various reading, מְשֻׂכָּתוֹ, or, more probably, מַשְׁכָּבוֹ. SEE IMAGERY.

16. תְּרָפַים, teradphim'. SEE TERAPHIR

(2.) The terms which follow have regard to the material and workmanship of the idol rather than to its character as an object of worship.

17. פָּסֶל, pe'sel, usually translated in the Authorized Version “graven or carved image.” In two passages it is ambiguously rendered “quarries” (Jdg 3:19; Jdg 3:26), after the Targum, but there seems to be no reason for departing from the ordinary signification. In the majority of instances the Sept. has γλυπτόν, once γλύμμα. The verb is employed to denote the finishing which the stone received at the hands of the masons after it had been rough-hewn from the quarries (Exo 34:4; 1 Kings 5:32). It is probably a later usage which has applied pesel to a figure cast in metal, as in Isa 40:19; Isa 44:10. (More probably still, pesel denotes by anticipation the molten image in a later stage, after it had been trimmed into shape by the caster.) These “sculptured” images were apparently of wood, iron, or stone, covered with gold or silver (Deu 7:25; Isa 30:22; Hab 2:19), the more costly being of solid metal (Isa 40:19). They could be burned (Deu 7:5; Isa 45:20; 2Ch 34:4), or cut down (Deu 12:3) and  pounded (2Ch 34:7), or broken in pieces (Isa 21:9), In making them, the skill of the wise iron-smith (Deu 27:15; Isa 40:20) or carpenter, and of the goldsmith, was employed (Jdg 17:3-4; Isa 41:7), the former supplying the rough mass of iron beaten into shape on his anvil (Isa 44:12), while the latter overlaid it with plates of gold and silver, probably from Tarshish (Jer 10:9), and decorated it with silver chains. The image thus formed received the further adornment of embroidered robes (Eze 16:18), to which possibly allusion may be made in Isa 3:19. Brass and clay were among the materials employed for the same purpose (Dan 2:33; Dan 5:23). (Images of glazed pottery have been found in Egypt [Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 3, 90: comp. Wis 15:8].) A description of the three great images of Babylon on the top of the temple of Belus will be found in Diod. Sic. 2, 9 (compare Layard, Nin. 2. 433). The several stages of the process by which the metal or wood became the “graven image” are so vividly described in Isa 44:10-20, that it is only necessary to refer to that passage, and we are at once introduced to the mysteries of idol manufacture, which, as at Ephesus, “brought no small gain unto the craftsmen.” SEE SHRINE.

18. נְסֶךְ or נֵסֶךְ, n'sek, and מִסֵּכָה, massekah', are evidently synonymous (Isa 41:29; Isa 48:5; Jer 10:14) in later Hebrew, and denote a “molten” image. Massekah is frequently used in distinction from pesel or pesilim (Deu 27:15; Jdg 17:3, etc.). The golden calf, which Aaron made, was fashioned with “the graver” (חֶרֶט, cheret), but it is not quite clear for what purpose the graver was used (Exo 32:4). The cheret (comp. χαράττω) appears to have been a sharp-pointed instrument, used like the stylus for a writing implement (Isa 8:1). Whether then Aaron, by the help of the cheret, gave to the molten mass the shape of a calf, or whether he made use of the graver for the purpose of carving hieroglyphics upon it, has been thought doubtful. The Syr. has tuipso (τύπος), “the mould,” for cheret. But the expression וִיָּצָר, vay- yatsar, decides that it was by the cheret, in whatever manner employed, that the shape of a calf was given to the metal. SEE MOLTEN.

(3.) In the New Test. the Greek of idol is εἴδωλον, which exactly corresponds with it. In one passage εἰκών is the “image” or head of the emperor on the coinage (Mat 22:20). SEE ALISGEMA.  II. Actual Forms of Idols. — Among the earliest objects of worship, regarded as symbols of deity, were the meteoric stones which the ancients believed to have been the images of the gods sent down from heaven. SEE DIANA. From these they transferred their regard to rough unhewn blocks, to stone columns or pillars of wood, in which the divinity worshipped was supposed to dwell, and which were consecrated, like the sacred stone at Delphi, by being anointed with oil, and crowned with wool on solemn days (Pausan. Phoc. 24, § 6). Tavernier (quoted by Rosenmüller, At. and Al Morgenland, 1, § 89) mentions a black stone in the pagoda of Benares which was daily anointed with perfumed oil, and such are the “Lingams” in daily use in the Siva worship of India (compare Armobius, 1, 30; Min. Felix, c. 3). Such customs are remarkable illustrations of the solemn consecration by Jacob of the stone at Bethel, as showing the religious reverence with which these memorials were regarded. Not only were single stones thus honored, but heaps of stone were, in later times at least, considered as sacred to Hermes (Homer,. Od. 16, 471; comp. the Vulg. at Pro 26:8, “Sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii”), and to these each passing traveler contributed his offering (Crezer, Symb. 1, 24). The heap of stones which Laban erected to commemorate the solemn compact between himself and Jacob, and on which he invoked the gods of his fathers, is an instance of the intermediate stage in which such heaps were associated with religious observances before they became objects of worship. Jacob, for his part, dedicated a single stone as his memorial, and called Jehovah to witness, thus holding himself aloof from the rites employed by Laban, which may have partaken of his ancestral idolatry. SEE JEGAR-SAIADUTHA.

Of the forms assumed by the idolatrous images we have not many traces in the Bible. Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, was a human figure terminating in a fish SEE DAGON; and that the Syrian deities were represented in later times in a symbolical human shape we know for certainty. SEE NISROCH.

The Hebrews imitated their neighbors in this respect as in others (Isa 44:13; Wis 13:13), and from various allusions we may infer that idols in human forms were not uncommon among them, though they were more anciently symbolized by animals (Wis 13:14), as by the calves of Aaron and Jeroboam, and the brazen serpent which was afterwards applied to idolatrous uses (2Ki 18:4; Rom 1:23). — When the image came from the hands of the maker it was decorated richly with silver and gold, and sometimes crowned (Epist.  Jeremiah 9), clad in robes of blue and purple (Jer 10:9), like the draped images of Pallas and Hera (Muller, Hand. dl. Arch. d. Kunst, § 69), and fastened in the niche appropriated to it by means of chains and nails (Wis 13:15), in order that the influence of the deity which it represented might be secured to the spot. So the Ephesians, when besieged by Croesus, connected the wall of their city by means of a rope to the temple of Aphrodite, with a view to insuring the aid of the goddess (Herod. 1, 26); and for a similar object the Tyrians chained the stone image of Apollo to the altar of Hercules (Curt. 4:3, § 15). Some images were painted red (Wis 13:14), like those of Dionysus and the Bacchantes, of Hermes, and the god Pan (Pausan. 2, 2, § 5; Muller, u. and. d. Arch. d. Kunst, § 69). This color was formerly considered sacred. Pliny relates, on the authority of Verrius, that it was customary on festival days to color with red lead the face of the image of Jupiter, and the bodies of those who celebrated a triumph (33:36). The figures of Priapus, the god of gardens, were decorated in the same manner (“ruber custos,” Tibull. 1, 1, 18). Among the objects of worship enumerated by Arnobius (1, 39) are bones of elephants, pictures, and garlands suspended on trees, the “rami coronati” of Apuleius (de Mag. c. 56).

When the process of adorning the image was completed, it was placed in a temple or shrine appointed for it (οἰκία, Epist. Jeremiah 12, 19; οἴκημα, Wis 13:15; εἰδωλεῖον, 1Co 8:10; see Stanley's note on the latter passage). In Wis 13:15, οἴκημα is thought to be used contemptuously, as in Tibull. 1, 10, 19, 20, “Cum paupere cultu Stabat in exigua ligneus cede deus” (Fritsche and Grimm, Handb.), but the passage quoted is by no means a good illustration. From these temples the idols were sometimes carried in procession (Epist. Jeremiah 4, 26) on festival days. Their priests were maintained from the idol treasury, and feasted upon the meats which were appointed for the idols use (Bel and the Dragon, 3, 13). These sacrificial feasts formed an important part of the idolatrous ritual, and were a great stumbling block to the early Christian converts. They were to the heathen, as Prof. Stanley has well observed, what the observance of circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were to the Jewish converts, and it was for this reason that Paul especially directed his attention to the subject, and laid down the rules of conduct contained in his first letter to the Corinthians (8-10). SEE IDOLATRY.

## Idolatry[[@Headword:Idolatry]]

             is divine honor paid to any created object. It is thus a wider term than image-worship (q.v.). For many old monographs on the various forms of ancient idolatry, see Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 108 sq. SEE GODS, FALSE; SEE BEAST-WORSHIP.

We find the idea of idolatry expressed in the O.T. by כָּזָב (a lie, Psa 45:5; Amo 2:4), or שָׁוְא(nullity), and still oftener by תּוֹעֵבָה(abomination). In after times the Jews designated it as עָבוּדָה רָעָה(foreign worship). Thus we see that it had no name indicative of its nature, for the Biblical expressions are more a monotheistic qualification of divine worship than a definition of it; the last Hebrew expression, however, shows idolatry as not being of Jewish origin. The word εἰδωλολατρείαin the N.T. is entirely due to the Septuagint, which, wherever any of the heathen deities are mentioned, even though designated in the sacred text only as אֵַלילַים(nothings), translates by εἴδωλον, an idol; a practice generally followed by later versions. A special sort of idolatry, namely, the actual adoration of images (Idololatria) thus gave name to the whole species (1Co 10:14; Gal 5:20; 1Pe 4:3). Subsequently the more comprehensive word εἰδολατρεία (idolatria, instead of idololatria) was adopted, which included the adoration and worship of other visible symbols of the deity (ε‹δος) besides those due to the statuary art. Herzog.

I. Origin of Idolatry. — In the primeval period man appears to have had not alone a revelation, but also an implanted natural law. Adam and some of his descendants, as late as the time of the Flood, certainly lived under a revealed system, now usually spoken of as the patriarchal dispensation, and Paul tells us that the nations were under a natural law (Rom 2:14-15). “Man in his natural state must always have had a knowledge of God sufficient for the condition in which he had been placed. Although God ‘in times past suffered all nations [or, rather, ‘all the Gentiles, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη] to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness' (Act 14:17). ‘For the invisible things of him, from the creation ‘of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, [even] his eternal power and godhead' (Rom 1:20). But the people of whom we are  speaking' changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things,' and worshipped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever' (Rom 1:21-25). Thus arose that strange superstition which is known by the term Fetishism [or low nature- worship], consisting in the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones” (Poole, Genesis of the Earth and of Man 1:2 nd ed. p. 160, 161). Paul speaks of those who invented this idolatry as therefore forsaken of God and suffered to sink into the deepest moral corruption (Rom 1:28). It is remarkable that among highly-civilized nations the converse obtains; moral corruption being very frequently the cause of the abandoning of true religion for infidelity. — Kitto. That theory of human progress which supposes man to have gradually worked his way up from barbaric ignorance of God to a so-called natural religion is contradicted by the facts of Biblical history.

Nothing is distinctly stated in the Bible as to any antediluvian idolatry. It is, however, a reasonable sup-position that in the general corruption before the Flood idolatry was practiced. There is no undoubted trace of heathen divinities in the names of the antediluvians; but there are dim indications of ancestral worship in the postdiluvian worship of some of the antediluvian patriarchs. It has been supposed that the SET or SUTEKH of the Egyptian Pantheon is the Hebrew Seth. The Cainite Enoch was possibly commemorated as Annacus or Nannacus at Iconium, though, this name being identified with Enoch, the reference may be to Enoch of the line of Seth. It is reasonable to suppose that the worship of these antediluvians originated before the Flood, for it is unlikely that it would have been instituted after it. ‘Some Jewish writers, grounding their theory on a forced interpretation of Gen 4:26, assign to Enos, the son of Seth, the unenviable notoriety of having been the first to pay divine honors to the host of heaven, and to lead others into the like error (Maimon. De Idol. i, 1). R. Solomon Jarchi, on the other hand, while admitting the same verse to contain the first account of the origin of idolatry, understands it as implying the deification of men and plants. Arabic tradition, according to Sir W. Jones, connects the people of Yemen with the same apostasy. The third in descent from Joktan, and therefore a contemporary of Nahor, took the surname of Abdu Shams, or “servant of the sun,” whom he and his family worshipped, while other tribes honored the planets and fixed stars (Hales, Chronol. 2, 59, 4to ed.). Nimrod, again, to whom is ascribed the  introduction of Zabianism, was after his death transferred to the constellation Orion, and on the slender foundation of the expression “Ur of the Chaldees” (Gen 11:31) is built the fabulous history of Abraham and Nimrod, narrated in the legends of the Jews and Mussulmans (Jellinek, Bet ha-Midrash, 1. 23; Weil, Bibl. Leg. p. 47-74; Hyde, Rel. Pers. c. 2).

II. Classification of Idolatry. — All unmixed systems of idolatry may be classified under the following heads; all mixed systems may be resolved into two or more of them. We give in this connection general illustrations of these species of false worship as evinced by the nations associated with the Jewish people, reserving for the next head a more complete survey of the idolatrous systems of the most important of these nations separately.

1. Low nature-worship, or fetishism, the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones. The fetishism of the Negroes is thought to admit of a belief in a supreme intelligence: if this be true, such a belief is either a relic of a higher religion, or else is derived from the Muslim tribes of Africa. Fetishism is closely connected with magic, and the Nigritian priests are universally magicians.

Beast-worship was exemplified in the calves of Jeroboam and the dark hints, which seem to point to the goat of Mendes. There is no actual proof that the Israelites ever joined in the service of Dagon, the fish-god of the Philistines, though Ahaziah sent stealthily to Baalzebub, the fly-god of Ekron (2 Kings 1). Some have explained the allusion in Zep 1:9 as referring to a practice connected with the worship of Dagon; comp. 1 Samuel 5, 5. The Syrians are stated by Xenophon (Anab. 1, 4, § 9) to have paid divine honors to fish. In later times the brazen serpent became the object of idolatrous homage (2Ki 18:4). But whether the latter was regarded with superstitious reverence as a memorial of their early history, or whether incense was offered to it as a symbol of some power of nature, cannot now be exactly determined. The threatening in Lev 26:30, “I will put your carcasses upon the carcasses of your idols,” may fairly be considered as directed against the tendency to regard animals, as in Egypt, as the symbols of deity. Tradition says that Nergal, the god of the men of Cuth, the idol of fire according to Leusden (Philippians Hebr. Mixt. diss. 43), was worshipped under the form of a cock; Ashima as a he-goat, the emblem of generative power; Nibhaz as a dog; Adrammelech as a mule or peacock; and Anammelech as a horse or pheasant.  The singular reverence with which trees have in all ages been honored is not without example in the history of the Hebrews. The terebinth at Mamre, beneath which Abraham built an altar (Gen 12:7; Gen 13:18), and the memorial grove planted by him at Beersheba (Gen 21:33), were intimately connected with patriarchal worship though in after ages his descendants were forbidden to do that which he did with impunity, in order to avoid the contamination of idolatry. Jerome (Onomasticon, s.v. Drys) mentions an oak near Hebron which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestine abounds with sacred trees. They are found “all over the land covered with bits of rags from the garments of passing villagers, hung up as acknowledgments, or as deprecatory signals and charms; and we find beautiful clumps of oak-trees sacred to a kind of beings called Jacob's daughters” (Thomson, The Land and the Book, 2, 151). SEE GROVE. As a symptom of the rapidly degenerating spirit, the oak of Shechem, which stood in the sanctuary of Jehovah (Jos 24:26), and beneath which Joshua set up the stone of witness, perhaps appears in Judges (Jdg 9:37) as “the oak (not ‘plain,' as in the A.V.) of soothsayers” or “augurs.” This, indeed, may be a relic of the ancient Canaanitish worship; an older name associated with idolatry, which the conquering Hebrews were commanded and endeavored to obliterate (Deu 12:3).

2. Shamanism, or the magical side of fetishism, the religion of the Mongolian tribes, and apparently the primitive religion of China.

3. High nature-worship, the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and of the supposed powers of nature. The old religion of the Shemitic races consisted, in the opinion of Movers (Plin. 1, c. 5), in the deification of the powers and laws of nature; these powers being considered either as distinct and independent, or as manifestations of one supreme and all-ruling being. In most instances the two ideas were co-existent. The deity, following human analogy, was conceived as male and female: the one representing the active, the other the passive principle of nature; the former the source of spiritual. the latter of physical life. The transference of the attributes of the one to the other resulted either in their mystical conjunction in the hermaphrodite, as the Persian Mithra and Phoenician Baal, or the two combined to form a third, which symbolized the essential unity of both. (This will explain the occurrence of the name of Baal with the masculine and feminine articles in the Sept.; comp. Hos 11:2; Jer 19:5;  Rom 11:4. Philochorus, quoted by Macrobius [Sat. 3, 8], says that men and women sacrificed to Venus or the Moon, with the garments of the sexes interchanged, because she was regarded both as masculine and feminine [see Selden, De Dis Syr. 2, 2]. Hence Lunus and Luna.) With these two supreme beings all other beings are identical; so that in different nations the same nature-worship appears under different forms, representing the various aspects under which the idea of the power of nature is presented. The sun and moon were early selected as outward symbols of this all-pervading power, and the worship of the heavenly bodies was not only the most ancient, but the most prevalent system of idolatry. Taking its rise, according to a probable hypothesis, in the plains of Chaldsea. it spread through Egypt, Greece, Scythia, and even Mexico and Ceylon; and it is worthy of notice that even the religion of remote India presupposes a grand symbolic representation of the divine by the worship of these great physical powers (compare Lassen, Ind. Alterth. 1, 756 sq.; Roth, Geschichte der Religionen). SEE HINDUISM.

It was regarded as an offence amenable to the civil authorities in the days of Job (Job 31:26-28), and one of the statutes of the Mosaic law was directed against its observance (Deu 4:19; Deu 17:3); the former referring to the star worship of Arabia, the latter to the concrete form in which it appeared among the Syrians and Phoenicians. It is probable that the Israelites learned their first lessons in sun worship from the Egyptians, in whose religious system that luminary, as Osiris, held a prominent place. The city of On (Bethshemesh or Heliopolis) took its name from his temple (Jer 43:13), and the wife of Joseph was the daughter of his priest (Gen 41:45). The Phoenicians worshipped him under the title of “Lord of heaven,” בִּעִל שָׁמִיַם, Baal-shamayim (βεελσάμην, acc. to Sanchoniatho in Philo Byblius), and Adon, the Greek Adonis, and the Tammuz of Ezekiel (8:14). SEE TAMMUZ.

As Molech or Milcom, the sun was worshipped by the Ammonites, and as Chemosh by the Moabites. The Hadad of the Syrians is the same deity, whose name is traceable in Benhadad, Hadadezer, and Hadad or Adad, the Edomite. The Assyrian Bel or Belus is another form of Baal. According to Philo (De Vit. Cont. § 3), the Essenes were wont to pray to the sun at morning and evening (Joseph. War, 2, 8, 5). By the later kings of Judah, sacred horses and chariots were dedicated to the sun-god, as by the Persians (2Ki 23:11; Bochart, Hieroz. pt. 1, bk. 2, c. 11; Selden, De Dis Syr. 2, 8), to march in procession and greet his rising (R. Solomon Jarchi on 2Ki 23:11). The Massagetae offered horses in sacrifice to him (Strabo, 11, p. 513), on the principle  enunciated by Macrobius (Sat. 7, 7), “like rejoiceth in like” (“similibus similia gaudent;” compare Herod. 1, 216), and the custom was common to many nations.

The moon, worshipped by the Phoenicians under the name of Astarte (Lucian, de Dea Syra, c. 4), or Baaltis, the passive power of nature, as Baal was the active (Movers, 1, 149), and known to the Hebrews as Ashtaroth or Ashtoreth, the tutelary goddess of the Zidonians, appears early among the objects of Israelitish idolatry. But this Syro-Phoenician worship of the sun and moon was of a grosser character than the pure star worship of the Magi, which Movers distinguishes as Upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, and was equally removed from the Chaldean astrology and Zabianism of later times. The former of these systems tolerated no images or altars, and the contemplation of the heavenly bodies from elevated spots constituted the greater part of its ritual.

But, though we have no positive historical account of star-worship before the Assyrian period, we may infer that it was early practiced in a concrete form among the Israelites from the allusions in Amo 5:26 and Act 7:42-43. Even in the desert they are said to have been given up to worship the host of heaven, while Chiun and Remphan, or Rephan, have on various grounds been identified with the planet Saturn. It was to counteract idolatry of this nature that the stringent law of Deu 17:3 was enacted, and with a view to withdrawing the Israelites from undue contemplation of the material universe, Jehovah, the God of Israel, is constantly placed before them as Jehovah Sabaoth, Jehovah of Hosts, the king of heaven (Dan 4:35; Dan 4:37), to whom the heaven and heaven of heavens belong (Deu 10:14). However this may be, Movers (Phon. 1, 65, 66) contends that the later star-worship, introduced by Ahaz and followed by Manasseh, was purer and more spiritual in its nature than the Israelito-Phoenician worship of the heavenly bodies under symbolical forms, as Baal and Asherah; and that it was not idolatry in the same sense that the latter was, but of a simply contemplative character; He is supported, to some extent, by the fact that we find no mention of any images of the sun or moon or the host of heaven, but merely of vessels devoted to their service (2Ki 23:4). But there is no reason to believe that the divine honors paid to the “Queen of Heaven” (Jer 7:18; Jer 49:19; or, as others render, “the frame” or “structure of the heavens”) were equally dissociated from image-worship. Mr. Layard (Nin. 2, 451) discovered a bas-relief at Nimrod which represented four idols  carried in procession by Assyrian warriors.

One of these figures he identifies with Hera, the Assyrian Astarte, represented with a star on her head (Amos 5, 26), and with the “queen of heaven,” who appears on the rocktablets of Pterium “standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower, or mural coronet,” as in the Syrian temple of Hierapolis (ib. p. 456; Lucian, de Dea Syra, 81, 32). But, in his remarks upon a figure which resembles the Rhea of Diodorus, Layard adds, “The representation in a human form of the celestial bodies, themselves originally but a type, was a corruption which appears to have crept at a later period into the mythology of Assyria; for, in the more ancient bas-reliefs, figures with caps surmounted by stars do not occur, and the sun, moon, and planets stand alone” (ib. p. 457,458). The allusions in Job 38:31-32 are too obscure to allow any inference to be drawn as to the mysterious influences which were held by the old astrologers to be exercised by the stars over human destiny, nor is there sufficient evidence to connect them with anything more recondite than the astronomical knowledge of the period. The same may be said of the poetical figure in Deborah's chant of triumph, “the stars from their highways warred with Sisera” (Jdg 5:20). In the later times of the monarchy, Mazzaloth, the planets, or the zodiacal signs, received, next to the sun and moon, their share of popular adoration (2Ki 23:5); and the history of idolatry among the Hebrews shows at all times an intimate connection between the deification of the heavenly bodies and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the sidereal powers to the worship of Gad and Meni, Babylonian divinities, symbols of Venus or the moon, as the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect the moon was reverenced by the Egyptians (Macrob. Sat. 1, 19),; and the name Baal-Gad is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter, as the bringer of luck, was grafted on the old faith of the Phoenicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with Eastern astrology Adrammelech Movers regards as the sun-fire-the solar Mars, and Anammelech the solar Saturn (Pho. 1, 410, 411). The Vulg. rendering of Pro 26:8, “Sicut qui mittit lapidem in acervum Mercurii,” follows the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, de Dis Syrzs, 2, 15; Maim. de Idol. 3, 2; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.v. מרקולים).

4. Hero-worship, the worship of deceased ancestors or leaders of a nation. Of pure hero-worship among the Shemitic races we find no trace. Moses,  indeed, seems to have entertained some dim apprehension that his countrymen might, after his death, pay him more honors than were due to man, and the anticipation of this led him to review his own conduct in terms of strong reprobation (Deu 4:21-22). The expression in Psa 106:28, “The sacrifices of the dead,” is in all probability metaphorical, and Wis 14:15 refers to a later practice due to Greek influence. The Rabbinical commentators discover in Gen 48:16 an allusion to the worshipping of angels (Col 2:18), while they defend their ancestors from the charge of regarding them in any other light than mediators, or intercessors with God (Lewis, Orig. Hebrews 5, 3). It is needless to add that their inference and apology are equally groundless. With like probability has been advanced the theory of the daemon-worship of the Hebrews, the only foundation for it being two highly poetical passages (Deu 32:17; Psa 106:37). It is possible that the Persian dualism is hinted at in Isa 45:7.

5. Idealism, the worship of abstractions or mental qualities, such as justice, a system never found unmixed. This constituted the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, as also of the Scandinavians. SEE MYTHOLOGY.

III. Idolatry of certain ancient Heathen Nations in Detail. — All idolatry is in its nature heathenish, and it has in all ages been a characteristic mark of heathendom, so that to the present day the vivid description of Romans 1 remains the most striking portraiture of heathen peoples. We have space in this article for a systematic view only of those early nations whose contact with the Hebrew race was the means of the importation of idolatry among the chosen people. SEE POLYTHEISM.

1. Mesopotamian Mythology.-The original idolatrous condition of the kindred of Abraham (q.v.) himself in the great plain of Aram is distinctly alluded to in Judges 24:2. According to Rawlinson (Essay in his Herod.), the Pantheons of Babylon and Nineveh, though originally dissimilar in the names of the divinities, cannot as yet be treated separately. The principal god of the Assyrians was Asshur, replaced in Babylonia by a god whose name is read II or Ra. The special attributes of Asshur were sovereignty and power, and he was regarded as the especial patron of the Assyrians and their kings. It is the Shemitic equivalent of the Hamitic or Scythic Ra, which suggests a connection with Egypt, although it is to be noticed that the same root may perhaps be traced in the probably Canaanitish Heres. Next to Asshur or Il was a triad, consisting of Anu, who appears to have  corresponded to Pluto, a divinity whose name is doubtful, corresponding to Jupiter, and Hea or Hoa, corresponding in position and partly in character to Neptune. The supreme goddess Mulita or Bilta (Mylitta cr Beltis) was the wife of the Babylonian Jupiter. This triad was followed by another, consisting of Ether (Il-a?), the sun, and the moon. Next in order are “the five minor gods, who, if not of astronomical origin, were at any rate identified with the five planets of the Chaldaean system.” In addition, Sir H. Rawlinson enumerates several other divinities of less importance, and mentions that there are “a vast number of other names,” adding this remarkable observation: “Every town and village, indeed, throughout Babylonia and Assyria appears to have had its own particular deity, many of these no doubt being the great gods of the Pantheon disguised under rustic names, but others being distinct local divinities.” Sir H. Rawlinson contents himself with stating the facts discoverable from the inscriptions, and does not theorize upon the subject further than to point out the strong resemblances between this Oriental system and that of Greece and Rome, not indeed in the Aryan ground-work of the latter, but in its general superstructure. If we analyze the Babylonian and Assyrian system, we discover that in its present form it is mainly cosmic, or a system of high nature-worship.

The supreme divinity appears to have been regarded as the ruler of the universe, the first triad was of powers of nature; the second triad and the remaining chief divinities were distinctly cosmic. But beneath this system were two others, evidently distinct in origin, and too deep- seated to be obliterated, the worship of ancestors and low nature-worship. Asshur, at the very head of the Pantheon, is the deified ancestor of the Assyrian race; and, notwithstanding a system of great gods, each city had its own special idolatry, either openly reverencing its primitive idol, or concealing a deviation from the fixed belief by making that idol another form of one of the national divinities. In this separation into its first elements of this ancient religion. we discover the superstitions of those races which, mixed, but never completely fused, formed the population of Babylonia and Assyria, three races whose three languages were yet distinct in the inscribed records as late as the time of Darius Hystaspis. These races were the primitive Chaldaeans, called Hamites by Sir H. Rawlinson, who undoubtedly had strong affinities with the ancient Egyptians, the Shemitic Assyrians, and the Aryan Persians. It is not difficult to assign to these races their respective shares in the composition of the mythology of the countries in which they successively ruled. The ancestral worship is here distinctly Shemitic: the name of Asshur proves this. It may be objected  that such worship never characterized any other Shemitic stock; that we find it among Turanians and Aryans: but we reply that the Shemites borrowed their idolatry, and a Turanian or Aryan influence may have given it this peculiar form. The low nature-worship must be due to the Turanians. It is never discerned except where there is a strong Turanian or Nigritian element, and when once established it seems always to have been very hard to remove. The high nature worship, as the last element, remains for the Aryan race. The primitive Aryan belief in its different forms was a reverence for the sun, moon, and stars, and the powers of nature, combined with a belief in one supreme being, a religion which, though varying at different times, and deeply influenced by ethnic causes, was never deprived of its essentially cosmic characteristics. SEE ASSYRIA.

2. Egyptian. — The strongest and most remarkable peculiarity of the Egyptian religion is the worship of animals (see Zickler, De religione bestiarum ab Agyptiis consecratarum, Lips. 1745; Schumacker, De culiu animalium inter Egyptios et Judceos, Wolfenb. 1773), trees, and like objects, which was universal in the country, and was even connected with the belief in the future state. No theory of the usefulness of certain animals can explain the worship of others that were utterly useless, nor can a theory of some strange anomaly find even as wide an application. The explanation is to be discovered in every town, every village, every hut of the Negroes, whose fetishism corresponds perfectly with this low nature- worship of the ancient Egyptians.

Connected with fetishism was the local character of the religion. Each home, city, town, and probably village, had its divinities, and the position of many gods in the Pantheon was due rather to the importance of their cities than any powers or qualities they were supposed to have. For a detailed account of the Egyptian deities, with illustrative cuts, see Kitto's Pictorial Bible, note on Deu 4:16; compare also EGYPT SEE EGYPT .

The Egyptian Pantheon shows three distinct elements. Certain of the gods are only personifications connected with low nature-worship. Others, the great gods, are of Shemitic origin, and are connected with high nature- worship, though showing traces of the worship of ancestors. In addition, there are certain personifications of abstract ideas. The first of these classes is evidently the result of an attempt to connect the old low nature-worship with some higher system. The second is no doubt the religion of the  Shemitic settlers. It is essentially the same in character as the Babylonian and Assyrian religion, and, as the belief of a dominant race, took the most important place in the intricate system of which it ultimately formed a part. The last class appears to be of later invention, and to have had its origin in an endeavor to construct a philosophical system.

In addition to these particulars of the Egyptian religion, it is important to notice that it comprised very remarkable doctrines. Man was held to be a responsible being, whose future after death depended upon his actions done while on earth. He was to be judged by Osiris, ruler of the West, or unseen world, and either rewarded with felicity or punished with torment. Whether these future states of happiness and misery were held to be of eternal duration is not certain, but there is little doubt that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul.

The religion of the Shepherds, or Hyksos, is not so distinctly known to us. It is, however, clear from the monuments that their chief god was SET, or SUTEKH, and we learn from a papyrus that one of the Shepherd-kings, APEPI, probably Manetho's “Apophis,” established the worship of SET in his dominions, and reverenced' no other god, raising a great temple to him in Zoan, or Avaris. SET continued to be worshipped by the Egyptians until the time of the 22nd dynasty, when we lose all trace of him on the monuments. At this period, or afterwards, his figure was effaced in the inscriptions. The change took place long after the expulsion of the Shepherds, and was effected by the 22nd dynasty, which was probably of Assyrian or Babylonian origin; it is, therefore, rather to be considered as a result of the influence of the Median doctrine of Ormud and Ahriman than as due to the Egyptian hatred of the foreigners and all that concerned them. Besides SET, other foreign divinities were worshipped in Egypt-the god RENPU, the goddesses KEN, or KETESH, ANTA, and ASTARTA. All these divinities, except ASTARTA, as to whom we have no particular information, are treated by the Egyptians as powers of destruction and war, as SET was considered the personification of physical evil. SET was always identified by the Egyptians with Baal; we do not know whether he was worshipped in Egypt before the Shepherd-period, but it is probable that he was.

This foreign worship in Egypt was probably never reduced to a system. What we know of it shows no regularity, and it is not unlike the imitations of the Egyptian idols made by Phoenician artists, probably as  representations of Phoenician divinities. The gods of the Hyksos are foreign objects of worship in an Egyptian dress. SEE HYKSOS.

3. Idolatry of Canaan and the adjoining Countries. The center of the idolatry of the Palestinian races is to be sought for in the religion of the Rephaites and the Canaanites. We can distinctly connect the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth with the earliest kind of idolatry; and, having thus established a center, we can understand how, for instance, the same infernal rites were celebrated to the Ammonitish Molech and the Carthaginian Baal. The most important document for the idolatry of the Hittites is the treaty concluded between the branch of that people seated on the Orontes and Rameses II. From this we learn that SUTEKH (or SET) and ASTERAT were the chief divinities of these Hittites, and that they also worshipped the mountains and rivers and the winds. The SUTERKHS of several forts are also specified. SEE HITTITES.

SET is known from the Egyptian inscriptions to have corresponded to Baal, so that in the two chief divinities we discover Baal and Ashtoreth, the only Canaanitish divinities known to be mentioned in Scripture. The local worship of different forms of Baal well agrees with the low nature-worship with which it is found to have prevailed. Both are equally mentioned in the Bible history. Thus the people of Shechem worshipped Baal-berith, and Mount Hermon itself seems to have been worshipped as Baal-Hermon, while the low nature- worship may be traced in the reverence for groves, and the connection of the Canaanitish religion with hills and trees. The worst feature of this system was the sacrifice of children by their parents-a feature that shows the origin of at least two of its offshoots.

The Bible does not give a very clear description of Canaanitish idolatry. As an abominable thing, to be rooted out and cast into oblivion, nothing is needlessly said of it. The appellation Baal, ruler, or possessor, implies supremacy, and connects the chief Canaanitish divinity with the Syrian Adonis. He was the god of the Canaanitish city Zidon, or Sidon, where “Ashtoreth, the abomination of the Zidonians,” was also specially worshipped. In the Judge-period we read of Baalim and Ashteroth in the plural, probably indicating various local forms of these divinities, but perhaps merely the worship of many images. The worship of Baal was connected with that of the groves, which we take to have been representations of trees or other vegetable products. SEE HIGH PLACE. In Ahab's time a temple was built for Baal, where there was an image. His worshippers sacrificed in garments provided by the priests; and his  prophets, seeking to propitiate him, were wont to cry and cut themselves with swords and lances. Respecting Ashtoreth we know less from Scripture. Her name is not derivable from any Shemitic root. It is equivalent to the Ishtar of the cuneiform inscriptions, the name of the Assyrian or Babylonian Venus, the goddess of the planet. The identity of the Canaanitish and the Assyrian or Babylonian goddess is further shown by the connection of the former with star-worship. In the Iranian languages we find a close radical resemblance to Ashtoreth and Ishtar in the Persian, Zend stara, Sansk. stra, ἀστήρ, stern, all equivalent to our “star.” This derivation confirms our opinion that the high nature-worship of the Babylonians and Assyrians was of Aryan origin. As no other Canaanitish divinities are noticed in Scripture, it seems probable that Baal and Ashtoreth were alone worshipped by the nations of Canaan. Among the neighboring tribes we find, besides these, other names of idols, and we have to inquire whether they apply to different idols or are merely different appellations.

Beginning with the Abrahamitic tribes, we find Molech, Malcham, or Milcom (מֹלֶךְ, מִלְכָּם, מַלְכֹּם) spoken of as the idol of the Ammonites. This name, in the first form, always has the article, and undoubtedly signifies the king (הִמֹּלֶךְ, equivalent to הִמֶּלֶךְ), for it is indifferently used as a proper name and as an appellative with a suffix (comp. Jer 49:1; Jer 49:3, with Amo 1:15). Milcom is from Molech or its root, with םformative, and Malcham is probably a dialectic variation, if the points are to be relied upon. Molech was regarded by the Ammonites as their king. When David captured Rabbah, we are told that “he took Malcham's crown from off his head, the weight whereof [was] a talent of gold with the precious stones: and it was [set] on David's head” (2Sa 12:30; comp. 1Ch 20:2). The prophets speak of this idol as ruler of the children of Ammon, and doomed to go into captivity with his priests and princes (Jer 49:1; Jer 49:3; Amo 1:15). The worship of Molech was performed at high places, and children were sacrificed to him by their parents, being cast into fires. This horrible practice prevailed at Carthage, where children were sacrificed to their chief divinity, Baal, called at Tyre “Melcarth, lord (Baal) of Tyre” מלקרת בעל צר(Inscr. Melit. Biling. ap. Gesen. Lex. s.v. בצל), the first of which words signifies king of the city, for מֶלֶךְ קֶרֶת. There can therefore be no doubt that Molech was a local form of the chief idol of Canaan, and it is by no means certain that this  name was limited to the Ammonitish worship, as we shall see in speaking of the idolatry of the Israelites in the Desert.

We know for certain of but one Moabitish divinity, as of but one Ammonitish. Chemosh appears to have held the same place as Molech, although our information respecting him is less full. Moab was the “people of Chemosh” (Num 21:29; Jer 48:46), and Chemosh was doomed to captivity with his priests and princes (Jer 48:7). In one place Chemosh is spoken of as the god of the king of the children of Ammon, whom Jephthah conquered (Jdg 11:24); but it is to be remarked that the cities held by this king, which Jephthah took, were not originally Ammonitish, and were apparently claimed as once held by the Moabites (2126; comp. Num 21:23-30); so that at this time Moab and Ammon were probably united, or the Ammonites ruled by a Moabitish chief. The etymology of Chemosh is doubtful, but it is clear that he was distinct from Molech. There is no positive trace of the cruel rites of the idol of the Ammonites, and it is unlikely that the settled Moabites should have had the same savage disposition as their wild brethren on the north. There is, however, a general resemblance in the regal character assigned to both idols and their solitary position. Chemosh, therefore, like Molech, was probably a form of Baal. Both tribes appear, to have had other idols, for we read of the worship, by the Israelites, of “the gods of Moab, and the gods of the children of Ammon” (Jdg 10:6); but, as there are other plurals in the passage, it is possible that this maybe a general expression. Yet, in saying this, we do not mean to suggest that there was any monotheistic form of Canaanitish idolatry. There is some difficulty in ascertaining whether Baal-Peor, or Peor, was a Moabitish idol. The Israelites, while encamped at Shittim, were seduced by the women of Moab and Midian, and joined them in the worship of Baal-Peor. There is no notice of any later instance of this idolatry. It seems, therefore, not to have been national to Moab, and, if so, it may have been borrowed, and Midianitish, or else local, and Canaanitish. The former idea is supported by the apparent connection of prostitution, even of women of rank, with the worship of Baal-Peor, which would not have been repugnant to the pagan Arabs; the latter finds some support in the name Shittim, the acacias, as though the place had its name from some acacias sacred to Baal, and, moreover, we have no certain instance of the application of the name of Baal to any non-Canaanitish divinity. Had such vile worship as was  probably that of Baal-Peor been national in Moab, it is most unlikely that David would have been on very friendly terms with a Moabitish king.

The Philistine idolatry is connected with that of Canaan, although it has peculiarities of its own, which are indeed so strong that it may be questioned whether it is entirely or even mainly derived from the Canaanitish source. At Ekron, Baal-zebub was worshipped, and had a temple, to which Ahaziah, the wicked son of Ahab, sent to inquire. This name means either the lord of the fly, or Baal the fly. It is generally held that he was worshipped as a driver-away of flies, but we think it more probable that some venomous fly was sacred to him. The use of the term Baal is indicative of a connection with the Canaanitish system. The national divinity of the Philistines seems, however, to have been Dagon, to whom there were temples at Gaza and at Ashdod, and the general character of whose worship is evident in such traces as we observe in the names Caphar-Dagon, near Jamnia, and Beth-Dagon, the latter applied to two places, one in Judah and the other in Asher. The derivation of the name Dagon, דָּגוֹן, as that of a fish-god, is from דָּג, a fish. Gesenius considers it a diminutive,” little fish,” used by way of endearment and honor (Thes. s.v.), but this is surely hazardous. Dagon was represented as a man with the tail of a fish. There can be no doubt that he was connected with the Canaanitish system, as Derceto or Atargatis, the same as Ashtoreth, was worshipped under a like mixed shape at Ashkelon (αὔτη δὲ τὸμὲν πρόσωπον ἔχει γυναικός, τὸδ᾿ ἄλλο σῶμα πᾶν ἰχθύος, Diod. Sic. ii, 4). In form he is the same as the Assyrian god supposed to correspond to the planet Saturn. The house of Dagon at Gaza, which Samson overthrew, must have been very large, for about 3000 men and women then assembled on its roof. It had two principal, if not only, pillars in the midst, between which Samson was placed and was seen by the people on the roof. The inner portion of some of the ancient Egyptian temples consisted of a hypsethral hall, supported by two or more pillars, and inner chambers. The overthrow of these pillars would bring down the stone roof of the hall, and destroy all persons beneath or upon it, without necessarily overthrowing the sidewalls.

The idolatry of the Phoenicians is not spoken of in the Bible. From their inscriptions and the statements of profane authors we learn that this nation worshipped Baal and Ashtoreth. The details of their worship will be spoken of in the article PHOENICIA.  Syrian idols are mentioned in a few places in Scripture. Tammuz, whom the women of Israel lamented, is no doubt Adonis, whose worship implies that of Astarte or Ashtoreth. Rimmon, who appears to have been the chief divinity of the Syrian kings ruling at Damascus, may, if his name signifies high (from רָמִם), be a local form of Baal, who, as the sun-god, had a temple at the great Syrian city Heliopolis, now called Baalbek.

The book of Job, which, whatever its date, represents a primitive state of society, speaks of cosmic worship as though it was practiced in his country, Idumaea or northern Arabia. “If I beheld a sun when it shined, or a splendid moon progressing, and my heart were secretly enticed, and my hand touched my mouth, surely this [were] a depravity of judgment, for I should have denied God above” (31:26-28). See Poole, Genesis of the Earth and of Man 1:2 nd ed. p. 184. This evidence is important in connection with that of the ancient prevalence of cosmic worship in Arabia, and that of its practice by some of the later kings of Judah.-Kitto.

4. Much indirect evidence on this subject might be supplied by an investigation of proper names. Mr. Layard has remarked, “According to a custom existing from time immemorial in the East, the name of the supreme deity was introduced into the names of men. This custom prevailed from the banks of the Tigris to the Phoenician colonies beyond the Pillars of Hercules; and we recognize in the Sardanapalus of the Assyrians, and the Hannibal of the Carthaginians, the identity of the religious system of the two nations, as widely distinct in the time of their existence as in their geographical position” (Nineveh, 2, 450). The hint which he has given can be but briefly followed out here. Traces of the sun worship of the ancient Canaanites remain in the nomenclature of their country. Beth-Shemesh, “house of the sun;” En-Shemesh, “spring of the sun,” and Ir-Shemesh, “city of the son,” whether they be the original Canaanitish names or their Hebrew renderings, attest the reverence paid to the source of light and heat, the symbol of the fertilizing power of nature. Samson. the Hebrew national hero, took his name from the same luminary, and was born in a mountain village above the modern ‘Ain Shems (En- Shemesh: Thomson, The Land and the Book, 2, 361). The name of Baal, the sun-god, is one of the most common occurrence in compound words, and is often associated with places consecrated to his worship, and of which, perhaps, he was the tutelary deity. Bamoth-Baal, “the high places of Baal;” Baal-Hermon, Beth-Baal-Meon, Baal-Gad, Baal-Hamon, in which the compound names of the sun god of Phoenicia and Egypt are  associated, Baal-Tamar, and many others, are instances of this. [That temples in Syria, dedicated to the several divinities, did transfer their names to the places where they stood, is evident from the testimony of Lucian, an Assyrian himself. His derivation of Hiera from the temple of the Assyrian Hera shows that he was familiar with the circumstance (De Dea Syr. c. 1). Baisampsa (=Bethshemesh), a town of Arabia, derived its name from the sun-worship (Vossius, De Theol. Gent. 2, c. 8), like Kir-Heres (Jer 48:31) of Moab.] Nor was the practice confined to the names of places: proper names are found with the same element. Esh-baal, Ish- baal, etc., are examples. The Amorites, whom Joshua did not drive cut. dwelt on Mount Heres, in Aijalon, “the mountain of the sun.” SEE TIAINATH-HERES.

Here and there we find traces of the attempt made by the Hebrews, on their conquest of the country, to extirpate idolatry. Thus Baalah or Kirjath-Baal, “the town of Baal,” became Kirjath-Jearim, “the town of forests” (Jos 15:60). The Moon. Astarte or Ashtaroth, gave her name to a city of Bashan (Jos 13:12; Jos 13:31), and it is not improbable that the name Jericho may have been derived from being associated with the worship of this goddess. SEE JERICHO. Nebo, whether it be the name under which the Chaldaeans worshipped the Moon or the planet Mercury, enters into many compounds: Nebu-zaradan, Samgarnebo, and the like. Bel is found in Belshazzar, Belteshazzar, and others. Were Baladan of Shemitic origin, it would probably be derived from Baal-Adon, or Adonis, the Phoenician deity to whose worship Jer 22:18 seems to refer; but it has more properly been traced to an Indo-Germanic root. Hadad, Hadadezer, Benhadad are derived from the tutelar deity of the Syrians, and in Nergalsharezer we recognize the god of the Cushites. Chemosh, the fire-god of Moab, appears in Carchemish, and Peor in Beth-Peor. Malcom, a name which occurs but once, and then of a Moabite by birth, may have been connected with Molech and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites. A glimpse of star-worship may be seen in the name of the city Chesil, the Shemitic Orion, and the month Chisleu, without recognizing in Rahab “the glittering fragments of the sea-snake trailing across the northern sky.” It would, perhaps, be going too far to trace in Engedi, “spring of the kid,” any connection with the goat-worship of Mendes, or any relics of the wars of the giants in Rapha and Rephaim. Furst, indeed, recognises in Gedi,Venus or Astarte, the goddess of fortune, and identical with Gad (Handw. s. t.). But there are fragments of ancient idolatry in other names in which it is not so palpable. Ishbosheth is identical with Eshbaal, and Jerubbesheth with Jerubbaal, and Mephibosheth and  Meribbaal are but two names for one person (comp. Jer 11:13). The worship of the Syrian Rimmon appears in the names HadadRimmon, and Tabrimmon; and if, as some suppose, it be derived from רַמּוֹן, Rimmon, “a pomegranate-tree,” we may connect it with the towns of the same name in Judah and Benjamin, with En-Rimmon and the prevailing tree-worship. It is impossible to pursue this investigation to any length: the hints which have been thrown out may prove suggestive. See each of these names in its place.

5. Idolatrous Usages. — Mountains and high places were chosen spots for offering sacrifice and incense to idols (1Ki 11:7; 1Ki 14:23), and the retirement of gardens and the thick shade of woods offered great attractions to their worshippers (2Ki 16:4; Isa 1:29; Hos 4:13). It was the ridge of Carmel which Elijah selected as the scene of his contest with the priests of Baal, fighting with them the battle of Jehovah as it were on their own ground. SEE CARMEL. Carmel was regarded by the Roman historians as a sacred mountain of the Jews (Tacit. Hist. 2, 78; Sueton. Vesp. 7). The host of heaven was worshipped on the housetop (2Ki 23:12; Jer 19:3; Jer 32:29; Zep 1:5). In describing the sun worship of the Nabataei, Strabo (16, 784) mentions two characteristics which strikingly illustrate the worship of Baal. They built their altars on the roofs of houses, and offered on them incense and libations daily. On the wall of his city, in the sight of the besieging armies of Israel and Edom, the king of Moab offered his eldest son as a burnt offering. The Persians, who worshipped the sun under the name of Mithra (Strabo, 15:732), sacrificed on an elevated spot, but built no altars or images. SEE MOUNT.

The priests of the false worship are sometimes designated Chemarim, a word of Syriac origin, to which different meanings have been assigned. It is applied to the non-Levitical priests who burnt incense on the high places (2Ki 23:5) as well as to the priests of the calves (Hos 10:5); and the corresponding word is used in the Peshito (Jdg 18:30) of Jonathan and his descendants, priests to the tribe of Dan, and in the Targum of Onkelos (Gen 47:22) of the priests of Egypt. The Rabbis, followed by Gesenius, have derived it from a root signifying “to be black,” and without any authority assert that the name was given to idolatrous priests from the black vestments which they wore. But white was the distinctive color in the priestly garments of all nations from India to Gaul, and black was only worn when they sacrificed to the subterranean  gods (Bahr, Symb. 2, 87, etc.). That a special dress was adopted by the Baal-worshippers, as well as by the false prophets ‘(Zec 13:4), is evident from 2Ki 10:22 (where the rendering should be “the apparel”): the vestments were kept in an apartment of the idol temple, under the charge probably of one of the inferior priests. Micah's Levite was provided with appropriate robes (Jdg 17:11). The “foreign apparel” mentioned in Zep 1:8, doubtless refers to a similar dress, adopted by the Israelites in defiance of the sumptuary law in Num 15:37-40. SEE CHEMIARIM.

In addition to the priests, there were other persons intimately connected with idolatrous rites, and the impurities from which they were inseparable. Both men and women consecrated themselves to the service of idols: the former as קְדֵשַׁים, kedeshim, for which there is reason to believe the A.V. (Deu 23:17, etc.) has not given too harsh an equivalent; the latter as קְדֵשׁוֹתkedeshoth, who wove shrines for Astarte (2Ki 23:7), and resembled the ἑταίραι of Corinth, of whom Strabo (8, 378) says there were more than a thousand attached to the temple of Aphrodite. Egyptian prostitutes consecrated themselves to Isis (Juvenal, 6:489; 9:22- 24). The same class of women existed among the Phoenicians, Armenians, Lydians, and Babylonians (Herod. 1, 93, 199; Strabo, 11:p. 532; Epist. of Jerem. ver. 43). They are distinguished from the public prostitutes (Hos 4:14), and associated with the performances of sacred rites, just as in Strabo (12, p. 559) we find the two classes co-existing at Comana, the Corinth of Pontus, much frequented by pilgrims to the shrine of Aphrodite. The wealth thus obtained flowed into the treasury of the idol temple, and against such a practice the injunction in Deu 23:18 is directed. Dr. Maitland, anxious to defend the moral character of Jewish women, has with much ingenuity attempted to show that a meaning foreign to their true sense has been attached to the words above mentioned; and that, though closely associated with idolatrous services, they do not indicate such foul corruption (Essay on False Worship). But if, as Movers, with great appearance of probability, has conjectured (Phon. 1, 679), the class of persons alluded to was composed of foreigners, the Jewish women in this respect need no such advocacy. That such customs existed among' foreign nations there is abundant evidence to prove (Lucian, De Syra Dea, c. 5); and from the juxtaposition of prostitution and the idolatrous rites against which the laws in Leviticus 19 are aimed, it is probable that, next to its immorality, one main reason why it was visited  with such stringency was its connection with idolatry (compare 1Co 6:9). SEE HARLOT.

But besides these accessories there were the ordinary rites of worship which idolatrous systems had in common with the religion of the Hebrews. Offering burnt sacrifices to the idol gods (2Ki 5:17), burning incense in their honor (1Ki 11:8), and bowing down in worship before their images (1Ki 19:18) were the chief parts of their ritual, and, from their very analogy with the ceremonies of true worship, were more seductive than the grosser forms. Nothing can be stronger or more positive than the language in which these ceremonies were denounced by Hebrew law. Every detail of idol-worship was made the subject of a separate enactment, and many of the laws, which in themselves seem trivial and almost absurd, receive from this point of view their true significance. We are told by Maimonides (Mror. Veb. c. 12) that the prohibitions against sowing a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments of mixed material, were directed against the practices of idolaters, who attributed a kind of magical influence to the mixture (Lev 19:19; Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. 2, 18). Such, too, were the precepts which forbade that the garments of the sexes should be interchanged (Deu 23:5; Maimonides, De Idol. 12, 9). According to Macrobius (Sat. 3. 8), other Asiatics, when they sacrificed to their Venus, changed the dress of the sexes. The priests of Cybele appeared in women's clothes, and used to mutilate themselves (Creuzer, Symbo 2, 34,42): the same custom was observed “by the Ithyphalli in the rites of Bacchus, and by the Athenians in their Ascophoria” (Young, Idol. Corinthians in Rel. 1, 105; comp. Lucian, De Dea Syra, c. 15).

To preserve the Israelites from contamination, they were prohibited for three years after their conquest of Canaan from eating of the fruit-trees of the land, whose cultivation had been attended with magical rites (Lev 19:23). They were forbidden to “round the corner of the head,” and to “mar the corner of the beard” (Lev 19:27), as the Arabians did in honor of their gods (Herod. 3:8; 4:175). Hence the phrase קְצוּצֵי פֵאָה(literally), “shorn of the corner,” is especially applied to idolaters (Jer 9:26; Jer 25:23). Spencer (De Leg. Hebrews 2, 9, § 2) explains the law forbidding the offering of honey (Leviticus 2, 11) as intended to oppose an idolatrous practice. Strabo describes the Magi as offering in all their sacrifices libations of oil mixed with honey and milk (15, p. 733) Offerings in which honey was an ingredient were made to the inferior deities and the dead (Homer, Od. 10, 519; Porph. De Antr. Nymph.  c. 17). So also the practice of eating the flesh of sacrifices “over the blood” (Lev 19:26; Eze 33:25-26) was, according to Maimonides, common among the Zabii. Spencer gives a double reason for the prohibition: that it was a rite of divination, and divination of the worst kind, a species of necromancy by which they attempted to raise the spirits of the dead (comp. Horace, Sat. 1, 8). There are supposed to be allusions to the practice of necromancy in Isa 65:4, or, at any rate, to superstitious rites in connection with the dead. The grafting of one tree upon another was forbidden, because among idolaters the process was accompanied by gross obscenity (Maimon. Mor. Neb. c. 12). Cutting the flesh for the dead (Lev 19:28; 1Ki 18:28), and making a baldness between the eyes (Deu 14:1), were associated with idolatrous rites, the latter being a custom among the Syrians (Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herod. 2, 158 note). The thrice repeated and much vexed passage, “Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk” (Exo 23:19; Exo 34:26; Deu 14:21), interpreted by some as a precept of humanity, is explained by Cudworth in a very different manner. He quotes from a Karaite commentary which he had seen in MS.: “It was a custom of the ancient heathens, when they had gathered in all their fruit, to take a kid and boil it in the dam's mill, and then in a magical way go about and besprinkle with it all the trees, and fields, and gardens, and orchards; thinking by this means they should make them fructify, and bring forth again more abundantly the following year” (On the Lord's Supper, c. 2). Dr. Thomson mentions a favorite dish among the Arabs called lebn immrs, to which he conceives allusion is made (The Land and the Book, 1, 135). The law which regulated clean and unclean meats (Lev 20:23-26) may be considered both as a sanitary regulation and also as having a tendency to separate the Israelites from the surrounding idolatrous nations. It was with the same object, in the opinion of Michaelis, that while in the wilderness they were prohibited from killing any animal for food without first offering it to Jehovah (Laws of Moses, art. 203). The mouse, one of the unclean animals of Leviticus (11, 29), was sacrificed by the ancient Magi (Isa 66:17; Movers, Phon. 1, 219).

It may have been some such reason as that assigned by Lewis (Orig. Hebrews 5, 1), that the dog was the symbol of an Egyptian deity, which gave rise to the prohibition in Deu 23:18. Movers says (1, 404) the dog was offered in sacrifice to Moloch, as swine to the moon and Dionysus by the Egyptians, who afterwards ate of the flesh (Herod. 3:47; Isa 65:4). Eating of the things offered was a necessary appendage to the  sacrifice (compare Exo 18:12; Exo 32:6; Exo 34:15; Num 25:2, etc.). Among the Persians the victim was eaten by the worshippers, and the soul alone left for the god (Strabo, 15:732). “Hence it is that the idolatry of the Jews in worshipping other gods is so often described synecdochically under the notion of feasting. Isa 57:7, ‘Upon a high and lofty mountain thou hast set thy bed, and thither wentest thou up to offer sacrifice;' for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie down on beds or couches. Eze 23:41; Amos 2, 8, They laid themselves down upon clothes laid to pledge by every altar,' i.e. laid themselves down to eat of the sacrifice that was offered on the altar; compare Eze 8:11 (Cudworth, ut supra, c. 1; comp. 1Co 8:10). The Israelites were forbidden “to print any mark upon them” (Lev 19:28), because it was a custom of idolaters to brand upon their flesh some symbol of the deity they worshipped, as the ivy-leaf of Bacchus (3Ma 2:29). According to Lucian (De Dea Syra, 59), all the Assyrians wore marks of this kind on their necks and wrists (comp. Isa 44:5; Gal 6:17; Rev 14:1; Rev 14:11). Many other practices of false worship are alluded to, and made the subjects of rigorous prohibition, but none are more frequently or more severely denounced than those which peculiarly distinguished the worship, of Molech. It has been attempted to deny that the worship of this idol was polluted by the foul stain of human sacrifice, but the allusions are too plain and too pointed to admit of reasonable doubt (Deu 12:31; 2Ki 3:27; Jer 7:31; Psa 106:37; Eze 23:39).

Nor was this practice confined to the rites of Molech; it extended to those of Baal (Jer 19:5), and the king of Moab (2Ki 3:27) offered his son as a burnt-offering to his god Chemosh. The Phoenicians, we are told by Porphyry (De Abstin. 2, c. 56), on occasions of great national calamity sacrificed to Kronos one of their dearest friends. Some allusions to this custom may be seen in Mic 6:7. Kissing the images of the gods (1Ki 19:18; Hos 13:2), hanging votive offerings in their temples (1Sa 31:10), and carrying them to battle (2Sa 5:21), as the Jews of Maccabseus's army did with the things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites (2Ma 12:40), are usages connected with idolatry which are casually mentioned, though not made the objects of express legislation. But soothsaying, interpretation of dreams, necromancy, witchcraft, magic, and other forms of divination, are alike forbidden (Deu 18:9; 2Ki 1:2; Isa 65:4; Eze 21:21). The history of other nations-and, indeed, the too common practice of the lower class of the population of Syria at the  present day-shows us that such a statute as that against bestiality (Lev 18:23) was not unnecessary (comp. Herod. 2, 46; Rom 1:26). Purificatory rites in connection with idol-worship, and eating of forbidden food, were visited with severe retribution (Isa 66:17). It is evident, from the context of Eze 8:17, that the rotaries of the sun, who worshipped with their faces to the east (Eze 8:16), and “put the branch to their nose,” did so in observance of some idolatrous rite. Movers (Phoen. 1, 66) unhesitatingly affirms that the allusion is to the branch Barsom, the holy branch of the Magi (Strabo, 15:p. 733), while Havernick (Comm. zu Ezech. p. 117), with equal confidence, denies that the passage supports such an inference, and renders, having in view the lament of the women for Tammuz, “Sie entsenden den Trauergesang zu ihren Zorn.” The waving of a myrtle branch, says Maimonides (De Idol. 6:2), accompanied the repetition of a magical formula in incantations. An illustration of the use of boughs in worship will be found in the Greek ikrTropia (Esch. Eun. 43; Suppl. 192; Schol. on Aristoph. Plut. 383; Porphyr. De Ant. Nymph. c. 33). For detailed accounts of idolatrous ceremonies, reference must be made to the articles upon the several idols. SEE SACRIFICE.

IV. History of Idolatry among the Jews.-

1. The first undoubted allusion to idolatry or idolatrous customs in the Bible is in the account of Rachel's stealing her father's teraphim (Gen 31:19), a relic of the worship of other gods, whom the ancestors of the Israelites served “on the other side of the river, in old time” (Jos 24:2). By these household deities Laban was guided, and these he consulted as oracles (נַחִשְׁתַּי, Gen 30:27, A.V. “learned by experience”), though without entirely losing sight of the God of Abraham and the God of Nahor, to whom he appealed when occasion offered (Gen 31:53), while he was ready, in the presence of Jacob, to acknowledge the benefits conferred upon him by Jehovah (Gen 30:27). Such, indeed, was the character of most of the idolatrous worship of the Israelites. Like the Cuthsan colonists in Samaria, who “feared Jehovah and served their own gods” (2Ki 17:33), they blended in a strange manner a theoretical belief in the true God with the external reverence which, in different stages of their history, they were led to pay to the idols of the nations by whom they were surrounded. For this species of false worship they seem, at all events, to have had an incredible  propension. On their journey from Shechem to Bethel, the family of Jacob put away from among them “the gods of the foreigner:” not the teraphim of Laban, but the gods of the Canaanites through whose land they passed and the amulets and charms which were worn as the appendages of their worship (Gen 35:2; Gen 35:4). SEE JACOB.

During their long residence in Egypt, the country of symbolism, they defiled themselves with the idols of the land, and it was long before the taint was removed (Jos 24:14; Eze 20:7). To these gods Moses, as the herald of Jehovah, flung down the gauntlet of defiance (Kurtz, Gesch. d. Alt. B. 2, 39), and the plagues of Egypt smote their symbols (Num 33:4). Yet, with the memory of their deliverance fresh in their minds, their leader absent, the Israelites clamored for some visible shape in which they might worship the God who had brought them up out of Egypt (Exodus 32). The Israelites, as dwellers in the most outlying and separate tract of the Shemitic part of Lower Egypt, are more likely to lave followed the corruptions of the Shepherd strangers than those of the Egyptians, more especially as, saving Joseph, Moses, and not improbably Aaron and Miriam, they seem to have almost universally preserved the manners of their former wandering life.

There is scarcely a trace of Egyptian influence beyond that seen in the names of Moses and Miriam, and perhaps of Aaron also, for the only other name besides the former two that is certainly Egyptian, and may be reasonably referred to this period, that of Harnepher, evidently the Egyptian HAR-NEFRU, “Horus the good,” in the genealogies of Asher (1Ch 7:36), probably marks an Egyptian taken by marriage into the tribe of Asher, whether a proselyte or not we cannot attempt to decide. There has been a difference of opinion as to the golden calf, some holding that it was made to represent God himself, others maintaining that it was only an imitation of an Egyptian idol. We first observe that this and Jeroboam's golden calves are shown to have been identical in the intention with which they were made, by the circumstance that the Israelites addressed the former as the God who had brought them out of Egypt (Exo 32:4; Exo 32:8), and that Jeroboam proclaimed the same of his idols (1Ki 12:28). We next remark that Aaron called the calf not only god, but the LORD (Exo 32:5); that in the Psalms it is said “they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth hay” (Psa 106:20); that no one of the calf-worshipping kings and princes of Israel bears any name connected with idolatry, while many have names compounded with the most sacred name  of God; and that in no place is any foreign divinity connected with calf- worship in the slightest degree. The adoption of such an image as the golden calf, however, shows the strength of Egyptian associations, else how would Aaron have fixed upon so ignoble a form as that of the God who had brought Israel out of Egypt? Only a mind thoroughly accustomed to the profound respect paid in Egypt to the sacred bulls, and especially to Apis and Minevis, could have hit upon so strange a representation; nor could any people who had not witnessed the Egyptian practices have found, as readily as did the Israelites, the fulfillment of their wishes in such an image. The feast that Aaron celebrated, when, after eating and drinking, the people arose, sang, and danced naked before the idol, is strikingly like the festival of the finding of Apis, which was celebrated with feasting and dancing, and also, apparently, though this custom does not seem to have been part of the public festivity, with indecent gestures. SEE GOLDEN CALF.

The golden calf was not the only idol which the Israelites worshipped in the Desert. The prophet Amos speaks of others. In the Masoretic text the passage is as follows: “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” (5, 26). The Sept. has Μολόχ for “your king,” as though their original Heb. had been מִלְכָּם instead of מִלְכְּכֶם, and ῾Ραιφάν for Chiun, besides a transposition.' ‘In the Acts the reading is almost the same as that 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” 107:43). We cannot here discuss the probable causes of these differences except of the more important ones, the substitution of Moloch for “your king,” and Raiphan or Remphan for Chiun. It should be observed, that if the passage related to Ammonitish worship, nothing would be more likely than that Molech should have been spoken of by an appellative, in which case a strict rendering of the Masoretic text would read as does the A.V.; a freer could follow the Sept. and Acts; but, as there is no reference to the Ammonites or even Canaanites, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Sept. followed a text in which, as above suggested, the reading was מִלְכָּם, Malcham, or “your king.” The likelihood of this being the true reading must depend upon the rest of the passage. Remphan and Chiun are at once recognized as two foreign divinities worshipped together in Egypt, RENPU, probably pronounced REIPU, and KEN the former a god represented as of the type of the Shemites, and apparently connected with war, the latter a goddess  represented naked standing upon a lion. They were worshipped with KHEM, the Egyptian god of productiveness, and the foreign war-goddess ANATA.

 Excluding KHEMI, who is probably associated with KEN from her being connected, as we shall see, with productiveness, these names, RENPU, KEN, and ANATA, are clearly not, except in orthography, Egyptian. We can suggest no origin for the name of RENPU The goddess KEN, as naked, would be connected with the Babylonian Mylitta, and as standing on a lion, with a goddess so represented in rock-sculptures at Maltheivyeh, near Nineveh. The former similarity connects her with generation; the latter, perhaps, does so likewise. If we adopt this supposition, the name KEN may be traced to a root connected with generation found in many varieties in the Iranian family, and not out of that family. It may be sufficient to cite the Greek γίν-ομαι, γυν-ή: she would thus be the goddess of productiveness. ANATA is the Persian Anaitis. We have shown earlier that the Babylonian high nature-worship seems to have been of Aryan origin. In the present case we trace an Aryan idolatry connected, from the mention of a star, with high nature-worship. If we accept this explanation, it becomes doubtful that Molech is mentioned in the passage, and we may rather suppose that some other idol, to whom a kingly character was attributed, is intended. Here we must leave this difficult point of OUT inquiry, only summing up that this false worship was evidently derived from the shepherds in Egypt, and may possibly indicate the Aryan origin of at least one of these tribes, almost certainly its own origin, directly or indirectly, from an Aryan source.

The next was a temporary apostasy. The charms of the daughters of Moab, as Balaam's bad genius foresaw, were potent for evil: the Israelites were “yoked to BaalPeor” in the trammels of his fair worshippers, and the character of their devotions is not obscurely hinted at (Numbers 25). The great and terrible retribution which followed left so deep an impress upon the hearts of the people that, after the conquest of the promised land, they looked with an eye of terror upon any indication of defection from the worship of Jehovah, and denounced as idolatrous a memorial so slight as the altar of the Reubenites at the passage of Jordan (Jos 22:16).

2. It is probable that during the wanderings, and under the strong rule of Joshua, the idolatry learnt in Egypt was so destroyed as to be afterwards utterly forgotten by the people. But in entering Palestine they found themselves among the monuments and associations of another false religion, less attractive indeed to the reason than that of Egypt, which still  taught, notwithstanding the wretched fetishism that it supported, some great truths of man's present and future, but of a religion which, in its deification of nature, had a strong hold on the imagination. The genial sun, the refreshing moon, the stars, at whose risings or settings fell the longed- for rains, were naturally reverenced in that land of green hills and valleys, which were fed by the water of heaven. A nation thrown in the scene of such a religion and mixed with those who professed it, at that period of national life when impressions are most readily made, such a nation, albeit living while the recollection of the deliverance from Egypt and the wonders with which the Law was given was yet fresh, soon fell away into the practices that it was strictly enjoined to root out. In the first and second laws of the Decalogue, the Israelites were commanded to worship but one God, and not to make any image whatever to worship it, lest they and their children should fall under God's heavy displeasure. The commands were explicit enough. But not alone was idolatry thus clearly condemned: the Israelites were charged to destroy all objects connected with the religion of the inhabitants of Canaan. They were to destroy utterly all the heathen places of worship, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree.”

They were to “overthrow” the “altars” of the heathen, “break their pillars,” “burn their groves, hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place” (Deu 12:2-3), a passage we cite on account of the fullness of the enumeration. Had the conquered nations been utterly extirpated, their idolatry might have been annihilated at once. But soon after the lands had been apportioned, that separate life of the tribes began which was never interrupted, as far as history tells us, until the time of the kings. Divided, the tribes were unable to cope with the remnant of the Canaanites, and either dwelt with them on equal terms, reduced them to tribute, or became tributaries themselves. The Israelites were thus surrounded by the idolatry of Canaan; and since they were for the most part confined to the mountain and hilly districts, where its associations were strongest, they had but to learn from their neighbors how they had worshipped upon the high hills and under every green tree. From the use of plural forms, it is probable that the Baals and Ashtoreths of several towns or tribes were worshipped by the Israelites, as Baal-Peor had been, and Baalberith afterwards was. It does not seem, however that the people at once fell into heathen worship: the first step appears to have been adopting a corruption of the true religion.  During the lives of Joshua and the elders who outlived him, indeed, they kept true to their allegiance; but the generation following, who knew not Jehovah, nor the works he had done for Israel, swerved from the plain path of their fathers, and were caught in the toils of the foreigner (Judges 2). From this time forth their history becomes little more than a chronicle of the inevitable sequence of offence and punishment. “They provoked Jehovah to anger and the anger of Jehovah was hot against Israel, and he delivered them into the hands of spoilers that spoiled them” (Jdg 2:12; Jdg 2:14). The narratives of the book of Judges, contemporaneous or successive, tell of the fierce struggle maintained against their hated foes, and how women forgot their tenderness and forsook their retirement to sing the song of victory over the oppressor.

By turns, each conquering nation strove to establish the worship of its national god. During the rule of Midian, Joash, the father of Gideon, had an altar to Baal, and an Asherah (Jdg 6:25), though he proved but a lukewarm worshipper (Jdg 6:31). Even Gideon himself gave occasion to idolatrous worship; yet the ephod which he made from the spoils of the Midianites was perhaps but a voice offering to the true God (Jdg 8:27). It is not improbable that the gold ornaments of which it was composed were in some way connected with idolatry (comp. Isa 3:18-24), and that, from their having been worn as amulets, some superstitious virtue was conceived to cling to them even in their new form. But, though in Gideon's lifetime no overt act of idolatry was practiced, he was no sooner dead than the Israelites again returned to the service of the Baalim, and, as if in solemn mockery of the covenant made with Jehovah. chose from among them Baal-Berith, “Baal of the Covenant” (comp. Ζεὺς ὅρκιος), as the object of their special adoration (Jdg 8:33). Of this god we know only that his temple, probably of wood (Jdg 9:49), was a stronghold in time of need, and that his treasury was filled with the silver of the worshippers (Jdg 9:4). Nor were the calamities of foreign oppression confined to the land of Canaan. The tribes on the east of Jordan event astray after the idols of the land, and were delivered into the hands of the children of Ammon (Jdg 10:8).

But they put away from among them “the gods of the foreigner,” and with the baseborn Jephthah for their leader gained a signal victory over their oppressors. The exploits of Samson against the Philistines, though achieved within a narrower space and with less important results than those of his predecessors, fill a brilliant page in his country's history. But the tale of his marvelous deeds is prefaced by that ever-recurring phrase, so mournfully familiar, “the children of Israel did evil again in the eyes of  Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hand of the Philistines.” Thus far idolatry is a national sin. The episode of Micah, in Judges 17, 18 sheds a lurid light on the secret practices of individuals, who, without formally renouncing Jehovah, though ceasing to recognize him as the theocratic king (Jdg 17:6) linked with his worship the symbols of ancient idolatry. The house of God, or sanctuary, which Micah made in imitation of that at Shiloh, was decorated with an ephod and teraphim dedicated to God, and with a graven and molten image consecrated to some inferior deities (Selden, De Dis Syris, synt. 1, 2). It is a significant fact, showing how deeply rooted in the people was the tendency to idolatry, that a Levite, who, of all others, should have been most sedulous to maintain Jehovah's worship in its purity, was found to assume the office of priest to the images of Micah; and that this Levite, priest afterwards to the idols of Dan, was no other than Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. Tradition says that these idols were destroyed when the Philistines defeated the army of Israel and took from them the ark of the covenant of Jehovah (1 Samuel 4). The Danites are supposed to have carried them into the field, as the other tribes bore the ark, and the Philistines the images of their gods, when they went forth to battle (2 Samuel 5, 21; Lewis, (Orig. Bebr. 5, 9). But the Seder Olnm Rabba (c. 24) interprets “the captivity of the land” (Jdg 18:30), of the captivity of Manasseh; and Benjamin of Tudela mistook the remains of later Gentile worship for traces of the altar or statue which Micah had dedicated, and which was worshipped by the tribe of Dan (Selden, P, Dis Syr. synt. 1, 2; Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 398). In later times the practice of secret idolatry was carried to greater lengths. Images were set up on the corn-floors, in the wine-vats, and behind the doors of private houses (Isa 57:8; Hos 9:1-2); and to check this tendency the statute in Deu 27:15 was originally promulgated. It is noticeable that they do not seem during this period to have generally adopted the religions of any but the Canaanites, although in one remarkable passage they are said, between the time of Jair and that of Jephthah, to have forsaken the Lord, and served Baalim, and Ashtaroth, and the gods of Syria, Zidon, Moab, the children of Ammon, and the Philistines (Jdg 10:6), as though there had then been an utter and profligate apostasy. The cause, no doubt, was that the Canaanitish worship was borrowed in a time of amity, and that but one Canaanitish oppressor is spoken of whereas the Abrahamites of the east of Palestine, and the Philistines, were almost always enemies of the Israelites. Each time of idolatry was punished by a servitude, each reformation followed by a deliverance. Speedily as the  nation returned to idolatry, its heart was fresher than that of the ten tribes which followed Jeroloam, and never seem to have had one thorough national repentance.

3. The notices of their great wars show that the enmity between the Philistines and the Israelites was toe great for any idolatry to be then borrowed from the former by the latter, though at an earlier time this was not the case. Under Samuel's administration a fast was held, and purificatory rites performed, to mark the public renunciation of idolatry (1Sa 7:3-6). Saul's family were, however, tainted, as it seems, with idolatry, for the names of Ishbosheth or Esh-baal, and Mephibosheth or Merib-baal, can scarcely have been given but in honor of Baal. From the circumstances of Michal's stratagem to save David, it seems not only that Saul's family kept teraphim, but, apparently, that they used them for purposes of divination, the Sept. having “liver” for ‘pillow,” as if the Hebr. had been כָּבֵדinstead of the present כְּבַיר. SEE PILLOW. The circumstance of having teraphim, more especially if they were used for divination, lends especial force to Samuel's reproof of Saul (1Sa 15:23). During the reign of David idolatry in public is unmentioned, and no doubt was almost unknown. SEE DAVID.

The earlier days of Solomon were the happiest of the kingdom of Israel. The Temple worship was fully established, with the highest magnificence, and there was no excuse for that worship of God at high places which seems to have been before permitted on account of the constant distractions of the country. But the close of that reign was marked by an apostasy of which we read with wonder. Hitherto the people had been the sinners, their leaders reformers; this time the king, led astray by his many strange wives, perverted the people, and raised high places on the Mount of Corruption, opposite God's temple. He worshipped Ashtoreth, goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, and Milcom, the abomination of the Ammonites, building high places for the latter two, as well as for all the gods of his strange wives. Solomon, no doubt, was very tolerant, and would not prevent these women from following their native superstitions, even if they felt it a duty to burn their and his children before Molech. Foreign idolatry was openly imitated. Three of the summits of Olivet were crowned with the high places of Ashtoreth, Chemosh, and Molech (1Ki 11:7; 2Ki 23:13), and the fourth, in memory of his great apostasy, was branded with the opprobrious title of the “Mount of Corruption.” Calamity speedily followed this great apostasy: the latter  years of Solomon were troubled by continual premonitions of those political reverses which were the inevitable penalty of this high treason against the theocracy. This is clearly brought out by the marked and frequent denunciations of the later prophets. SEE SOLOMON.

Rehoboam, the son of an Ammonitish mother, perpetuated the worst features of Solomon's idolatry (1Ki 14:22-24); and in his reign was made the great schism in the national religion-when Jeroboam, fresh from his recollections of the Apis worship of Egypt, erected golden calves at Bethel and at Dan, and by this crafty state policy severed forever the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (1Ki 12:26-33). To their use were temples consecrated and the service in their honor was studiously copied from the Mosaic ritual. High-priest himself, Jeroboam ordained priests from the lowest ranks (2Ch 11:15); incense and sacrifices were offered, and a solemn festival appointed, closely resembling the feast of tabernacles (1Ki 12:23; 1Ki 12:33; comp. Amo 4:4-5). SEE JEROBOAM.

The worship of the calves, “the sin of Israel” (Hos 10:8), which was apparently associated' with the goat-worship of Mendes (2Ch 11:15; Herod. 2, 46) or of the ancient Zabii (Lewis, Orig. Hebrews 5, 3), and the Asherim (1Ki 14:15; A.V. “groves”), ultimately spread to the kingdom of Judah, and centered in Beersheba (Amo 5:5; Amo 7:9). At what precise period it was introduced into the latter kingdom is not certain. The Chronicles tell us how Abijab taunted Jeroboam with his apostasy, while the less partial narrative in 1 Kings represents his own conduct as far from exemplary (1Ki 15:3). Asa's sweeping reform spared not even the idol of his grandmother Maachah, and, with the exception of the high places, he removed all relics of idolatrous worship (1Ki 15:12-14), with its accompanying impurities. His reformation wag completed by Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:6). See each king in alphabetical order. The successors of Jeroboam followed in his steps, till Ahab, who married a Zidonian princess, at her instigation (1Ki 21:25) built a temple and altar to Baal, and revived all the abominations of the Amorites (1Ki 21:26). For this he attained the bad pre-eminence of having done “more to provoke Jehovah, the God of Israel, to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him” (1Ki 16:33). Compared with the worship of Baal, the worship of the calves was a venial offence, probably because it was morally less detestable, and also less anti-national (1Ki 12:28; 2Ki 10:28-31). SEE ELIJAH.

Henceforth Baal- worship became so completely identified with the northern kingdom that it  is described as walking in the way or statutes of the kings of Israel (2Ki 16:3; 2Ki 17:8), as distinguished from the sin of Jeroboam, which ceased not till the Captivity (2Ki 17:23), and the corruption of the ancient inhabitants of the land. The idolatrous priests became a numerous and important caste (1Ki 18:19), living under the patronage of royalty, and fed at the royal table. The extirpation of Baal's priests by Elijah, and of his followers by Jehu (2 Kings 10), in which the royal family of Judah shared (2Ch 22:7), was a death-blow to this form of idolatry in Israel, though other systems still remained (2Ki 13:6). But, while Israel thus sinned and was punished, Judah was morally more guilty (Eze 16:51). The alliance of Jehoshaphat with the family of Ahab transferred to the southern kingdom, during the reigns of his son and grandson, all the appurtenances of Baal-worship (2Ki 8:18; 2Ki 8:27). In less than ten years after the death of that king, in whose praise it is recorded that he “sought not the Baalim,” nor walked “after the deed of Israel” (2Ch 17:3-4), a temple had been built for the idol, statues and altars erected, and priests appointed to minister in his service (2 Kings' 11:18). Jehoiada's vigorous measures checked the evil for a time, but his reform was incomplete, and the high places still remained, as in the days of Asa, a nucleus for any fresh system of idolatry (2Ki 12:3). Much of this might be due to the influence of the king's mother, Zibiah of Beersheba, a place intimately connected with the idolatrous defection of Judah (Amo 8:14). After the death of Jehoiada, the princes prevailed upon Joash to restore at least some portion of his father's idolatry (2Ch 24:18). The conquest of the Edomites by Amaziah introduced the worship of their gods, which had disappeared since the days of Solomon (2Ch 25:14; 2Ch 25:20). After this period, even the kings who did not lend themselves to the encouragement of false worship had to contend with the corruption which still lingered in the hearts of the people (2Ki 15:35; 2Ch 27:2). Hitherto the temple had been kept pure. The statues of Baal and the other gods were worshipped in their own shrines; but Ahaz, who “sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him” (2Ch 28:23), and built altars to them at every corner of Jerusalem, and high places in every city of Judah, replaced the brazen altar of burnt-offering by one made after the model of “the altar” of Damascus and desecrated it to his own uses (2Ki 16:10-15).

The conquest of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser was for them the last scene of the drama of abominations which had been enacted uninterruptedly for  upwards of 250 years. In the northern kingdom no reformer arose to vary the long line of royal apostates; whatever was effected in the way of reformation was done by the hands of the people (2Ch 31:1). But even in their captivity they helped to perpetuate the corruption. The colonists, whom the Assyrian conquerors placed in their stead in the cities of Samaria, brought with them their own gods, and were taught at Bethel, by a priest of the captive nation “the manner of the rod of the land, the lessons thus learnt resulting in a strange admixture of the calf-worship of Jeroboam with the homage paid to their national deities (2Ki 17:24-41). Their descendants were ill consequence regarded with suspicion by the elders who returned from the captivity with Ezra, and their offers of assistance rejected (Ezr 4:3). SEE SAMARITANS.

The first act of Hezekiah on ascending the throne was the restoration and purification of the Temple, which had been dismantled and closed during the latter part of his father's life (2Ch 28:24; 2Ch 29:3). The multitudes who flocked to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, so long in abeyance, removed the idolatrous altars of burnt-offering and incense erected by Ahaz (2Ch 30:14). The iconoclastic spirit was not confined to Judah and Benjamin, but spread throughout Ephraim and Manasseh (2Ch 31:1), and to all external appearance idolatry was extirpated. But the reform extended little below the surface (Isa 29:13). Among the leaders of the people there were many in high position who conformed to the necessities of the time (Isa 28:14), and under Manasseh's patronage the false worship, which had been merely driven into obscurity, broke out with tenfold virulence. Idolatry of every form, and with all the accessories of enchantments, divination, and witchcraft, was again rife; no place was too sacred, no associations too hallowed, to be spared the contamination. If the conduct of Ahaz in erecting an altar in the temple court is open to a charitable construction, Manasseh's was of no doubtful character. The two courts of the Temple were profaned by altars dedicated to the host of heaven, and the image of the Asherah polluted the holy place (2Ki 21:7; 2Ch 33:7; 2Ch 33:15; comp. Jer 32:34). Even in his late repentance he did not entirely destroy all traces of his former wrong. Tradition states that the remonstrances of the aged Isaiah (q.v.) only served to secure his own martyrdom (Gemara on Yebamoth, 4). The people still burned incense on the high places; but Jehovah was the ostensible object of their worship. The king's son sacrificed to his father's idols but was not associated with him in his  repentance, and in his short reign of two years restored all the altars of the Baalim and the images of the Asherah. With the death of Josiah ended the last effort to revive among the people a purer ritual, if not a purer faith. The lamp of David, which had long shed but a struggling ray, flickered for a while, and then went out in the darkness of Babylonian captivity. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

It will be useful here to recapitulate the main varieties of the idolatry, which so greatly marred the religious character of this monarchical period of the Jewish state. It has been a question much debated whether the Israelites were ever so far given up to idolatry as to lose all knowledge of the true God. It would be hard to assert this of any nation, and still more difficult to prove. That there always remained among them a faithful few, who in the face of every danger adhered to the worship of Jehovah, may readily be believed, for even at a time when Baal-worship was most prevalent there were found seven thousand in Israel who had not bowed before his image (1Ki 19:18). But there is still room for grave suspicion that among the masses of the people, though the idea of a supreme Being-of whom the images they worshipped were but the distorted representatives---was not entirely lost, it was so obscured as to be but dimly apprehended. And not only were the ignorant multitude thus led astray, but the priests, scribes, and prophets became leaders of the apostasy (Jeremiah 2-8). Warburton, indeed, maintained that they never formally renounced Jehovah, and that their defection consisted “in joining foreign worship and idolatrous ceremonies to the ritual of the true God” (Die. Leg. b. 5, § 3). But one passage in their history, though confessedly obscure, seems to point to a time when, under the rule of the judges, ‘Israel for many days had no true God, and no teaching priest, and no law” (2Ch 15:3). The correlative argument of Cudworth, who contends from the teaching of the Hebrew doctors and rabbis “that the pagan nations anciently, at least the intelligent amongst them, acknowledged one supreme God of the whole world, and that all other gods were but creatures and inferior ministers,” is controverted by Mosheim (Intell. Syst. 1, 4, § 30, and notes). There can be no doubt that much of the idolatry of the Hebrews consisted in worshipping the true God under an image, such as the calves at Bethel and Dan (Josephus, Ant. 8, 8, 5; δαμάλεις ἐπωνύμους τῷ θεῷ), and by associating his worship with idolatrous rites (Jer 41:5) and places consecrated to idols (2Ki 18:22). From the peculiarity of their position they were never  distinguished as the inventors of a new pantheon, nor did they adopt any one system of idolatry so exclusively as ever to become identified with it (so the Moabites with the worship of Chemosh (Num 21:29); but they no sooner came in contact with other nations than they readily adapted themselves to their practices, the old spirit of antagonism died rapidly away, and intermarriage was one step to idolatry.

a. Sun-worship, though mentioned with other kinds of high nature- worship, as in the enumeration of those suppressed by Josiah, seems to have been practiced alone as well as with the adoration of other heavenly bodies. In Ezekiel's remarkable vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem, he saw about four-and-twenty men between the porch and the altar of the Temple, with their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east, worshipping the sun (Eze 8:16). Josiah had before this taken away ‘the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord,” and had “burned the chariots of the sun with fire” (2Ki 23:11). The same part of the temple is perhaps here meant. There is nothing to show whether these were images or living horses. The horse was sacred to the sun among the Carthaginians, but the worship of the visible sun instead of an image looks rather like a Persian or an Arab custom. SEE SUN.

b. In the account of Josiah's reform we read of the abolition of the worship of Baal, the sun, the moon, Mazzaloth, also called Mazzaroth (Job 38:32), which we hold to be the mansions of the moon, SEE ASTRONOMY, and all the host of heaven (2Ki 23:5). Manasseh is related to have served “all the host of heaven” (21:3). Jeremiah speaks of “the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses of the kings of Judah,” as to be defiled, “because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the host of heaven, and have poured out drink-offerings unto other gods” (Jer 19:13). In this prophet's time the people of Judah and Jerusalem, among other abominations, made cakes for “the queen of heaven,” or “the worship of heaven:” a different form justifying the latter reading. The usual reading is Api, מְלֶכֶת, which the Sept. once follows, the Vulg. always; some copies give מְלֶאכֶת, worship, that is, “a deity or goddess.” The former reading seems preferable, and the context in two passages in Jeremiah shows that an abstract sense is not admissible (Jer 44:17-19; Jer 44:25). In Egypt, the remnant that fled after the murder of Gedaliah were warned by the prophet to abandon those  idolatrous practices for which their country and cities had been desolated. The men, conscious that their wives had burned incense to false gods in Egypt, declared that they would certainly burn incense and pour out drink- offerings to the queen of heaven, as they, their fathers, their kings, and their princes had done in a time of plenty, asserting that since they had left off these practices they had been consumed by the sword and by famine: for this a fresh doom was pronounced upon them (ch. 44). It is very difficult to conjecture what goddess can be here meant: Ashtoreth: would suit, but is never mentioned interchangeably; the moon must be rejected for the same reason. Here we certainly so a strong resemblance to Arab idolatry, which was wholly composed of cosmic worship and of fetishism, and in which the mansions of the moon were reverenced on account of their connection with seasons of rain. This system of cosmic worship may have been introduced from the Nabathaeans or Edomites of Petra, from the Sabians, or from other Arabs or Chaldmeans. SEE QUEEN OF HEAVEN.

c. Two idols, Gad,גָּד, or Fortune, and Meni,מְנַי, or Fate, from מָנָה, he or it divided, assigned, numbered, are spoken of in a single passage in the later part of Isaiah (Isa 65:1). Gesenius, depending upon the theory of the post-Isaiah authorship of the later chapters of the prophet, makes these to be idols worshipped by the Jews in Babylonia, but it must be remarked that their names are not traceable in Babylonian and Assyrian mythology. Gesenius has, however, following Pococke (Spec. Hist. Arabum, p. 93), compared Meni with Manah, a goddess of the pagan Arabs, worshipped in the form of a stone between Mekkeh and El-Medineh by the tribes of Hudheyl and Khuzaah. But EI-Beydawi, though deriving the name of this idol from the root mana, “he cut,” supposes it was thus called because victims were slain upon it (Comment. in Coran. ed. Fleischer, p. 293). This meaning certainly seems to disturb the idea that the two idols were identical, but the mention of the sword and slaughter as punishments of the idolaters who worshipped Gad and Meni is not to be forgotten. Gad may have been a Canaanitish form of Baal, if we are to judge from the geographical name Baal-gad of a place at the foot of Mount Hermon (Jos 11:17; Jos 12:7; Jos 13:5). Perhaps the grammatical form of Meni may throw some light upon the origin of this idolatry. The worship of both idols resembles that of the cosmic divinities of the later kings of Judah. SEE MEN.

d. In Ezekiel's vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem he beheld a chamber of imagery in the Temple itself having “every form of creeping things, and  abominable beasts, and [or even] all the idols of the house of Israel, portrayed upon the wall round about,” and seventy Israelitish elders offering incense (Eze 8:7-12). This is so exact a description of an Egyptian sanctuary, with the idols depicted upon its walls, dimly lighted, and filled with incense-offering priests, that we cannot for a moment doubt that these Jews derived from Egypt their fetishism, for such this special worship appears mainly, if not wholly to have been. SEE IMAGERY, CHAMBER OF.

e. In the same vision the prophet saw women weeping for Tammuz (Eze 8:13-14), known to be the same as Adonis, from whom the fourth month of the Syrian year was named. This worship was probably introduced by Ahaz from Syria. SEE TAMMUZ.

f. The image of jealousy, סֵמֶל הִקַּנְאָה, spoken of in the same passage, which was placed in the Temple, has not been satisfactorily explained. The meaning may only that it was an image of-a false god, or there may be a play in the second part of the appellation upon the proper name. We cannot, however, suggest any name that might be thus intended. SEE JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF.

g. The brazen serpent, having become an object of idolatrous worship, was destroyed by Hezekiah (2Ki 18:4). SEE BRAZEN SERPENT.

h. Moloch-worship was not only celebrated at the high place Solomon had made, but at Topheth, in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, where children were made to pass through the fire to the Ammonitish abomination.. This place, as well as Solomon's altars, Josiah defiled, and we read of no later worship of Moloch, Chemosh, and Ashtoroth. SEE MOLOCH.

i. For the supposed divinity אחד of Isa 66:17 (compare Meier, De uno deo Assyriorum, Helmst. 1734), SEE ACHR).

The new population placed by the king of Assyria in the cities of Samaria adopted a strange mixture of religions. Terrified at the destruction by lions of some of their number, they petitioned the king of Assyria, and an Israelitish priest was sent to them. They then adopted the old worship at high places, and still served their own idols. The people of Babylon made Succothbenoth; the Cuthites, Nergal; the Hamathites, Ashima; the Avites, Nibhaz and Tartak; and the people of Sepharvaim burned their children to their native gods, Adrammelech and Anammelech. Nergal is a well known  Babylonian idol, and the occurrence of the element Melech (king) in the names of the Molechs of Sepharvaim is very remarkable (2Ki 17:24-41).

4. The Babylonian Exile was an effectual rebuke or the national sin. It is true that even during the captivity the devotees of false worship plied their craft as prophets and diviners (Jer 29:8; Ezekiel 13), and the Jews who fled to Egypt carried with them recollections of the material prosperity which attended their idolatrous sacrifices in Judah, and to the neglect of which they attributed their exiled condition. (Jer 44:17-18). One of the first difficulties, indeed, with which Ezra had to contend, and which brought him well-nigh to despair, was the haste with which his countrymen took them foreign wives of the people of the land, and followed them in all their abominations (Ezra 9). The priests and rulers, to whom he looked for assistance in his great enterprise, were among the first to fall away (Ezr 9:2; Ezr 10:18; Neh 6:17-18; Neh 13:23). Still, the post-exilian prophets speak of idolatry as an evil of the past, Zechariah before telling the time when the very names of the false gods would be forgotten (Zec 13:2). In. Malachi we see that a cold formalism was already the national sin, and such was ever after the case with the Jewish people. The Babylonian Exile, therefore, may be said to have purified the Jews from their idolatrous tendencies. How this great change was wrought does. not appear. Partly no doubt, it was due to the pious examples of Ezra and Nehemiah; partly, perhaps, to the Persian contempt for the lower ‘kinds of idolatry, which insured a respect for the Hebrew religion on the part of the government; partly to the sight of the fulfillment of God's predicted judgments upon the idolatrous nations which the Jews had either sought as allies or feared as enemies. SEE EXILE.

5. Years passed by, and the names of the idols of Canaan had been forgotten, when the Hebrews were assailed by a new danger. Greek idolatry under Alexander and his successors was practiced throughout the civilized world. The conquests of Alexander in Asia caused Greek influence to be extensively felt, and Greek idolatry to be first tolerated, and then practiced by the, Jews (1Ma 1:43-50; 1Ma 1:54). Some place-hunting Jews were base enough to adopt it. At first the Greek: princes who ruled Palestine wisely forbore to interfere with the Hebrew religion. The politic earlier Ptolemies even encouraged it; but when the country had fallen into the hands of the Seleucidae, Antiochus Epiphancs, reversing his father's policy of toleration, seized. Jerusalem, set up an idol-altar to Jupiter in the  Temple itself, and forbade the observance of the law. Weakly supported by a miserable faction, he had to depend wholly upon his military power. The attempt of Artiochus to establish this form of worship was vigorously resisted by Mattathias (1Ma 2:23-26), who was joined in his rebellion by the Assideans (1Ma 2:42), and destroyed the altars at which the king commanded them to sacrifice (1Ma 2:25; 1Ma 2:45). The erection of. synagogues has been assigned as a reason for the comparative purity of the Jewish worship after the Captivity (Prideaux, Conn. 1, 374), while another cause has been discovered in the hatred for images acquired by the Jews in their intercourse with the Persians. The Maccabaean revolt, small in its beginning, had the national heart on its side, and, after a long and varied struggle, achieved more than the nation had ever before effected since the days of the Judges. Thenceforward idolatry was to the Jew the religion of his enemies, naturally made no perverts.

6. The early Christians were brought into contact with idolaters when the Gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and it became necessary to enact regulations for preventing scandal by their being involved in pagan practices, when joining in the private meals and festivities of the heathen (1 Corinthians 8). But the Gentile converts do not seem to have been in any danger of reverting to idolatry, and the cruel persecutions they underwent did not tend to lead them back to a religion which its more refined votaries despised. It is, however, not impossible that many who had been originally educated as idolaters did not, on professing Christianity, really abandon all their former superstitions, and that we may thus explain the very early outbreak of many customs and opinions not sanctioned in the N.T.

V. Ethical Views respecting Idolatry. — That this is a cardinal sin, and, indeed, the highest form, if not essential principle of all sin, as aiming a direct blow at the throne of God itself, is evident from its prohibition in the very fore-front of the Decalogue. Hence the tenacity with which the professors of all true religion in every age have opposed it under every disguise and at whatever cost. It has always and naturally been the associate of polytheism, and those corrupt forms of Christianity, such as the Roman and Greek Churches, which have endeavored to apologize for the adoration of pictures, images, etc., on the flimsy pretext that it is not the inanimate objects themselves which arc revered, but only the beings thus represented, arc but imitators in this of the sophistry of certain refined speculators among the grosser heathen e.g. of Egypt, Greece, etc., who put forth similar claims. SEE IMAGE-WORSHIP.  Three things are condemned in Scripture as idolatry:

1. The worshipping of a false God;

2. the worshipping of the true God through an image;

3. the indulgence of those passions which draw the soul away from God, e.g. covetousness, lust, etc. The Israelites were guilty of the first when they bowed the knee to Baal; of the second when they set up the golden calves; and both Israelites and Christians are often guilty of the third.

1. Light in which Idolatry was regarded in the Mosaic Code, and the penalties with which it was visited of one main object of the Hebrew polity was to teach the unity of God, the extermination of idolatry was but a subordinate end. Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, was the civil head of the state. He was the theocratic king of the people, who had delivered them from bondage, and to whom they had taken a willing oath of allegiance. They had entered into a solemn league and covenant with him as their chosen king (comp. 1Sa 8:7), by whom obedience was requited with temporal blessings, and rebellion with temporal punishment. This original contract of the Hebrew government, as it has been termed, is contained in Exo 19:3-8; Exo 20:2-5; Deuteronomy 39, 10-30; the blessings promised to obedience are enumerated in Deu 28:1-14, and the withering curses on disobedience in Deu 28:15-68. That this covenant was strictly insisted on it needs but slight acquaintance with Hebrew history to perceive. Often broken and often renewed on the part of the people (Jdg 10:10; 2Ch 15:12-13; Neh 9:38), it was kept with unwavering constancy on the part of Jehovah. To their kings he stood in the relation, so to speak, of a feudal superior: they were his representatives upon earth, and with them, as with the people before, his covenant was made (1Ki 3:14; 1Ki 11:11). Idolatry, therefore, to an Israelite was a state offence (1Sa 15:23), a political crime of the gravest character, high treason against the majesty of his king. It was a transgression of the covenant (Deu 17:2), “the evil” pre- eminently in the eyes of Jehovah (1Ki 21:25, opp. to. הִיָּשָׁר, ‘the right,” 2Ch 27:2).

But it was much more than all this. While the idolatry of foreign nations is stigmatized merely as an abomination in the sight of God, which called for his vengeance, the sin of the Israelites is regarded as of more glaring enormity, and greater moral guilt. In the  figurative language of the prophets, the relation between Jehovah and his people is represented as a marriage bond (Isa 54:5; Jer 3:14), and the worship of false gods, with all its accompaniments (Leviticus 20:56), becomes then the greatest of social wrongs (Hosea 2; Jeremiah 3, etc.). This is beautifully brought out in Hos 2:16, where the heathen name Baali, my master, which the apostate Israel has been accustomed to apply to her foreign possessor, is contrasted with Ishi, my man, my husband, the native word which she is to use when restored to her rightful husband, Jehovah. Much of the significance of this figure was unquestionably due to the impurities of idolaters, with whom such corruption was of no merely spiritual character (Exo 34:16; Num 25:1-2, etc.), but manifested itself in the grossest and most revolting forms (Rom 1:26-32).

Regarded in a moral aspect, false gods are called “stumbling-blocks” (Eze 14:3), “lies” (Amo 2:4; Rom 1:25), “horrors” or “frights” (1Ki 15:13; Jer 50:38), “abominations” (Deu 29:17; Deu 32:16; 1Ki 11:5; 2Ki 23:13), “guilt” (abstract for concrete, Amo 8:14, אִשְׁמָה, ashmadh; comp.2Ch 29:18, perhaps with a play on Ashima, 2Ki 17:30); and with a profound sense of the degradation consequent upon their worship, they are characterized by the prophets, whose mission it was to warn the people against them (Jer 44:4), as “shame” (Jer 11:13; Hos 9:10). As considered with reference to Jehovah, they are “other gods” (Jos 24:2; Jos 24:16), “strange gods” (Deu 32:16), “new gods” (Jdg 5:8), “devils-not God” (Deu 32:17 - 1Co 10:20-21); and, as denoting their foreign origin, “gods of the foreigner” (Jos 24:14-15). Their powerlessness is indicated by describing them as “gods that cannot save” (Isa 45:20),” that made not the heavens” (Jer 10:11), “nothing” (Isa 41:24; 1Co 8:4), “wind and emptiness” (Isa 41:29), “vanities of the heathen” (Jer 14:22; Act 14:15); and yet, while their deity is denied, their personal existence seems to have been acknowledged (Kurtz, Gesch. d. A.B. ii, 86, etc.), though not in the same manner in which the pretensions of local deities were reciprocally recognized by the heathen (1Ki 20:23; 1Ki 20:28; 2Ki 17:26). Other terms of contempt are employed with reference to idols, אֵַלילַים, elilim (Lev 19:4), and גַּלּוּלַים, gilluliem (Deu 29:17), to which different meanings  have been assigned, and many which indicate ceremonial uncleanness. SEE IDOL.

Idolatry, therefore, being from one point of view a political offence, could be punished without infringement of civil rights. No penalties were attached to mere opinions. For aught we know, theological speculation may have been as rife among the Hebrews as in modern times, though such was not the tendency of the Shemitic mind. It was not, however, such speculations, heterodox though they might be, but overt acts of idolatry, which were made the subjects of legislation (Michaelis, Laws of Moses, § 245, 246). The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was devoted to destruction (Exo 22:20); his nearest relatives were not only bound to denounce him and deliver him up to punishment (Deu 13:2-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (Deu 17:2-5). To attempt to seduce others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (Deu 13:6-10). An idolatrous nation shared a similar fate. No facts are more strongly declared in the Old Test. than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (Exo 34:15-16; Deuteronomy 7; Deu 12:29-31; Deu 20:17), and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (Jer 2:17). A city guilty of idolatry was looked upon as a cancer of the state; it was considered to be in rebellion, and treated according to the laws of war. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were put to death. No spoil was taken, but everything it contained was burnt with itself; nor was it allowed to be rebuilt (Deu 13:13-18; Jos 6:26). Saul lost his kingdom, Achan his life, and Hiel his family for transgressing this law (1 Samuel 15; Joshua 7; 1Ki 16:34).

The silver and gold with which the idols were covered were accursed (Deu 7:25-26). Not only were the Israelites forbidden to serve the gods of Canaan (Exo 23:24), but even to mention their names, that is, to call upon them in prayer or any form of worship (Exo 23:13; Jos 23:7). On taking possession of the land they were to obliterate all traces of the existing idolatry; statues, altars, pillars, idol temples, every person and every thing connected with it, were to be swept away (Exo 23:24; Exo 23:32; Exo 34:13; Deu 7:5; Deu 7:25; Deu 12:1-3; Deu 20:17), and the name and worship of the idols blotted out. Such were the precautions taken by the framer of the Mosaic code to  preserve the worship of Jehovah the true God, in its purity. Of the manner in which his descendants have “put a fence” about “the law” with reference to idolatry, many instances will be found in Maimonides (De Idol.). They were prohibited from using vessels, scarlet garments, bracelets, or rings, marked with the sign of the sun, moon, or dragon (ib. Deu 7:10); trees planted or stones erected for idol-worship were forbidden (Deu 8:5; Deu 8:10); and, to guard against the possibility of contamination, if the image of an idol were found among other images intended for ornament, they were all to be cast into the Dead Sea (Deu 7:11). — Smith. SEE ANATHENIA.

2. New-Test. Definitions on the Subject.-

(1.) The name “idolater” is given not only to persons who worship heathen gods, but also such as worship idols of their own. Act 17:16 : “Now, while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry.” 1Co 5:10-11 : Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world. But now I have written unto you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolater, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such a one no not to eat.” l Corinthians 6:9: “Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters.” 1Co 10:7 : “Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them.” Rev 21:8 : “But the fearful ... and idolaters shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone.”

(2.) The term idolatry is figuratively used to designate covetousness, which takes ‘Mammon' for its god (Mat 6:24; Luk 16:13). Col 3:5 : “Mortify, therefore, your members which are upon the earth; fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness, which is idolatry.” Hence it is said (Eph 5:5), “For this ye know, that no whoremonger, nor unclean person, nor covetous man, who is an idolater, hath any inheritance in the kingdom of Christ and of God.” St. Paul further designates all evil concupiscence in general by the name of idolatry; e.g. Php 3:19 : “Whose end is destruction, whose god is their belly, and whose glory is in their shame, who mind earthly things;” comp. Rom 16:18, “For they that are such serve not our Lord Jesus Christ, but their own belly; and by good words  and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.” The same is said (2Ti 3:4) of those who are “lovers of pleasure more than lovers of God.” According to Rom 1:21, idolatry takes its source in the impurity of the will, or in the heart, not in the mind; it is consequently a result of the abuse of human free agency. It is said, in the above-mentioned passage, “Because that when they knew God they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened.” The not glorifying and the not praising' manifest the badness of the will or heart. In the Book of Wisdom (Wis 14:14) it is said that idolatry came into the world through the “idle vanity of man.” Idolatry and sin have consequently the same origin, namely, the misuse of moral freedom. They therefore assist each other, yet, at the same time, present separately a difficult problem for reason to understand. To some extent idolatry may be considered as the theoretical, and sin as the practical effect of evil, which, in its complete manifestation, embraces both the mind and the heart, but takes its source exclusively in the latter; for all evil results from the will, by its own free action, separating itself from the divine will. — Krehl, Handworterbuch des N.T. p. 12.

3. In the later Christian Church. — The fathers generally define idolatry, from Rom 1:23, as a “taking away from God the glory which belongs to him” (Tertull. De Idololatria, c. 11), or “divine honor given to another” (Cyprian; Hilar. Diac.); sometimes, also, as a transferring of prayer from the Creator to the creature (Gregor. Naz.). Christian writers in general had no doubt on the subject (see Finnicus Maternus, De errore proianarum religionum, ed. Münter, c. 1-5). When Clement of Alexandria regards astonishment at the light emitted by the heavenly bodies, thankfulness towards the inventor of agriculture, consciousness of sin, a personification of effects, etc., as the origin of myths, he does not mean to consider them as the original source of idolatry, but only of its contemporary forms. From the primitive worship of the heavens as the abode of the invisible God, according to the oldest traditions, the worship of the different nations, as they became disseminated over the globe, and divided geographically and otherwise, turned to other symbols. Again, nations preserving the remembrance, and, so to speak, living under the influence of their founders and heroes, as ‘soon as they forgot the true God, made these the objects of their veneration and worship. Thus they came to worship their progenitors (as in China) and their heroes, which latter worship is by some (Boss, for instance) considered as the only source  of mythology. How from thence they passed to the worship of symbolic animals, thence to anthropomorphism, and finally to the adoration of statues as images of the deity, has been best explained by Creuzer in his Symbolik u. Hythologie d. alten Volker (3rd edit. 1, 5 sq.). The fathers did not fail to perceive the influence which the original tradition of the true God had on the development of the symbolism and myths of the heathen religious systems. Lactantius (Defalsa relig. 1, 11) considers the consensus gentium in the belief in gods as a proof that they are touched by them.

The early Protestant theologians had especially to contend against naturalism, which asserted that “the recognition of one supreme God is innate in man,” and denied our knowledge of the unity of God being due either to revelation or to tradition, since it is found at the foundation of the learned polytheistic systems. They considered all further developments in these systems as resulting from intentional additions made in support of their hierarchy by an interested priesthood, or by rulers from motives of policy (see Herbert of Cherbury, De relig. gentilium, p. 6,168 sq.). These views were ably opposed by Gerhard Jo. Vossius (De theologia gentili et physiologia Christiana, 1, 3 sq.), Van Dale (De origine et progressu idololatrice, 1, 2, 3), Selden (De diis Syris [Lips. 1662], p. 25 sq.). They however meant, as did also Farmer (The general Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Heathen Nations [Lond. 1783]), that the daemons, whether evil spirits or departed human souls, had very early become the objects of veneration on the part of the heathen. The Jews came gradually to the idea that the heathen deities were not nonentities, as the prophets had stated them to be, but really existing evil spirits, a view which was continued by the fathers, especially in relation to the so-called oracles. The earliest German theologians also admitted this doctrine of a worship of daemons. This, however, was gradually discarded after the researches of S. J. Baumgarten (Gesch. d. Religionsparteien, p. 176 sq.), and idolatry is now generally considered as the result of a' sophisticated tradition.

Rationalism, based on Pelagian principles, either embraced the views of the naturalists, or else those of Heyne, J. H. Boss, etc., who maintain, the former that the myths and idolatry were either the natural consequences of historical events or the peculiar garb of philosophical ideas (historical and philosophical mythicism), while the latter derives idolatry partly from the universal wisdom whose higher thoughts assumed that form in order to be the more readily appreciated by the people, and partly from the interests of the priesthood; he considers, also, the tradition of real heroes as an abundant source. Others (like Lobeck,  etc.) see in the mythology of the heathen but a childish play of the imagination. But the opinion which most generally obtained is that behind the outward form of mythology is hidden a real philosophical or religious idea, and that personalities and historical facts are only erroneously introduced into it (Buttmann; G. Hermann). Finally, others considered idolatry in its full development as the result of the intentional maneuvers of the priesthood (so Fr. Creuzer, in the first editions of his Symbolik), or of a hierarchical system of nature, which amounts nearly to the same (K.O. Muller, Prolegonz. zu einer wissenschaftlichen Mythologie, p. 316-344). The latter considers the very origin and nature of the gods and consequently of idolatry, as the result of an unconscious popular necessity, which from the first was connected or identified with illusion, instead of remaining a true and special idea. From this view-whose only defect is its too great disregard of the original religion-it is easy to come to those which govern the newer systems of religious philosophy, such as are upheld by Hegel (Vorlesungen 2. Religions philosophie), according to which religion has received a steady development from an earthly basis, so that idolatry was but one of its first forms, and not at all an estrangement from God, but a necessary part of the progress towards him. This view of it completely makes away with idolatry by the presumed connection of all religions arriving by successive developments at absolute religion. This view is supported by Hinrichs (D. Religion im innern Verhaltnisse z. Wissenschaft [Heidelb. 1821], p. 141 sq.) and Kraft (D. Religionen aller Valker in philosophischer Darstellung [Stuttg. 1848]). Feuerbach and other extreme Rationalists even consider religion itself as a sickly ideal phenomenon in human life.

We must rank under idolatry all adoration not addressed to the one invisible God of the Bible, or such adoration of him as is rendered in any manner not conforming to the revelations of the Bible. It results partly from additions and the influence of the world, partly from the original traditional command to seek God, which seeking, when unaided by him (in revelation), ends in error, so that, unconsciously, it is worldly existence that is apprehended instead and in the place of God. The mode of this apprehension varies in different nations, according to their geographical, historical, and intellectual circumstances, and may degenerate into the adoration of the most vain and arbitrary objects (fetishes), which priests or sorcerers may set up. Between the original symbolic and the most abject idolatry there are various-stages. While the majority of the heathen are  either on the brink or in the midst of fetishism, the more enlightened part look upon the idols only as symbols, sometimes of several deities, and sometimes of one God.

Idolatry was formerly considered as divided into two distinct classes, real and comparative; the former was absolute polytheism-the belief in the real divinity of the images-while the latter was either (Baumgarten) the worship of the several deities as subordinate to one, or (G.H. Vossius) the considering of the images worshipped as mere symbols of the invisible God. In Col 3:5 we find a metaphorical use made of the word idolatry to express undue attachment to earthly possessions and advantages. The same name has also been given, with good reason, to the use made of images in the Roman and Greek Churches. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v. Abgotterei. On this last point, SEE MARIOLATRY; SEE SAINT-WORSHIP, etc.

## Iduel[[@Headword:Iduel]]

             (Ι᾿δουῆλος), the second named of the leading Jews sent by Ezra to procure the aid of the priests in the return from exile (1Es 8:43); evidently the ARIEL SEE ARIEL (q.v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezr 8:16).

## Idumaea[[@Headword:Idumaea]]

             (Ι᾿δουμαία), the Gr. form of the Heb. name Edom, as found in the Sept., the N. Test., and Josephus. According to Josephus (Ant. 2, 1, 1), however, it is only a more agreeable mode of pronouncing what would otherwise be Α᾿δῶμα (comp. Jerome on Eze 25:12). In the Sept. we sometimes meet with Ε᾿δώμ, but more generally with Ι᾿δουμαία (the people being called Ι᾿δουμῖοι), which is the uniform orthography in the Apocrypha (1Ma 4:15; 1Ma 4:29; 1Ma 4:61; 1Ma 5:3; 1Ma 6:31; 2Ma 12:32), as well as in Mar 3:8, the only passage in the N.T. where it occurs. Our Auth Version has in three or four places (Isa 34:5-6; Eze 35:15; Eze 36:5) substituted for Edom “Idumea,” which is the name employed by the writers of Greece and Rome, though it is to be noted that they, as well as Josephus, include under that name the south of Palestine, and sometimes Palestine itself, because a large portion of that country came into possession of the Edomites of later times.  The Heb. אֵֹּדם, Edom, as the name of the people, is masculine (Num 22:20); as the name of the country, feminine (Jer 49:17). We often meet with the phrase אֶרֶוֹ אֵֹדם, Erets-Edom, “the Land of Edom,” and once with the poetic form שְׂדֵה אֵֹרם, Sedeh-Edom, “the Field of Edom” (Jdg 5:4). The inhabitants are sometimes styled בְּנֵי אֵֹרם, Beney-Edom, “the Children of Edom,” and poetically בִּת אֵֹדם, Bath- Edom, “the Daughter of Edom” (Lam 4:21-22). A single person was called אֲרֹמַי, Adomi, “an Edomite” (Deu 23:8), of which the feminine אֲדֹמַית, Adomith, occurs in 1Ki 11:1.

1. Origin of the Name. — The name was derived from Isaac's son Edom, otherwise called Esau, the elder twin brother of Jacob. SEE ESAU. It signifies red, and seems first to have been suggested by his appearance at his birth, when “he came out all red,” i.e. covered with red hair (Gen 25:25), and it was afterwards more formally and permanently imposed on him on account of his unworthy disposal of his birthright for a mess of red lentils (Gen 25:30): “And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, from the red, that red (הָאָדֹם הִזֶּה מַןאּהָאָדֹם), for I am faint; therefore was his name called Red” (Edom; אדֵוֹם). In the East it has always been usual for a chief either to give his name to the country which he conquers, or over which he rules, or to take a name from it. Esau, during the life of his father, seized the mountainous region occupied by the Horites. He had two names; but one of them was peculiarly applicable to the newly acquired territory. The mountains of Seir were remarkable for their reddish color; hence, doubtless, the name Edom, “red,” was given to them. Esau is called “the father of Edom,” giving to it his name and ruling over it (Gen 36:43); and the country, in a very few cases, is also called “the mount of Esau” (Oba 1:8-9; Oba 1:19).

The original name of the country was Mount Seir, and it was probably so called from Seir, the progenitor of the Horites (Gen 14:6; Gen 36:20-22), though the signification of this name, rugged, may have been the cause of its adoption, as the mountains are singularly rough and rugged. And so says Josephus (Ant. 1, 20, 3): “Esau named the country Roughness from his own hairy roughness.” Part of the region is still called Esh-Sherah, in which some find a trace of Seir, but the two words have no etymological relation. The name Seir continued to be applied to Edom after its occupation by the descendants of Esau, and even down to the close of the  O.T. history (see Jos 11:17; 2Ch 20:10 : Eze 25:8, etc.). The aborigines were called Horites (Sept. Χοῤῥᾶιοι; Gen 14:6); that is, Troglodytes, or “cave-dwellers,” from the nature of their habitations. SEE HORITE. The mountains of Edom, as all travelers know, are filled with caves and grottoes hewn in the soft sandstone strata.

2. Situation and Boundaries. — Edom proper, or Idumaaa, is situated on the south-eastern border of Palestine, extending from it to the northern extremity of the Elanitic Gulf. It was bounded on the west by the great valley of the Arabal, on the south by a line drawn due east from the modern fortress of Akabah, on the east by the desert of Arabia, and on the north by the ancient kingdom of Moab. Its length from north to south was about 100 miles, and its breadth averaged 20. These boundaries are nowhere directly defined, but we can ascertain them from various incidental references in Scripture. When the Israelites encamped at Kadeshbarnea they were close to the border of Edom (Numbers 20), and Mount Hor is said to be within its border (Num 33:37). Hence, as Kadesh was situated in the valley of the Arabah, and as Mount Hor is only a few miles to the east of it, we conclude that the Arabah is the western boundary. The Israelites asked, but were refused, a passage through either Edom or Moab, so as to go direct from Kadesh to the east side of the Jordan (Num 20:14-20; Jdg 11:17-18). In consequence of this refusal, they were obliged to march south along the Arabah to Ezion-geber, and thence eastward by the wilderness round the territories of Edom and Moab (id. with Num 21:4).

Hence we conclude that Edom and Moab occupied the whole region along the east side of the valley of the Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elanitic Gulf. Edom was wholly a mountainous country, as may be inferred from the names given to it in the Bible and by ancient writers (Deu 1:2; Deu 2:5; Josephus, Ant. 2, 1, 2; Eusebius, Onomast. s.v. Idumesa). The foot of the mountain range, therefore, may be regarded as marking its eastern border. On the north it appears to have been separated from Moab by the “brook Zered” (Deu 2:13-14; Deu 2:18; Num 21:12), which is probably identical with the modern wady el Ahsy. These views are corroborated by other and independent testimony. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the word Gabla is substituted for Seir in Deu 32:2; and Eusebius and Jerome state that Idumea was in their time called Gebalene, which is a Greek (Γεβαληνή) corruption of the Hebrew Gebal, “mountain” (Ononast. id. et s.v. Seir), and is retained to this day in the Arabic form  Jebal. The modern province of Jebal is bounded on the west by the Arabah, and on the north by wady el-Ahsy (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 151; Burckhardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 410). We may safely conclude from this that the ancient province had the same boundaries, as it had the same name. Thus Josephus writes (Ant. 5, 1, 22): “The lot of Simeon included that part of Idumrea which bordered upon Egypt and Arabia;” and, though this is true, it does not contradict the language of Scripture — “I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a foot breadth, because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession” (Deu 2:5). Not a foot breadth of Edom Proper, or Mount Seir, was ever given by divine sanction to the Jews.

Josephus divides Idumaea into two provinces, Gobolitis and Amalekitis (Ant. 2, 1, 2). The former embraced Idumaea Proper, being identical, as the name would indicate, with “Mount Seir;” the other embraced a portion of Southern Palestine, with the desert plain south of it, which was originally occupied by the Amalekites (Num 13:29), and subsequently, as we shall see, by the Edomites. Pliny places Idumaea to the south of Palestine, bordering upon Egypt (Hist. Nat. 5, 14). Strabo (16, 2, 36, p. 760) states that the Idumseans were originally Nabathaeans, but, being driven out thence, they joined themselves to the Jews. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

3. History. — The first mention of Mount Seir is in Gen 14:6, where the confederate kings are said to have smitten the “Horites in their Mount Seir.” B.C. cir. 2080. These Horites appear to have been a tribe of the gigantic aborigines of Western Asia, so called from dwelling in caves (Gen 36:20-30). They were a pastoral people, divided into tribes like the modern Bedouin, having independent chiefs called Alltiph (אַלּוּ, Gen 36:29). Esau's marriage with the daughters of Canaan alienated him from his parents, and he then obtained a settlement among the Horites, where he acquired power and wealth as early as the time of Jacob's return from Padan-aram (Gen 27:46). Probably his close alliance with Ishmael tended to increase his influence in his adopted country (Gen 28:9; Gen 32:3 sq.). — Though then established in Edom, Esau had still some part of his flocks in Western Palestine, in connection with those of his father; but on the return of Jacob he removed all his property from Canaan and dwelt in Mount Seir (Gen 36:6-8). He gradually subdued and finally exterminated, or perhaps rather supplanted, the Horites (Deu 2:12; Deu 2:22), and a distinct tribe of his descendants, the Amalekites, leaving  Edom, took possession of the desert plateaus south of Canaan (Gen 36:12; Exo 8:14 sq.). The earliest form of government among the Edomites was, like that of the Horites, by chiefs (in the A.V. rendered “dukes,” but manifestly the same as the modern Arab sheiks), exercising independent authority over distinct tribes (Gen 36:15-19).

It appears, however, that the various tribes were, at least in times of general war, united under one leader, to whom the title of king (מֶלֶךְ) was given. The names of eight of these kings (only one of whom is spoken of as related to any other, Anah, the son of Zibeon) are mentioned in Gen 36:31-39, who are said to have reigned in Edom “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,” that is, apparently before the time of Moses (see Deu 33:5; Exo 18:16-19). Most of the large nomad tribes of Arabia have now an acknowledged chief, who is styled ezir, and who takes the lead in any great emergency, while each division of the tribe enjoys independence under its own sheik on all ordinary occasions. Such would seem to have been the case with the Edomites, and this affords an easy solution of the apparent confusion in the account given by Moses, Gen 36:31-43; and again in Exo 15:15, where it is said “the dukes of Edom shall be amazed,” and Jdg 11:17, where Moses is represented as having sent “messengers from Kadesh into the king of Edom.” The primitive and pastoral character of the people is incidentally brought out by the circumstance that this Anah, though a chieftain's son, was in the habit of tending his father's asses (Gen 36:24). It was when thus employed that he found in the wilderness הִיֵּמַם, ha-yenzim, rendered in the Eng. Vers. by “the mules,” but meaning more probably “the hot springs.” There is in the country to the south-east of the Dead Sea (which formed part of the Seirite possessions) a place, Callirhoe, celebrated among the Greeks and Romans for its warm baths, which has been visited by modern travelers (Josephus, War, i, 33, 5; Pliny, Hist. Nat. 5, 5, 17; Legh's Travels).

Though the Israelites and Edomites were closely related, and though the former were commanded “not to abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother” (Deu 23:7), yet the bitterest enmity appears to have existed between them at every period of their history, as a perpetuation of the unbrotherly feud between their progenitors. When the Israelites asked permission to pass through the territory of Edom on their way to Canaan, they were rudely refused. B. C. 1619. The road by which it was sought to penetrate the country was termed “the king's highway” (Deu 23:17), supposed  by Dr. Robinson (Researches, 2, 556; but see a different explanation in De Saulcy's Narrative, 1, 392; comp. 273, 276) to be wady el-Ghuweir, for it is almost the only valley that affords direct and easy passage through those mountains. From a comparison of these incidents it may be inferred that the change the form of government took place during the wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert, unless we suppose, with Rosenmüller, that it was only this north-eastern part of Edom which was now subject to a monarch, the rest of the country remaining under the sway of its former chieftains. But whether the regal power at this period embraced the whole territory or not, perhaps it did not supplant the ancient constitution, but was rather grafted on it, like the authority of the Judges in Israel, and of Saul, the first king, which did not materially interfere with the government that previously existed. It further appears, from the list of Idumeman kings, that the monarchy was not hereditary, but elective (for no one is spoken of as the son or relative of his predecessor); or probably that chieftain was acknowledged as sovereign who was best able to vindicate his claim by force of arms. Every successive king appears to have selected his own seat of government: the places mentioned as having ‘enjoyed that distinction are Dinhabah, Avith, Pagu or Pai. Even foreigners were not excluded from the throne, for the successor of Samlah of Masrekah was Saul, or Shaul, “of Rechoboth, on the river.” The word Rechoboth means, literally, streets, and was a not uncommon name given to towns; but the emphatic addition of “the river” points evidently to the Euphrates, and between Rakkah and Anah, on that river, there are still the remains of a place called by the Arabs Rachabath Malik Ibn-Tauk. In the age of Solomon we read of one Hadad, who “was of the king's seed in Edom” (1Ki 11:14); from which some have conjectured that by that period there was a royal dynasty of one particular family; but all that the expression may imply is that he was a blood relation of the last king of the country. Hadad was the name of one of the early sovereigns “who smote Midian in the field of Moab” (Gen 36:35).

The country was attacked by Saul with partial success (1Sa 14:47). A few years later David overthrew the Edomites in the “valley of Salt,” at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 109), and put garrisons in their cities (2Sa 8:14; 1Ch 18:11-13; 1Ki 11:15. Comp. the inscription of Psalms 60, and Psa 5:8-9; Psa 118:9-10, where “the strong city” may denote Selah or Petra). Then were fulfilled the. prophecies in Gen 25:23; Gen 27:40, that the “elder  should serve the younger;” and also the prediction of Balaam (Num 24:18), that Edom and Seir should be for possessions to Israel. Solomon created a naval station at Ezion-geber, on the Elanitic Gulf, from whence his ships went to India and Eastern Africa (1Ki 9:26; 2Ch 8:18). Towards the close of his reign an attempt was made to restore the independence of the country by one Hadad, an Idumaean prince, who, when a child, had been carried into Egypt at the time of David's invasion, and had there married the sister of Tahpanhes the queen (1Ki 11:14-23). SEE HADAD.

If Edom then succeeded in shaking off the yoke, it was only for a season, since in the days of Jehoshaphat, the fourth Jewish monarch from Solomon, it is said “there was no king in Edom; a deputy was king;” i.e. he acted as viceroy for the king of Judah. For that the latter was still master of the country is evident from the fact of his having fitted out, like Solomon, a fleet at Ezion-geber (1Ki 22:47-48; 2Ch 20:36-37). It was, no doubt, his deputy (called king) who joined the confederates of Judah and Israel in their attack upon Moab (2Ki 3:9; 2Ki 3:12; 2Ki 3:26). Yet there seems to have been a partial revolt of the Edomites, or at least of the mountaineers of Seir, even in the reign of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 20:22); and under his successor, Jehoram, they wholly rebelled, and “made a king over themselves” (2Ki 8:20; 2Ki 8:22; 2Ch 21:8; 2Ch 21:10). From its being added that, notwithstanding the temporary suppression of the rebellion, “Edom revolted from under the hand of Judah unto this day,” it is probable that the Jewish dominion was never completely re- stored. Amaziah, indeed, invaded the country, and having taken the chief city, Selah or Petra, he, in memorial of the conquest, changed its name to Joktheel (q. d. subdued of God); and his successor, Uzziah, retained possession of Elath (2Ki 14:7; 2Ch 25:11-14; 2Ch 26:3). But in the reign of Ahaz, hordes of Edomites made incursions into Judah, and carried away captives (2Ch 28:17). About the same period, Rezin, king of Syria, expelled the Jews from Elath, which was thenceforth occupied by the Edomites (2Ki 16:6, where for Syrians, ארומים, we ought to read Edomites, אדומים, De Rossi, Varice Lectiones, 2, 247). Now was fulfilled the other part of Isaac's prediction, viz., that in course of time Esau “should take his brother's yoke from off his neck” (Gen 27:40).

It appears from various incidental expressions in the later prophets that the Edomites employed their recovered power in the enlargement of their territory in all directions. They spread as far south as Dedan in Arabia, and northward to Bozrah in the Hauran; though it is doubtful if the Bozrah of Scripture may  not have been a place in Idumaea Proper (Isa 34:6; Isa 63:1; Jer 49:7-20; Eze 25:13; Amo 1:12). During the decline of the Jewish power, and wars of Judah and Israel, the Edomites gradually enlarged their possessions. When Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem, the Edomites joined him and took an active part in the plunder and slaughter which followed. Their cruelty at that time is specially referred to in Psalms 137, and was the chief cause of those dreadful prophetic curses which have since been executed upon their country (Jer 49:17; Lam 4:21; Eze 25:13-14; Oba 1:10-21). From the language of Malachi (Mal 1:2-3), and also from the accounts preserved by Josephus (Ant. 10, 9, 7), it would seem that the Edomites did not wholly escape the Chaldaean scourge; but instead of being carried captive, like the Jews, they not only retained possession of their own territory, but became masters of the south of Judah, as far as Hebron (1Ma 5:65, comp. with Eze 35:10; Eze 36:5). Probably as a reward for the assistance afforded by them to the Chaldeeans, the Edomites were permitted to settle in Southern Palestine, and in the country lying between it and the borders of Egypt. The name Idumea was now given to the whole country, from the valley of the Arabah to the Mediterranean (Joseph. Ant. 5, 1, 22; Strabo, 16:2), and from Eleutheropolis to Elath (Jerome, Comment. in Obad.). Hence arose the mistakes of Roman writers, who sometimes give the name Idumaea to all Palestine, and even call the Jews Idumaeans (Virgil, Georg. 3, 12; Juvenal, 8:160).

While the Edomites thus extended their conquests westward, they were driven out of their own country by the Nabatheeans (q.v.), who, leaving the nomad habits of their ancestors, settled down amid the mountains of Edom, engaged in commerce, and founded the little kingdom of Arabia Petraee. Some of their monarchs took the name Aretas (2 Maccabees 5, 8; Joseph. Ant. 15, 1, 2), and some Obodas (Joseph. Ant. 13, 5, 1). One of them was that Aretas whose daughter Herod Antipas married (Mat 14:3-4); and it was the same king of Arabia who captured Damascus, and held it at the time of Paul's conversion (Act 9:25; 2Co 11:32). Idumaea was taken by the Romans in A.D. 105, and under their paternal government the enterprising inhabitants increased greatly in wealth and power. A lucrative transport trade between India, Persia, and the Levant was in their hands. Roads were constructed across the desert of Arabia, through the defiles of Edom, and westward and northward to the  Mediterranean and Palestine. Traces of them still remain, with ruinous military stations at intervals, and fallen milestones of the times of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius (Peutinger Tables; Laborde's Voyage; Burckhardt's Syria, p. 374, 419; Irby and Mangles's Travels, p. 371, 377, 1st ed.). The magnificent rock-temples, palaces, and tombs of Petra were then constructed, which still continue to be the wonder and admiration of Eastern travelers. They are not the works of the Edomites, but of the descendants of Nebaioth, Ishmael's oldest son and Esau's brother-in-law (Gen 25:13; Gen 36:3; Joseph. Ant. 1, 12, 4; Diod. Sic. 19.)

On the revival of Jewish power under the Asmonseans, that part of Southern Palestine to which the name Idumnea had been given by classic writers was seized, and about B.C. 125 they were finally subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled them to submit to circumcision and other Jewish rites, with a view to incorporate them with the nation (1 Macc. 5, 3, 65; 2 Macc. 10, 16; 12, 32; Joseph. Ant. 13, 9, 1; 15, 4). The amalgamation, however, of the two races seems never to have been perfected. The country was governed by Jewish prefects, and one of these, an Idumaean by birth, became procurator of Judaea, and his son was Herod the Great, “king of the Jews” (Joseph. Ant. 12, 8, 6; 13, 9, 2 14,1, 3 and 8; 15, 7, 9; 17, 11, 4). Not long before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, 20,000 Idumseans were called in to the defense of the city by the Zealots, but both parties gave themselves up to rapine and murder (Joseph. War, 4, 4, 5; 5, 1; 7, 8, 1). This is the last mention made of the Edomites in history. The author of a work on Job, once ascribed to Origen, says that their name and language had perished, and that, like the Ammonites and Moabites, they had all become Arabs. In the second century Ptolemy limits the name Idumsea to the country west of the Jordan.

In the first centuries of the Christian sera Edom was included in the province of Palcestina Tertia, of which Petra was metropolis (S. Paulo, Geogr. Sac. p. 307; Reland, Palcest. p. 218). After the Mohammedan conquest its commercial importance declined, its flourishing port and inland cities fell to ruin. The Mohammedans were the instruments by which the fearful predictions of the Scripture were finally fulfilled. The Crusaders made several expeditions to Edom, penetrating it as far as to Petra, to which they gave the name “Valley of Moses” (Gesta Dei per François, p. 518, 555, etc.), a name still existing in the Arabic form Wady Maisa. On a commanding hill some twelve miles north of Petra they built a fortress, and called it Mons Regalis; its modern name is Shobek (ib. p. 611). The  Crusaders occupied and fortified Kerak, the ancient Kir Moab, and raised it to the dignity of an Episcopal see, under the impression that it was Petra (ib. p. 812, 885, 1119). From the age of the Crusaders until the present century nothing was known of Idumaea. No traveler had passed through it, and as a country it had disappeared from history. Volney heard some vague reports of its wonders from Arabs. Seetzen also heard much of it in the year 1806, but he was unable to enter it. Burckhardt was the first to traverse the country. In 1812 he traveled from Kerak south by Shobek to Petra (Trav. in Syr. p. 377 sq.; Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 165). In 1828, Laborde, proceeding northward from Akabah through the defiles of Edom, also visited Petra, and brought away a portfolio of splendid drawings, which proved that the descriptions of Burckhardt had not been exaggerated. Many have since followed the footsteps of the first explorers, and a trip to Petra now forms a necessary part of the Eastern traveler's grand tour.

4. Physical Geography. — Idumaea embraces a section of a broad mountain range, extending in breadth from the valley of the Arabah to the desert plateau of Arabia. “Along the base of the range on the side of the Arabah, are low calcareous hills. To these succeed lofty masses of igneous rock, chiefly porphyry; over which lies the red and variegated sandstone in irregular ridges and abrupt cliffs, broken by deep and wild ravines. The latter strata give the mountains their most striking features” (Porter, Handb. for S. and Pal. 1, 44). “The first thing that struck me,” says Stanley, “in turning out of the Arabah up the defiles that lead to Petra was, that we had suddenly left the desert. Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sinaitic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass, sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprouting corn; and this continues through the whole descent to Petra, and in Petra itself. The next peculiarity was when, after having left the summit of the pass, or after descending from Mount Hor, we found ourselves insensibly encircled with rocks of deepening and deepening red. Red, indeed, even from a distance, the mountains of ‘red' Edom appear, but not more so than the granite of Sinai; and it is not till one is actually in the midst of them that this red becomes crimson, and that the wonder of the Petra colors fully displays itself (Sin. and Pal. p. 88). The ravines which intersect these sandstone mountains are very remarkable. Take them as a whole, there is nothing like them in the world, especially those near Petra. “You descend from wide downs  and before you opens a deep cleft between  rocks of red sandstone rising perpendicularly to the height of one, two, or three hundred feet. This is the Sikl.... Follow me, then, down this magnificent gorge-the most magnificent, beyond all doubt, which I have ever beheld. The rocks are almost precipitous, or rather they would be if they did not, like their brethren in all this region, overlap, and crumble, and crack, as if they would crash over you” (ib. p. 90).

Such are the ravines of Idumaea, and the dark openings of the numerous tombs and grottoes which dot their sides; and the sculptured façades here and there hewn out in their gorgeously colored cliffs add vastly to their picturesque grandeur. The average elevation of the sandstone range is about 2000 feet. Immediately on its eastern side, and indeed so close to it as to make up part of one great range, is a parallel ridge of limestone, attaining a somewhat higher elevation, and extending unbroken far to the north and south. The latter sinks with a gentle slope into the desert of Arabia. The deep valleys and the little terraces along the mountainsides, and the broad downs upon their summits, are covered with rich soil, in which trees, shrubs, and flowers grow luxuriantly. While Edom is thus wild, rugged, and almost inaccessible, the deep glens and flat terraces along the mountainsides are covered with rich soil, from which trees, shrubs, and flowers now spring up luxuriantly. No contrast could be greater than that between the bare, parched plains on the east and west, and the ruddy cliffs, and verdant, flower-spangled; glens and terraces of Edom. This illustrates Bible topography, and reconciles seemingly discordant statements in the sacred volume. While the posterity of Esau dwelt amid rocky fastnesses and on mountain heights, making their houses like the eyries of eagles, and living by their sword (Jer 49:16; Gen 27:40), yet Isaac, in his prophetic blessing, promised his disappointed son that his dwelling should be “of the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above” (Gen 27:39). But many critics are of opinion (e.g. Vater, De Wette, Geddes,Von Bohlen) that מַשְׁמִנֵּיshould there be rendered from, i.e. “far away from, or destitute of,” the fatness of the earth, etc.; and it is immediately added, “for thou shalt live by thy sword “and it does not appear that Idumaea was ever particularly noted for its fertility. Some other passages of Scripture are also illustrated by a glance at the towering precipices and peaks of Edom. The border of the Amorites was from “the ascent of scorpions (Akrabbim), from the rock” that is, from the rocky boundary of Edom (Jdg 1:36). We read that Amaziah, after the conquest of Seir, took ten thousand of the captives to the “top of the cliff,”  and thence cast them down, dashing them all to pieces (2Ch 25:11-12).

5. Present State of the Country. — Idumaea, once so rich in its flocks, so strong in its fortresses and rock-hewn cities, so extensive in its commercial relations, so renowned for the architectural splendor of its temples and palaces-is now a deserted and desolate wilderness. Its whole population is contained in some three or four miserable villages; no merchant would now dare to enter its borders; its highways are untrodden, its cities are all in ruins. The predictions of God's Word have been fulfilled to the very letter (see Estlander, Vaticinia Jesaice in dumnceos. Aboae, 1825). “Thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and brambles in the fortresses thereof… When the whole earth rejoiceth I will make thee desolate.... Thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumaea, even all of it… Edom shall be a desolation; every one that goeth by it shall be astonished” (Isa 34:13; Eze 35:14; Jer 49:17). Idumaea is now divided into two districts, Jebal, including the northern section as far as wady el-Ghuweir, and Esh Shercah, embracing the southern part (Burckhardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 410; Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 154). Burckhardt mentions a third district, Jebal Hesma; but Robinson says that though there is a sandy tract, el-Hismah, with mountains around it, on the east of Akabah, it does not constitute a separate division. The site of the ancient capital Bozrah is now marked by the small village of Busaireh, and Petra, the Nabathaean capital, is well known as wady Musa.

The whole of this region is at present occupied by various tribes of Bedouin Arabs. The chief tribe in the Jebal is the Hejaya, with a branch of the Kaabineh, while in esh-Sherah they are all of the numerous and powerful tribe of the Haweitat, with a few independent allies. The Bedouins in Idumaea have of late--years been partially subject to the pacha of Egypt, paying an annual tribute, which, in the case of the Beni Sukhr, is one camel for two tents. The fellahin, or peasants, are half Bedouin, inhabiting the few villages, but dwelling also in tents; they too pay tribute to the Egyptian government, and furnish supplies of grain.

6. The character of the Edomites was drawn by Isaac in his prophetic blessing to Esau — “By thy sword shalt thou live” (Gen 27:40). War and rapine were the only professions of the Edomites. By the sword they got Mount Seir-by the sword they exterminated the Horites-by the sword they long battled with their brethren of Israel, and finally broke off  their yoke-by the sword they won Southern Palestine-and by the sword they performed the last act in their long historic drama, massacred the guards in the Temple, and pillaged the city of Jerusalem.

Little is known of their religion, but that little shows them to have been idolatrous. It is probable that Esau's marriage with the “daughters of Cancan,” who “were a grief of mind” to his father and mother (Gen 26:34-35), induced him to embrace their religion; and when Esau and his followers took possession of Mount Seir, they seem to have followed the practice common among ancient nations of adopting the country's gods, for we read that Amaziah, king of Judah, after his conquest of the Edomites, “brought the gods of the children of Seir, and set them up to be his gods” (2Ch 25:14-15; 2Ch 25:20). Josephus also refers both to the idols (one of which he named Koze) and priests of the Idumaens (Ant. 15, 17, 9).

7. Literature. — With respect to the striking fulfilment of the prophetic denunciations upon Edom, we need only refer the reader to the well- known work of Keith, who frequently errs, however, in straining the sense of prophecy beyond its legitimate import, as well as in seeking out too literally minute an accomplishment. On Idumaea generally, see C. B. Michaelis, Dis. De Antiquiss, Idumaea. Hist. in Pott and Ruperti's Sylloge Comment. Theologic. part 6, p. 121; J. D. Michaelis, Comment. de Troglodytis Seiritis, in the Syntagma Comment., part 1, p. 194. For the ancient geography, Reland's Palcestina; Forster's Geography of Arabia; Ritter's Palastina und Syrien. For the history and commerce, Nolde, Hist. Idumaea, Frank. 1726: Vincent's Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, vol. 2. For modern geography, the travels of Burckhardt, Laborde, Wilson, Stanley, and Porter's Handb. for Syria and Pal.; but especially, Sketches of Idumaea and its present Inhabitants, by Dr. E. Robinson, in the Amer. Rib. Repository for April 1833, p. 247, and his Bib. Researches, 2, 551. SEE EDOMITE, etc.

## Idumaean[[@Headword:Idumaean]]

             (Ι᾿δουμαῖος), an inhabitant of the land of Idumaea (q.v.) (2Ma 10:15-16).

## Iduna[[@Headword:Iduna]]

             in Norse mythology, is the loveliest of the Asas, the goddess of eternal youth and immortality; not created or born, but existing from the beginning. She is the wife of the wise Braga, the god of the poetic art. In her keeping are the apples of rejuvenation, without which even the gods would become aged, therefore they daily eat the same.

## Ifays[[@Headword:Ifays]]

             the wooden tablets employed by the Japanese, containing inscriptions commemorative of the dead, mentioning the date of his decease, and the name given to him since that event. The ifays are carried in the funeral procession, along with the body, to the grave, and one of them is placed over it, remaining there seven weeks, when it is removed to make way for the gravestone. Another is set up in the best apartment of the house during the period of mourning. Sweetmeats, fruits, and tea are placed before it; and morning, noon, and night food is prepared for it as for a living person. The whole household pray before it morning and evening during seven weeks, and other religious ceremonies are observed.

## Igal[[@Headword:Igal]]

             (Heb. Yigal', יַגְאָל, avenger), the name of three men.  1. (Sept. Ι᾿γάλ, Vulg. Igal, Eng. Vers. “Igal.”) Son of Joseph, and commissioner on the part of Issachar to explore the land of Canaan (Num 13:7). He of course perished with his nine false-hearted companions on their return (Num 14:37). B.C. 1657.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿γαάλ, Vulg. Igaal, A.V. “Igal.”) Son of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (2Sa 23:36). B.C. 1046. In the parallel list of 1 Chronicles the name is given as “Joel the brother of Nathan” (11:38,Ι᾿ωήλ). Kennicott, after a minute examination of the passage, both in the original and in the ancient versions, decides in favor of the latter as most likely to be the genuine text (Dissertion, p. 212-214).

3. (Sept. Ι᾿ωήλ, Vulg. Jegaal, A.V. “Igeal.”) One of the sons of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:22). The number “six” there given is that of the grandchildren of Shechaniah (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 17). B.C. ante 406.

## Igdaliah[[@Headword:Igdaliah]]

             (Heb. Yigdalyah', but only in the prolonged form, Yigdalya'hu, יַגְדִּלְיָהוּ, whom Jehovah will make great; Sept. Γοδολίας, Vulg. Jegedalia), the father of Hanan, into the chamber of which latter Jeremiah brought the Rechabites to propose the test of their temperance (Jer 35:4). B.C. ante 606.

## Igeil[[@Headword:Igeil]]

             (1Ch 3:22). SEE IGAL 3.

## Iglau, Treaty Of[[@Headword:Iglau, Treaty Of]]

             a celebrated compact, ratified at Iglau, in Bohemia, which closed the long- protracted war between the Hussites and the. Roman Catholics. It was dated November 30, 1433. SEE HUSSITES.

## Ignatian Epistles[[@Headword:Ignatian Epistles]]

             SEE IGNATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

## Ignatius Loyola[[@Headword:Ignatius Loyola]]

             SEE LOYOLA.

## Ignatius of Antioch[[@Headword:Ignatius of Antioch]]

             one of the apostolical fathers (q.v.), called also Theoyhorus (ὁ θεοφόρος), a title which he explained to the emperor Trajan as meaning “one who has Christ in his heart.” We have no trustworthy accounts of the life and ministry of Ignatius. The chief authority is the Martyrium Ignatii (see below), but even those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated. There are several unsupported stories in the fathers, e.g. that Ignatius was the child whom Christ took into his arms  (Mar 9:36), that he had seen Christ, etc. Abulpharagius (Dynasc. 7, 75, ed. Pococke, 1663) was understood to assert that Ignatius was born at Nura in Sardinia or Cappadocia, but Mr. Cureton (see below) shows that the words used have no such reference. The Martyrium (c. 3) asserts that he was, along with Polycarp, a hearer of St. John; Chrysostom says that he was nominal bishop of Antioch by the laying on of the hands of the apostles themselves but Eusebius fixes the date of his ordination at A.D. 69, when several of the apostles were dead. According to the same historian, he was the second successor of St. Paul, Evodius having been the first. The Apostolic Constitutions, on the other hand, say that Ignatius and Evodius held the office together, Evodius by appointment from Peter, Ignatius from Paul. So say, also, Baronius and Natalis Alexander, making, however, Evodius bishop of the Jews, and Ignatius of the Gentiles. “Of the episcopate of Ignatius we know little. He appears to have been over- earnest in insisting upon the prerogatives of the clergy, especially the bishops.

The Miartyrium Ignatii represents him as anxious for the steadfastness of his flock during the persecution said to have taken place in Domitian's reign, and incessant in watching and prayer and in instructing his people, fearing lest the more ignorant and timid among them should fall away. On the cessation of the persecution he rejoiced at the little injury the church at Antioch had sustained. When the emperor Trajan, elated with his victories over the Dacians and other nations on the Danubian frontier, began to persecute the Church, the anxiety of Ignatius was renewed, and, eager to avert the violence of persecution from his flock, and to obtain the crown of martyrdom, he offered himself as a victim, and was brought before the emperor, then at Antioch on his way to the eastern frontier to attack the Armenians and Parthians. The conference between Trajan and the bishop is given in the Martyriuen Ignatii; it ended in an order of the emperor that Ignatius should be taken to Rome, and there thrown to the wild beasts. He was led thither by a long and tedious route, but was allowed to have communication with his fellow-Christians at the places at which he stopped. He was thrown to the wild beasts in the Roman amphitheatre, at the feast distinguished as ἡ τρισκαιδεκάτη, ‘the feast of the thirteenth' (Smith, Dict. of Class. Antiq. s.v. Saturnalia). Such parts of him as remained were collected by his sorrowing friends, and taken back to Antioch, where in Jerome's time they were resting in the cemetery outside the gate toward Daphne. From thence they were removed by the emperor Theodosius II to the Church of Ignatius (previously known as the Tycheum, or Temple of Fortune), in the city of Antioch (Evang. Hist. Eccl.  1, 16). Their subsequent removals are uncertain. The martyrdom of St. Ignatius is commemorated by the Roman Church on the 1st of February; by the Greek ‘Church on the 20th of December, the correct anniversary of his martyrdom.” The year of Ignatius's death has been much disputed. Many of the best writers (following the Martyriume Ignatii) place it in A.D. 107; but, as it is now generally conceded that Trajan did not visit the East till 114, and as he probably spent the winter 114-115 at Antioch, the best critics agree on A.D. 115 as the most probable date.

Epistles of Igynatius. — On his way from Antioch to Rome, Ignatius is said to have written seven epistles. These are enumerated both by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. 3, 36) and Jerome (De Viris Illustr. c. 16). At present, however, there are fifteen epistles extant, all ascribed to Ignatius. Seven of these are considered by many to be genuine, namely,

1. Πρὸς Ε᾿φεσίους, Ad Ephesios;

2. Μαγνησιεῦσιν, Ad Magnesianos;

3. Τραλλιανοῖς, Ad Tralliancs;

4. Πρὸς ῾Ρωμαίους, Ad Romanios;

5. Φιλαδελφεῦσιν, Ad Philadelphenos;

6. Σμυρναίοις, Ad Smyrnceos; and,

7. Πρὸς ΠολύκαρπονAd Polycarpumn.

The titles of these epistles agree with the enumeration of Eusebus and Jerome. There are found two recensions of them — a longer, now regarded as an interpolated one, first published by Pacaeus (1557), and a shorter form, which is considered as tolerably uncorrupted. Many doubt the genuineness of either (see below). Two ancient Latin versions are extant, corresponding in a great degree to the two forms or recensions of the Greek text: the larger, known as the common (vulyata) version, the other first discovered and published by archbishop Usher (1644) (see below). The epistles to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp were published, with a translation, in a still shorter Syriac version, by Cureton (1845). Many of the interpolations found in the larger form are of passages from the N.T.

Five other epistles, though extant in Greek, are regarded by nearly all classes of critics as spurious, namely,

8. Πρὸς Μαρίαν εἰς Νεάπολιν τὴν πρὸς τῷ Ζαρθῷ, or Πρὸς Μαρίαν Κασταθολίτην, or ἐκ Κασοθήλων, or Κασταθαλῖτιν, or ἐκ  Κασταθάλων Ad Macrinam, Neapo liem, quce est ad Zarbumn, or Ad Mariam Cassobolitam variously written Castabalitam, or Castabalensem, or ex Cossobelis, or Chassaobolorum, or Chasabolorum, or Castabolorm;

9. Πρός τοὺς ἐν Ταρσῷ, Ad Tarsenses;

10. Πρὸς Α᾿ντιοχεῖς, Ad Antiochenos;

11. Πρὸς ῞Ηρωνα, διάκονον Α᾿ντιοχείας, Ad Heronem Diaconum Antiochice;

12. Πρὸς Φιλιππησίους, Ad Philippenses. Some copies add to the title of this last epistle the words περὶ Βαπτίσματος, De Baptismate, an addition which by no means describes the contents. Of four of these spurious epistles two ancient Latin versions are extant, the common version, and that published by Usher. Of that to the Philippians there is but one version, namely, the common. The epistle to Polycarp in the common Latin version is defective, containing only about one third of what is in the Greek text. There is also extant, both in the Greek and in the two Latin versions, an epistle of Mary of Cassobele (called also Προσήλυτος, Proselta) to Ignatius, to which his letter professes to be an answer.

The remaining three epistles ascribed to Ignatius are found only in Latin. They are very short, and have long been given up as spurious. They are,

13. S. Joanni Evangelist;

14. Al Eundem; and,

15. Beatac Virginia.

With these is found a letter of the Virgin to Ignatius, Beata Virgo Ignatio, professing to be an answer to his letter. This also is given up as spurious.

The controversy respecting the genuineness of these writings began at an early period. In A.D. 1495 the three Latin epistles and the letter of the Virgin were printed at Paris, subjoined to the Vita et Processus S. Tholsm Cantuarensis Martyris super Libertate Ecclesiastica. In A.D. 1498, three years after the appearance of these letters, another collection, edited by J. Faber, of Staples (Stapulensis), was printed at Paris in folio, containing the common Latin version of eleven letters, that of Mary of Cassobelae not being among them. They were published with some of the works ascribed to Dionysius Areopagita and an epistle of Polycarp. These eleven epistles were reprinted at Ven. 1502; Paris, 1515; Basel, 1520; and Strasburg,  1527. In 1516 the preceding fourteen epistles, with the addition of the letter to Mary of Cassobelae, were edited by Symphorianus Champerius of Lyons, and published at Paris in 4to, with seven letters of St. Antony, commonly called the Great. In A.D. 1557, the twelve epistles of Ignatius, in Greek, were published by Valentinus Paceus, or Paceus, in 8vo, at Dillingen, in Suabia on the Danube, from an Augsburg MS. They were reprinted at Paris, 1558, with critical emendations. The same twelve Greek epistles, from another MS. from the library of Gaspar a Nydpryck, were published by Andreas Gesner, with a Latin version by Joannes Brunner, Ziurich, 1559, folio. In these editions the Greek text of the seven epistles was given in the larger form, the shorter form, both in Greek and Latin, being as yet undiscovered. The genuineness of these remains was now called in question. The authors of the Centuries Magdeburgenses were the first to express their doubts, though with caution and moderation. Calvin, in his Institutiones (1, 3), declared that “nothing could be more silly than the stuff (naeenice) which had been brought out under the name of Ignatius, and rendered the impudence of those persons more insufferable who had set themselves to deceive people by such phantoms (larvce).” The controversy grew warm, the Roman writers and the Episcopalians commonly contending for the genuineness of at least a part of the epistles, and the Presbyterians denying it. The three epistles not extant in Greek were the first given up, but the rest were stoutly contended for. Several, however, distinguished between the seven enumerated by Eusebius and the rest, and some contended that even those which were genuine were interpolated. While the controversy was in this state, Vedelius, a professor at Geneva, published an edition (S. Ignatii quae extant Omnia, Geneva, 1623, 4to) in which the seven genuine were arranged apart from the other five epistles; he marked, also, in the genuine epistles, the parts which he regarded as interpolations. In 1644 archbishop Usher's (4to, Oxford) edition of the epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius appeared. It contained,

1. Polycarpiana Epistolarum Ignatianarum Sylloge (Polycarp's Collection of the Epistles of Ignatius), containing Polycarp's epistle to the Philippians and six of the supposed genuine epistles of Ignatius;

2. Epistolce B. Ignatio adscriptae a Medice Etatis Graecis Sex (Six Epistles ascribed to St. Ignatius by the Greeks of the Middle Age). The epistle of Polycarp was included in this class, with the five spurious epistles extant in Greek. The common Latin version was also printed with these in  parallel columns, and the three epistles which are extant only in Latin were subjoined;

3. A Latin version of eleven epistles (that to the Philippians being omitted) from the two MSS. obtained by Usher, and now first printed. This corresponds, in the main, to the shorter text of the so-called genuine epistles, The work of Usher contains also a valuable introduction and notes to the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Canons ascribed to Clement of Rome. In 1646 the epistles of Ignatius were published by Isaac Vossius (4to, Amst.), from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence. The MS., which is not accurately written, and is mutilated at the end, is valuable as the only one containing the shorter recension of the genuine epistles; it wants, however, that to the Romans, which was given by Vossius in the longer form, as in the former editions. The five spurious epistles, and that of Mary of Cassobelae to Ignatius, from the Medicean MS., the text of which differs materially from that previously published; the three Latin epistles; Usher's Latin version of the eleven Greek epistles; and the common version of that to the Philippians, were all given by Vossius. In 1647 Usher published his Appendix Ignatiina, containing the Greek text of the seven epistles, and two Latin versions of the Martyriun Ignatii. He gave the Medicean text of six of the epistles; that to the Romans was the common text, with the interpolations expunged, as determined by a collation, of the epistle contained in the Martyriun, both in the Greek of Symeon Metaphrastes and the Latin version published by Usher. After the controversy had been carried on for some time, and great progress had been made towards the settlement of the text, the most formidable attack on the genuineness of the epistles was made by Daille (Dallaus), one of the most eminent of the French Protestants, in his work De Scriptis quae sub Dionysii Areopagite et Ignatii Antiocheni circumfrentur Libri duo (Genesis 1666, 4to). The works of Ignatius form the subject of the second book.

This attack of Daille called forth the Vindiciae Ignatianae of bishop Pearson (Cambridge, 1672, 4to), which was long supposed to have settled the controversy. But it has recently been reopened with fresh vigor and interest. Archbishop Usher, in his edition of the Ignatian Epistles published at Oxford in 1644, declared that he could not venture to promise that the genuine Ignatius could be recovered without the aid of another Greek text, which he hoped to obtain from a MS. in the Medicean Library at Florence, or at least without the aid of a Syriac copy, which he did not despair of procuring from Rome. The  Medicean MS. was published, but the difficulties remained the same. The Syriac version, which was then looked to as affording the only probable clew to the solution, eluded the most diligent and anxious search for a period of 200 years. It was reserved for the Rev. William Cureton, a canon of Westminster, to supply this clew. Mr. Cureton discovered, among a most important collection of Syriac MSS., procured for the British Museum by archdeacon Tattam, in the year 1843, from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara of the Syrians, in the Desert of Nitria, three entire epistles, which he published in the year 1845. This publication naturally excited great attention on the part of those who felt an interest in the subject, and called forth severe strictures from some who seemed to consider that to remove any part of the seven epistles of Ignatius was to take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy. The form Which the controversy now took led to the publication, in 1849, by Mr. Cureton, of the Corpus Ignatianum, in which the editor brought together a complete Collection of the Ignatian Epistles — genuine, interpolated, and spurious; together with numerous Extracts from them, as quoted by Ecclesiastical Writers down to the Tenth Century, and accompanied by a full history of the controversy from its commencement. Mr. Cureton's conclusion was that the three epistles which he published were the only genuine productions of Ignatius in the series bearing his name. If this did not “take away so much from the foundations of episcopacy,” it is because the supposed testimony of a most venerable apostolic father is not one of its foundations, for certainly the three letters are as bare of prelatic allusion as any of Paul's.

But the matter did not rest here. Several critical reviews of this position appeared, the most important of which was by Uhlhorn, in the 21st volume of the Zeitschriff d. Hist. Theol., in which a long and learned examination of the question, under the title Das Verhiltniss d. syrischen Recension cd. ignatianischen Briefe zu d. kürzern griechischen… Authentie d. Briefe uberhaupt (translated into English, in a somewhat condensed form, by the Rev. Henry Browne, in the Theol. Critic [1852]), is entered into, which finally asserts that “the seven letters, according to the shorter Greek recension, are the genuine productions of Ignatius of Antioch.” Another Translation of the Epistles of Ignatius (together with Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, and the Apologies of Justin Martyr and Tertullian), with notes, and an account of the present state of the question respecting the epistles of Ignatius, by the Rev. Temple Chevallier, B.D. (8vo), appeared in 1852. In 1859 the question was again opened, and again in the Zeitschfeiu hist. Theol., by Dr. R. A. Lipsius, who, in a paper  entitled Ueber die Aechtheit der syrischen Recension der ignatianischen Briefe, goes over the ground again with all the learning of his predecessors in the same field, but more at length, examining in detail, and with great critical acumen, the arguments which have been adduced by both sides in this discussion. Dr. Lipsius adopts all the reasoning of the learned editor of the Corpus Ignatianum, and arrives at the same conclusion, namely, that the three letters to Polycarp, to the Ephesians, and to the Romans, in the form in which they appear in the Syriac recension, are the genuine letters of Ignatius, but that the present recession of the seven letters are from a later hand, in which the three genuine letters have been remodeled, and to these three four new ones added.

It is a circumstance not to be overlooked that this full adoption of Mr. Cureton's views has appeared in the same journal which gave to the world Uhlhorn's lucubrations, and speaks highly for the honest desire of its conductors to promote the cause of truth, and that only. Bunsen also adopted the views of Cureton in his Die dreiechten und vier unechten Briefe des Ignatius (Hamburg, 1847, 8vo), and his conclusions have been admitted by some eminent Presbyterian authorities (see Bibl. Repos. July, 1849); but Dr. Killen, the Irish Presbyterian, in his Ancient Church (Belfast and N. Y. 1859, 8vo), condemns all the epistles as worthless and spurious. He remarks that “it is no mean proof of the sagacity of the great Calvin that upwards of three hundred years ago he passed a sweeping sentence of condemnation on these Ignatian epistles. At the time many were startled by the boldness of his language, and it was thought that he was somewhat precipitate in pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the Word of God strengthens the intellectual vision, and assists in the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. Had Pearson enjoyed the same clear views of Gospel truth as the reformer of Geneva, he would not have wasted so many precious years in writing a learned vindication of the nonsense attributed to Ignatius. Calvin knew that an apostolic man must have been acquainted with apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the production of an age when the pure light of Christianity was greatly obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we cannot more appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it, “There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of  Ignatius.” Dr. Killen's positive arguments against the genuineness of all the epistles are,

1. The style is suspicious;

2. The epistles ignore God's Word, which is never done by any of the genuine writings of the early fathers;

3. They contain chronological blunders;

4. They use words in meanings which they did not acquire till long after the time of Ignatius;

5. They abound in puerilities, vaporing, and mysticism;

6. They manifest an unhallowed and insane desire for martyrdom. Baur and Hilgenfeld also hold them all not to be genuine, but think that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after A.D. 150, and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek.

With Uhlhorn agree also many able and sound critics of the Romanists and Protestants, as Mohler, Hefele, and Gieseler.

The most complete edition of Ignatius is that contained in the Patres Apostolici of Cotelerius, the second edition of which, by Le Clerc (Almst; 1724, 2 vols. folio), contains all the genuine and spurious epistles (Greek and Latin), with the epistles of Mary of Cassobelse and of the Virgin, the two ancient Latin versions (the common one and Usher's), the Martyriumn Ignatii, the Dissertationes (i.e. the Introduction) of Usher, the Vindiciae of Pearson, a Dissertatio de Ignatianis Epistolis by Le Clerc, and variorum notes. A useful edition of the genuine epistles, with those of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and the Martyria of Ignatius and Polycarp, was published by Jacobson (Oxford, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo). There are versions in several languages of modern Europe, including two English translations, an old one by archbishop Wake (Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, Lond. 1693, 8vo), and a modern one by Clementson (1827. 8vo). Wake's translation has been repeatedly published.

The Martyrium Ignatii, which is our chief authority for the circumstances of Ignatius's death, professes to be written by eye-witnesses, the companions of his voyage to Rome, supposed to be Philo, a deacon of Tarsus or some other church in Cilicia, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian,  who are mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (Ad Philarlelph.c. 11; Ad Smyrneos, c. 13). Usher adds to them a third person, Gaius, but on what authority we know not, and Gallandius adds Crocus, mentioned by Ignatius (Ad Romanus, c. 10). The account, with many interpolations, is incorporated in the work of Symeon Metaphrastes (Dec. A.D. 20), and a Latin translation from him is given by Surius, De Probatis Sanctor. Vitis, and in the Acta Sanctorum, under the date of the 1st of February. The Martyrium was first printed in Latin by archbishop Usher, who gave two distinct versions from different MSS. The Greek text was first printed by Ruinart, in his Aeta Martyrium Sincera (Par. 1689, 4to), from a MS. in the Colbertine library, and in a revised edition in Le Clerc's Cotelerius. It is given by Jacobson and by most of the later editors of the epistles. Its genuineness is generally recognized, but it is thought to be interpolated. See the remarks of Grabe, quoted by Jacobson at the end of the Martyrium. A considerable fragment of an ancient Syriac version of the Martyrium of Ignatius has been published by Mr. Cureton.

See Smith, Dict. of Biog. and Mythol. s.v.; Cave, Hist. Litt. anno 117; Lardner, Credibility of Gospel History; Edinburgh Review, July, 1849; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 197-200; Bohringer; Kirchengesch. in Biog. 1, 7 sq.; Milman. Lat. Christ. 1, 53 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 1, 269, 295, 631; Cureton, Corpus Ignatianum (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Milton, Prose Works, 1, 78 sq.; NX Y. Review, 1, 367; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Lit. April, 1850; New Englander, Nov. 1849; Quarterly Review, Dec. 1850; Lipsius, in Zeitsch. f. history Theol. 1856, Heft 1; Uhlhorn, in Herzog's Real Encyklop. 6, 623 sq.; Brit. and For. Rev. 33, 640 sq.; Am. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1867, p. 137 sq.; Princet. Rep. 1849, p. 378 sq.; Amer. Quart. Church Review, Jan. 1870, p. 563 sq. SEE EPISTLES.

## Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople[[@Headword:Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople]]

             flourished about the beginning of the 9th century. The schism of the Greek and Roman churches, which began under Photius (q.v.), who persecuted Ignatius and usurped his see, gives importance to his life. The following account of him is (necessarily) chiefly from Roman sources, and must be taken with allowance. He was born in 799, and was the son of the emperor Michael Curopalates; his mother, Procopia, was the daughter of the emperor Nicephorus. On the revolt of Leo the Armenian, Michael surrendered to him the throne, which he had occupied for the short period of a year and nine months only, and embraced monastic life. His sons  followed the example of their father, and the youngest, Nicetas, then aged fourteen, changed his name to Ignatius. The new emperor, in order not to be disturbed in the possession of power, separated the several members of the family of Michael, and caused his two sons, Eustratius and Nicetas, to be made eunuchs. During the reign of the three emperors, Leo, Michael II, and Theophilus. the young men were allowed to enjoy in tranquility the monastic life to which they had devoted themselves. Ignatius was admitted into the order of priesthood by Basil, bishop of Paros, in the Hellespont, a prelate who had suffered great persecution in opposing the Iconoclasts, and to whom Ignatius was much attached. On the death of Theophilus, the empress Theodora was declared regent in the name of her son, Michael III.

Being opposed to the Iconoclasts, she banished John, the patriarch of Constantinople, and caused Methodius to; be elected in his place. Four years after, on the death of Methodius, the patriarchal dignity was bestowed upon, Ignatius. But he did not long enjoy this honor. Bardas, the brother of the empress, whom he had excommunicated on account of his scandalous excesses, having obtained considerable influence on the mind of the young emperor Michael, whose vices he flattered and encouraged, induced him to take the reins of government, and to compel his mother to withdraw to a convent, and to accept the vows. Ignatius, when summoned to lend his authority to this unfilial act, did not: content himself with remonstrating against it, but gave' a stern refusal. He was, in consequence, banished to the isle of Terebinthos, and deprived of his see, which he had held for eleven years. Photius, a eunuch related to Bardas, and a person of considerable learning, who favored the Iconoclasts, was by the will of the emperor, but without the consent of the Church, appointed to the patriarchate of Constantinople. For the controversy of Photius with the Church of Rome and its issue, SEE PHOTIUS.

All means employed to induce Bardas to resign remaining ineffective, his death was finally determined upon, and he was murdered in 866. Basil the Macedonian now became possessed of the supreme power. One of the first acts of his reign was to banish Photius and recall Ignatius, who was triumphantly reinstated in his patriarchal dignity Nov. 3, 867. At his suggestion a council was assembled at Constantinople, which ranks in the Roman Church as the eighth ecumenical. It was presided over by the legate of pope Adrian II, and in it Photius and his partisans were excommunicated, and their opinions condemned. From this time Ignatius was allowed to rule the Greek Church without opposition. He died Oct. 23, 878, on which day the Greek and Roman churches still celebrate his memory. He was buried in  the church of St. Sophia, but his remains were afterwards transferred to that of St. Michael, near the Bosphorus. The details of his life are principally drawn from Nicetas David, who had known him personally. Ignatius wrote Βίος Ταρασίου τοῦ πατριάρχου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως, the Greek text of which remains unpublished, but a Latin translation of it is to be found in Surius, De probatis Sanctorum Vitis, and in the Aeta Sanctorum (Feb. 25), 3:576: Βίος τοῦ ἁγίου Νικηφόρου, πατριάρχου Κωνστ, the Greek text of which is contained in the Acta Sanctorunm (March 12). ii, 704, Append. He also wrote other works, among them an abridgment of fifty-three fables from Babrius in Iambic verses, each fable containing only four verses. These were published at first under the name of Gabrias, Gabrius, or Babrius, in the Aldine Esop (Venice, 1505), and afterwards under the author's real name (Ignatius Magister), in Ritterhusius's Phedrus, and Nevelet's Mythologia Esopica. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 795; English Cyclopedia; Smith, Dict. of Biography; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. 2, 52, 96; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3, 558 sq.; Hardwicke, Ch. Hist. (Middle Ages), p. 195 sq.

## Ignis Purgatorius[[@Headword:Ignis Purgatorius]]

             SEE PURGATORY.

## Ignispicium[[@Headword:Ignispicium]]

             a species of divination practiced by the ancient Romans, consisting of observations made on the flames ascending from the sacrificial altar.

## Ignorance[[@Headword:Ignorance]]

             the want of knowledge or instruction. It is often used to denote illiteracy. Mr. Locke observes that the causes of ignorance are chiefly three:

1, want of ideas;

2, want of a discoverable connection between the ideas we have;

3, want of tracing and examining our ideas.

As respects religion, ignorance has been distinguished into three sorts:

1. An invincible ignorance, in which the will has no part. It is an insult upon justice to suppose it will punish men because they were ignorant of things which they were physically incapable of knowing.

2. There is a willful and obstinate ignorance; such an ignorance, far from exculpating, aggravates a man's crimes.

3. A sort of voluntary ignorance, which is neither entirely willful nor entirely invincible, as when a man has the means of knowledge, and does not use them. — Locke, On the Understanding. 2, 178; Grove, Moral Philosophy, 2, 26, 29, 64; Watts, On the Mind; Henderson's Buck, Theolog. Dict. s.v. SEE KNOWLEDGE.

## Ignorantines[[@Headword:Ignorantines]]

             (Latin, Fratres Ignorantice; French, Freres Ignorantines), also known as the Congregation of Christians Instruction and Christian Schools, is the name of a Jesuitical foundation for the gratuitous instruction of poor children in sacred as well as secular learning, which was founded in France in the early part of the 18th century (1724) by the abbé de la Salle. ‘As the object is to confine the instruction to such branches as do not conflict with, but even favor, the religious views of the Roman Catholics, virtually preparing the young, by the exclusion of all books by Protestants, to remain true to the church of their fathers, they have gradually been introduced into every Catholic country of Europe. In France this society shared at the Revolution the fate of all the other religious bodies; but, under the name of Brothers of the Christian Schools, they were recalled, and re-established under Napoleon in 1806. They are now exceedingly numerous in France, Italy, and in some parts of Bohemia and Germany. Many branches exist also in England and Ireland. In the latter country they have large educational establishments, with a series of schoolbooks specially designed for Roman Catholics. The Ignorantines wear a dress very similar to that of the Jesuits. — Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 517; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 632.

## Igumen or Hegumen[[@Headword:Igumen or Hegumen]]

             is the title of an abbey in the male monasteries of the Greek Church, more especially in Russia.

## Ihre, Johann von[[@Headword:Ihre, Johann von]]

             a Swedish philologian, was born March 3, 1707, at Lund, and educated at the universities of Upsala, Greifswald, Jena, and Halle. At the last-named high school he afterwards lectured for a time on the Oriental languages,  then traveled extensively in Germany, Holland, England, and France, and on his return to his native country was appointed librarian at Upsala University. In 1737 he was appointed professor of poetry, and the year following professor of rhetoric, which he remained for forty years. He died Nov. 26, 1780. He distinguished himself greatly by his thorough investigations into the philological merits of his mother tongue, and by his labors on the Gothic version of Ulfilas, the results of which are left us in Scripta versionem Ulphilanam et lieng. Maeso-gothicam illustrentia, which were collected and edited by A. F. Büsching (Berl. 1773, 4to). This collection (which is very rare, as only 131 copies were printed) contains,

1. Ulphilas illustratus, a series of critical observations on the readings of the Codex Argenteus, with a preface, in which he attempts to prove ‘that the letters of the Codex were produced by an encaustic process, the surface of the parchment having been covered with wax, on which silver-leaf was laid, and the form of the letter stamped thereon with a hot iron;”

2. Fragmenta vers. Ulph., containing the portions of the Epistle to the Romans published by Knittel, with annotations;

“3. Dissertatio de originibuss Ling. Lat. et Gr. inter Mesogothos reperiundis;

4. De verbis Moesogoth; Analecta Ulphil., i, de Cod. Argent. et litt. Goth., 2, de nominibus subst. et adject. Maesogoth.;

5. De Ling. Cod. Arg.;

6. Specimen Gloss. Ulphil., cume praejationibus. An Appendix to the work contains tracts by other writers. He wrote also De usu LXX interpretum in N.T. (Upsal. 1730): — De usu accentuum Hebraeorum (ibid. 1733). See Kitto, Cyclopaedia Bib. Lit. 2, 377; Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex., Adelung's Add. 2, 2270 sq.

## Iim[[@Headword:Iim]]

             (Heb. Iyism', עַיַּיםuins, as in Jer 26:18, etc.), the name of two places.

1. (Sept. Αἰείμ, Vulg. Iim.) A city in the extreme south of Judah, mentioned between Baalah and Azem (Jos 15:29), and therefore doubtless included within the territory set off to Simeon, as the associated places were (Jos 19:3), which afford the only means for a  conjectural position nearly midway from the Dead Sea towards the Mediterranean.

2. (Sept. Τα‹, Vulg. Ijeabarim), both reading the same as in the preceding verse.). One of the stations of the Israelites not long before reaching the Jordan (Num 33:45); usually called fully IJE-ABARIM (Num 33:44).

## Ijar[[@Headword:Ijar]]

             SEE IYAR.

## Ije-abarim[[@Headword:Ije-abarim]]

             (Hebrew lyeh' ha-Abarim', הָעֲבָרַים עַיֵּי, ruins of the Abarim., or regions beyond; Sept. Α᾿χαγαί, but in Num 33:44 simply read; Vulg. Jeabarin and Ijeabarim), the forty-seventh station of the Israelites on approaching Canaan, described as being between Oboth and Dibon-gad, “in the border of Moab” (Num 33:44), or between Oboth and the brook Zered, “in the wilderness which is before (i.e. east of) Moab, towards the sun-rising” (Num 21:11), and therefore not far from Aineh, a little south of wady el-Ahry, which forms the southern boundary of the Moabitish territory, and lies near the southern end of the range of Abarim, that give this compound form to the name (simply IIM in Num 33:44), to distinguish it from the lim of Judah (Jos 15:29). SEE ABARIM.

## Ijon[[@Headword:Ijon]]

             (iebo. yon', עַיּוֹן, place of ruins; Sept. Α᾿ϊvν, Αίάν, Αιων), a frontier city of the kingdom of Israel, mentioned as being captured, along. with Abel- BethMeholah and other places in Naphtali, first by Benhadad of Syria (1Ki 15:20; 2Ch 16:4), and afterwards by Tiglath- pileser of Assyria (2Ki 15:29). The associated names and circumstances render the supposition of Dr. Robinson (Researches, 3, 346) very probable, that this locality corresponds to a large ruin-covered hill called Tell Debbin (Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 335), in the present Merj Ayun (meadow of fountains), a fine meadow tract between wady et-Teim and the Litany, north of Lake Huleh (comp. Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846, p. 204, 214; new edition of Researches, 3, 375; Schwarz, Palestine, p. 36).

## Ijon (2)[[@Headword:Ijon (2)]]

             As a representative of this Conder suggests (Tent Work, 2:337) El-Kiam, four and a half miles north-east from Mimas (at the great angle of the Litany); but this is an entirely modern village of about three hundred Christians and two hundred Druses (Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 1:88), and the name has little resemblance. Tell Diblin, the more probable representative, is beyond the limits of the Ordnance Survey.

## Iken, Konrad[[@Headword:Iken, Konrad]]

             a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, born at Bremen Dec. 25, 1689, was professor of theology at the gymnasium of that city, and pastor of one of the Reformed churches. He died June 30, 1753. Iken wrote, Antiquitates Hebraicae (Brem. 1730, 4to, 5th ed., annotated by J. H. Schacht, 1810, 8vo) Thesaurus Nov. Theolog. — Philol. Dissertationum, exegeticarum ex Musceo Th. Ifascei et Conrad. Ikenii (Levden, 1732, 2 vols. fol.): — De tempore celebratce ultinmae Caenae paschalis Christi (Bremen, 173.5 and 1739, 8vo); this work and the following are directed against G. F. Gude (q.v.):--Dissertatio quae contra Gudium demonstratur Coenam Christi σταυρώσιμον vere paschalem fuisse (Bremen, 1742, 8vo): — Tractatus Talmudicus de cultu quotidiano Templi, quem versione Latina donatum et notis illustratume eruditorun examini subjicit Conrad. Ikenius (Bremen, 1736, 4to): — Symbolce litterarice ad incrementum scientiarum omnis yeneris, a variis amicis collatcer Bremen, 1744-49, 3 vols. 8vo):--Harmonia historiceper-pessionum J. Christi (Bremen, 1743, 4to; 2nd ed. Utrecht, ,758.4to) —Dissertationes philol. — theolog. in diversa sac. cod. utriusque instrunentalia loca (Leyden, 1749, 4to; 2nd ed. augmented, pub. by J. H. Shacht, Utrecht, 1770, 4to): — De Institutis et Caerimoniis Legis allosaicce ante Mosen (Bremen, 1752, 2 parts, 4to). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gin. 25, 8 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. 2, 377. (J.N.P.)

## Ikkesh[[@Headword:Ikkesh]]

             (Heb. Ikkesh', עַקֵּשׁ, perverse, as in Psa 101:4, etc.; Sept. Ε᾿κκἰς, Ε᾿κκής, Ε᾿κκῆς), the father of Ira the Tekoite, which latter was one of David's famous warriors (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28), and captain of the sixth regiment of his troops (1Ch 27:9). B.C. ante 1046.

## Iko-siu[[@Headword:Iko-siu]]

             the sect of the worshippers of Amidas (q.v.), the most numerous and powerful ecclesiastical body in Japan.

## Ikonobortsi[[@Headword:Ikonobortsi]]

             is the name of a small sect of Russian dissenters who are opposed to paintings, both in churches and in private houses. SEE RUSSIA.

## Ikriti, Shemarja ben-Ellah[[@Headword:Ikriti, Shemarja ben-Ellah]]

             a Jewish philosopher and commentator, originally from Rome, flourished at Negroponte towards the close of the 13th and the opening of the 14th century. His father Eliah was a distinguished scholar of the island of Crete,  whence he derived his name. Shemarja devoted his early years to the study of philosophical writings, but later he gave his time almost exclusively to the study of exegesis, as the result of which he translated and wrote commentaries on all the books of the 0. T., with the exception of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. His edition of Genesis, to which, according to his own statement, he devoted no less than twenty-five years, he dedicated, with other works of his, to king Robert of Naples (in 1328). The main object of writing these commentaries, which have never yet been published, was to reconcile the Rabbanites and Karaites. Himself a Rabbanite, he held that the Karaites were in the wrong to set aside altogether the Talmudical traditions; and the Rabbanites, he asserted, missed the mark also by not only assigning the first place to the Talmud, but by disregarding the Bible (comp. Ozar Nechmald,Vien. 1857, ii, 93). But, whatever his success may have been with the Rabbanites, he certainly failed to convince the Karaites, who read his works extensively, that the Talmudical Hagada contained a deep meaning unrevealed to the superficial student, or to persuade them that the Bible and Talmud both deserved a philosophical interpretation. Another aim which Shemarja is said to have had in writing his commentaries was the union of the followers of Maimonides (q.v.) with the old orthodox school. He also wrote a Logic, after the Greek style, and a Hebrew Grammar. See Grirtz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7, 318 sq.; Carmol.y in Jost's Annalen (1839), p. 69, 155; Dukes, Shir Shelomo (Hannov. 1858), 2, 4; Kitto, Cyclopaedia Bibl. Liter. 2, 377; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 27 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Ilahi[[@Headword:Ilahi]]

             (the divine) of Akbar was a system of philosophic deism introduced by Akbar, the emperor of Delhi, in the latter half of the 16th century. He proposed to found a new creed on the basis of universal toleration,  combining in one religious body the Hindus, Mohammedans, and Christians, along with the followers of Zoroaster. His object in establishing a new creed was both political and religious; he was the only one of the Delhi emperors who regarded India as his country, and who sought to efface from the memory of the Hindus the fact that they were a conquered people. Ilahi, or the divine system, was essentially eclectic in character. The fundamental point on which Akbar insisted was the great doctrine of the Divine Unity, which he declared was but obscurely revealed in the prophets. But while he thus adopted a Mohammedan basis for his creed, he took care at the same time to declare his entire disbelief of the divinity of the Koran. From the time of his rejection of the Koran, the emperor professed himself to be an impartial inquirer after truth, and accordingly he conversed openly with the teachers of every religion. He finally decided upon a system, which was the revival of Zoroastrianism in a modified form. Having acquired sufficient influence over the theologians, doctors of the law, and learned men, to secure their public recognition of him as the sole protector of the faith, Akbar propounded his creed, which was accepted by several Hinduis and Mohammedans. Encouraged by his success, he now ordered the abolition of the old confession of Islam, "There is no God but God, and Mohammed is his prophet," and the substitution of another, "There is no God but God, and Akbar is the vicar of God." He next abrogated the five daily prayers, the ablutions, fasts, alms, and pilgrimages enjoined upon the faithful. He abolished the religious services observed on Fridays, and dismissed the muezzins. He ordered that that should be considered as clean which was declared by the Koran. to be unclean. He permitted the sale of wine, and the practice of games of chance. He forbade the marriage of more than one wife, and enjoined the postponement of the circumcision of boys until twelve years of age, and even then the ceremony was to be entirely optional. He finally ordered the sera of his own accession to the throne to be used instead of the Hegira. At first he received considerable support from various sections, but his system became more and more unpopular, and, on the accession of his son Jehanghir, the empire returned to Islamism.

## Ilai[[@Headword:Ilai]]

             (Heb. Ilay', עַילִי, i. q. Chald. עַלִּי, supreme; Sept. ᾿Ηλί), an Ahohite, and one of David's chief heroes (1Ch 11:29); called ZALBION in the parallel list (2Sa 23:28). B.C. 1046.

## Ildefonsus, St[[@Headword:Ildefonsus, St]]

             archbishop of Toledo, was born in that city in 607. He studied under Isidore of Seville, became monk, then abbot of the convent, of Agli, near Toledo, and was finally made archbishop of his native city in 658. According to Julian of Toledo, Ildefonsus composed a large number of works, most of which, however, were left unfinished. The only writings supposed to be authentic that we now possess under his name are, De illibata b. Visginis virginitate (in the Biblioth. Patr., Lugd., 7): — two  books, De cognitione baptismi et de itinere deserti quo pergitur post baptismum, a rule of faith and conduct for converts: — a continuation of Isidorus's De viris illustribus, beginning with Gregory the Great, and containing notices of thirteen other writers, mostly Spanish bishops (in Fabricius, Bibl. eccles. p. 60 sq.). One of his successors in the see of Toledo, St. Julian (680-690), added to this a Vita Ildefonsi Toletani, from which almost all our information concerning Ildefonsus is derived. Two letters of his, with answers by Quirinus bishop of Barcelona, are found in D'Achery, Spicil. The Adoptianists (q.v.), in the 8th century, quoted the writings of Eugenius, Ildejbnsus, Julianus, Toletance sedis antistites, as favoring their peculiar views (see Alcuin, Opp. 2, 568). See the Bollandists, Jan. 23rd; Gregorio Mavlns, Vida de S. Ildelfonso (Valentia, 1727, 12mo); Baronius, Annales, 667, No. 5, 6; Baillet, Vies des Saints, Jan. 23rd. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 633; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 811 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. 3, 581.

## Ilgen, Karl David[[@Headword:Ilgen, Karl David]]

             an eminent German theologian, was born February 26, 1763, at the village of Sehna, in Prussian Saxony. When fourteen years old he was able to enter the second class in' the gymnasium of Naumburg; but his parents being unable to give him any further help, he was from that time obliged to depend on his own exertions alone. His struggle for subsistence strengthened his mind, and in 1783, with a good elementary education, he entered the University of Leipzig. Here were written his first essays, which are to be found in the collection of his works entitled Opuscula philologica (Erford, 1797, 2 vols.). He applied himself with particular zeal to the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. In 1789 he was called to the rectorship of the Academy of Naumburg, and so distinguished himself as an instructor that five years afterwards he was called as professor of Oriental languages to Jena, and there he was finally transferred to the chair of theology. In spite of his eminent attainments, his bluntness and dryness of manner prevented his being as efficient in his new sphere of action as he might otherwise have been. His learning was better displayed in his writings than in his lectures. He began to write a work on the “Historical Documents of the Temple of Jerusalem,” for which he intended to make a thorough investigation of all the Jewish sayings, traditions, and fables, and to compare them with what historical knowledge we possess on the same points, so as to secure a history of the Jews, their political institutions, their mode of divine worship, their moral, religious, and intellectual state, such  as would truly have deserved the name of a critically correct history,” but, through the agency of G. Hermann, this work was interrupted by a call as rector to Pforte (in Prussian Saxony) (1802). He held this position for twenty-nine years, and fulfilled its duties with distinguished ability. In 1816 he was appointed counselor of the Consistory. In 1831 he was compelled to ask for his discharge, and retired to Berlin, where he died September 17, 1834. All that he has left us of any value, besides the De Jobi antiquissimi cafminis Hebr. natura atque virtute (Leips. 1789), is a few philosophical treatises which he wrote during his rectorship at Pforte. — Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 633 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. Bib. Lit. 2, 378.

## Ilicet[[@Headword:Ilicet]]

             (for ire licet, "you may go"), a solemn word pronounced at the conclusion of the funeral rites among the ancient Romans. It was uttered by the praefica or some other person at the close of the ceremony, after the bones and ashes of the deceased had been committed to the urn, and the persons  present had been thrice sprinkled with pure water from a branch of olive or laurel for the purpose of purification. From the occasion on which the word ilicet was employed, it is sometimes used proverbially among Roman authors to signify all is over.

## Ilithyia[[@Headword:Ilithyia]]

             in Greek and Roman mythology, is the goddess of birth, the daughter of Jupiter and Juno, born on Crete, in the Amnisian cave, and sister of Hebe, Mar, and Vulcan. Homer speaks of a number of Ilithyiae, daughters of Juno, who send the arrow of pain, but help those in childbed. Often Ilithyia is identified with Juno, which is not strange, since Juno is the goddess of marriage. The Greek Ilithyia was also identified with Diana, probably because the latter, being the goddess of the moon, a certain influence over birth might be credited her. She is also called Lucina, or genetalis. Pindar and Ovid make her the daughter of Juno. In a Grecian temple erected to her she was represented as wearing a loose robe, and holding in one hand a flambeau.

## Ilive, Jacob[[@Headword:Ilive, Jacob]]

             an English infidel, born in 1710, was both a printer and a type-founder by trade. In 1733 he published a discourse to prove the plurality of worlds. He maintained that earth is a hell, and that the souls of men are fallen angels. Before and after this publication he lectured publicly on the same topic. In the same year, 1733, he published another work, entitled A Dialogue between a Doctor of the Church of England and Mr. Jacob Ilive upon the subject of the Oration. In 1751 he published what claimed to be a translation of The Book of Jasher, which he attributed to a certain Alcuin of Brittany, although he was himself the real author (see Horne's Bibl. Bib.). Another pamphlet, entitled Modest Remarks on Bishop Sherlock's Sermons, caused him to be condemned to two years' imprisonment. During his forced residence at Clerkenwell Bridewell, he wrote Reasons offered for the Reformation of the House of Correction in Clerkenwell. Ilive however, did some real service to Biblical statistics in publishing a second edition of Calasio, Concordantice Sacrorum Bibliorum (Lond. 1747,4 vols. fol.). See Gough, Brit. Topography; Wilson, Hist. of Dissenting Churches; Chalmers, Genesis Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bior. Generale, 25:814; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. 2, 1605. (J. N. P.)

## Illatio[[@Headword:Illatio]]

             is a term used in old rituals of the Mass for praefatio.

## Illescas, Gundisaly De[[@Headword:Illescas, Gundisaly De]]

             abbot of St. Frontes, Spain, who died in 1580, is the author of Historia Pontifical y Catolica (Salamanca, 1574; continued by L. de Bavia, M. de Guadalaxara, and J. Banos de Velasco, Madrid, 1678, 6 volumes fol.). See Winer. Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:682; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Illescas, Jacob de[[@Headword:Illescas, Jacob de]]

             (יעקיב דילישקאש), a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished in the 14th century at Illecas, not far from Madrid, whence his family derived their name. He wrote a Commentary on the Pentateuch (contained  in Frankfurter's great Rabbinic Bible) in an allegorical, cabalistic sense, with many valuable grammatical explanations of difficult passages. He also paid particular attention to obscure passages of Rashi and Aben-Ezra's expositions on this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and freely quotes other celebrated Jewish literati, as Lekach Tob, Joseph, Tam, Bechor Shor, Jehudah the Pious, Isaac of Vienna, Moses de Coney, Aaron, Eljakim, the Tosafoth, etc. See Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Liter. 2, 378; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 91.

## Illgen, Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Illgen, Christian Friedrich]]

             a German theologian, was born at Chemnitz, in Saxony, Sept. 16,1786, studied at the University of Leipzig, where he first lectured, and then became extraordinary professor of philology in 1818, of theology in 1823, ordinary professor of theology in 1825, and finally canon. He was particularly distinguished for his knowledge of theological history. He died Aug. 4, 1844. His principal works are, Lalius Socinus, Leben (Lpz. 1814 and 1826, 2 parts,. 4to): — Memoria utriusque catechismi Lutheri (Leipzig, 1829-30): — Historia collegi iphilobiblici (1836-40): — Abhandlung i. den Wlerth der christlichen Dogmengeschichte (1817); and a collection of Predigten: die Veirlarung d. irdischen Lebens durch d. Evangelium (1823). He founded the Historical Theological Society, and from 1825 to the time of his death he edited the Zeitschriffiur hist. Theol. See S. Bruno Lindner, Erinnerungen an Dr. Illgen in the Zeitschrift.f. d. historische Theologie (1845), p. 3; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 814; Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 6, 635.

## Illinos[[@Headword:Illinos]]

             in Chaldaic mysticism, was the second of the three primary principles of the Chaldmeans, created with Anos and Aos by the uncreated from the two natural forces, the creating and conceiving principles, Asoron and Kisara.

## Illuminated[[@Headword:Illuminated]]

             (φωτιζόμενοι) was a term used in the early Christian Church for the baptized. SEE BAPTISM. The apostle Paul writes in two places (Heb 6:4; Heb 10:32) of those who were ἃπαξ φωτισθέντες; and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 372), in its third canon, calls the newly baptized προσφάτως φωτισθέντας. Justin Martyr, in his second Apology, explains the name to refer to the spiritual knowledge acquired by those who were baptized, and there was probably an association between the term and the ritual use of lights in the baptismal service. — Blunt, Cyclop. of Theol. 1, 323. By some, however, the title “illuminated” is supposed to have been given to those newly baptized in the early Church, because a lighted taper  was put into their hands as a symbol of their enlightenment. SEE LIGHTS. (J. H.W.)

## Illuminati[[@Headword:Illuminati]]

             a name assumed at different periods by sects of Mystics or Enthusiasts and Theosophs, who claim a greater degree of illumination or perfection than other men.

1. The first sect known under this name was a party of mystic enthusiasts who made their appearance in Spain about 1575, and who also bore the name of Alumbrados or Alombrados. They considered prayer as such an efficacious means of union with God that the soul of man could by it become entirely identified with the nature of God, so that its actions would therefore be really the actions of God himself; and they further held that for such persons good works, the sacraments, etc., are superfluous as a means of sanctification. (We invite here to a comparison of the doctrines of this sect with the Jesuits, when first instituted by Ignatius Loyola. See Ranke, History of the Popes, transl. by Mrs. Austin, 1, 190.) They were persecuted by the Inquisition, and then disappeared from Spain; but in 1623 they reappeared in France, under the name of Guerinets, a sect very similar to the Alombrados of Spain, a sort of Illuminati, but who, in addition to the mystic belief of the Alombrados, believed in a special revelation of perfectibility, made to one of their number, a friar, whose name was Bouquet. But they also soon became extinct, and were no longer known in France in 1605.

Another very similar sect arose in Belgium.

2. But the name of “Illuminati” was really first given to an association of Deists and Republicans which was founded May 1, 1776, by Adam Weishaupt, professor of canon law at the University of Ingolstadt. This “order,” which, by its founder, was first called the Order of the Perfectibilists, was established on a masonic foundation like that of the organization of the Jesuits. They announced as their aim to elevate mankind to the highest possible degree of moral purity, and to lay the foundation for the reformation of the world by organizing an association of the best men to oppose the progress of moral evil. Practically, however, the “order” soon evinced tendencies dangerous alike to Church and State. In their opposition to religious and political Jesuitism, Which at that time, in Roman Catholic Germany, imposed unbearable restraints on the human  mind, they aimed at nothing less than revolutionizing religion, abolishing Christianity in order to substitute reason in its place, deposing all civil powers, and establishing a nominal republican government. Weishaupt himself, however, was a very honorable man, actuated by the purest motives, and zealous for the religious and political improvement of mankind. The most active disciple, through whose influence the society increased with extraordinary rapidity, was the baron Adolph von Knigge, who joined the Illuminati in 1780. The baron maintained that Christianity was not so much a popular religion as a system exclusively applicable to the elect, and that, introduced by the Mystics; it had found its form of highest development in Freemasonry. Only a small number of the elect were allowed an insight into the ultimate object of the new organization, but the whole system was made profusely attractive to a certain class of minds by mysterious ceremonies and forms. The order aimed steadfastly at obtaining the control of the higher offices in Church and State; and, although liberty and equality were proclaimed as its fundamental principles, it sought absolute supremacy. With a view to reach that end, Weishaupt, who had himself been a Jesuit, finally made use of the same means by which the Jesuits had been so successful.

Thus he sought to win over to his side all persons of any influence; to surround rilers with members of the order; to make proselytes of men weak in mind but strong of purse, while at the same time he excluded such as, on account of their pride or their strength of character, would be unlikely to prove pliant subjects, or whose want of discretion might injure the order. Strict, unquestioning, and blind obedience was made the first duty of every member; every one was under the direct control of his immediate superiors, and knew in fact no other members of the order. Aside from this, each member was subject to a private supervision, which extended to the head of the society; “and the Illuminati were soon involved in a system of mutual espionage, confession, and the like, essentially inconsistent with true freedom, but calculated to place the threads all in one hand, by which the holy legion was to be led on, as it was imagined, to the benefaction of mankind.” Only such persons as were distinguished for prudence, wisdom, complete abnegation for self, and zeal for the interest of the society, were admitted to the higher degrees, wherein the mysteries of the higher order were revealed to them, while those of the lower degrees hardly suspected their existence.

These mysteries related to religion, on which subject they were of the character of naturalism and freethinking; and to politics, in regard to which the aim was to replace monarchy by republicanism and socialism. An active  correspondence was kept up between the chiefs and the members of the order in the different districts where lodges were established. It was carried on by means of a cipher, generally of the usual figures; but the higher orders also made use of other signs. The months were designated by particular names; thus January became Dineh, February Benmeh; and Germany was called the Orient, Bavaria Achaia, Munich Athens. The order was represented by (symbol O) a lodge by (symbol) The letters addressed to a superior were marked Q. L., i.e. Qzuibus licet, to open the letter; if the letter was addressed to one of the higher chiefs, it was marked Soli; and if to one still superior, Prinzo. Each one of the Illuminati was, besides, known in the order by some particular name. Thus the founder went by the ominous appellation of Spartacus; Knigge by that of Philo, etc. The attractions which the order presented by its mysterious secret forms, and the extraordinary energy and Jesuitical acumen which the leaders brought to bear on their undertaking, soon swelled its numbers, and, during its most prosperous period, the association consisted of over 2000 members, among them some of the most prominent names of Germany, and even princes, who, however, could only be initiated into the lower orders, as the higher mysteries of the order inculcated republicanism. The headquarters of the order were in Bavaria, which, with Suabia and Franconia, formed the first province of the association in Germany, and it was not only established in all the principal cities of Germany, but also gained a foothold in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and Italy.

As regards its interior organization, the order was established on the basis of the Society of Jesus, of which, as we have already observed, Weishaupt had once been a member. In 1777 he had joined the freemasons. From the first it had been his aim to connect his new society with freemasonry, for the purpose of giving it a firmer foundation, and with the ultimate object of finally absorbing the latter in the former. Knigge's activity and enterprise finally succeeded in bringing the Illuminati to be considered as freemasons by the craft, bat this step made new enemies for the Illuminati, and ultimately caused their overthrow. Knigge modeled the material organization of the society after that of freemasonry, dividing the members into three classes, each of which was again composed of several degrees. The first, a preparatory class, was composed of novices, Minervites, and Illuninati minores. Any man eighteen years of age could become a novice, and on his conduct depended his promotion to the next degree, which  could be effected after one, two, or three years. The second class, or that of freemasons, embraced apprentices, masons, and master-masons, besides the two higher grades of Illuminatus major and of Illuminatus dirigens, of Scottish knights. These latter had the control of the Minervite lodges. The third class, or that of the “Mysteries,” was divided into higher and lesser mysteries; the latter embraced the priests and the regents, or members to whom had been imparted the mysterious aims of the society in regard to religion and politics. The initiation to the degree of regent was conducted with great solemnity, and was very impressive. The adepts of the higher mysteries were also of two degrees, the Magneus and the Rex, to whom the principles of naturalism, republicanism, and socialism were further developed. These were the Areopagites of the order, and had no superiors but the secret council, presided over by the general of the order (Weishaupt), which composed the highest court of appeal for all members of the order.

A jealous feeling and contention for leadership, which sprang up between Weishaupt and Knigge, and a difference of opinion of the two greatest heads of the society on many points of organization and discipline, hastened the decline of the order, especially after Knigge had left it (July 1, 1784). As soon as the State and Church disturbing tendency, which for a time had remained hidden, became known, the order was vehemently denounced. June 22, 1784, the elector of Bavaria issued an edict for its suppression. But the society continued to exist in secret. When, however, the authorities had succeeded in obtaining further evidences of the dangerous tendency of the order by securing some of the papers of the association (which they published), they punished the members by fine, imprisonment, and exile. Many quit the country, among them Weishaupt (Feb. 16, 1785), on whose head a price had been set. He fled to Gotha (some say Halle), and resided there until his death, Nov. 18,1830. Edicts were again published by the elector of Bavaria, March 2 and August 16, 1785, which, by the severe punishment which it threatened to members, caused the rapid decline of the order, and they disappeared altogether towards the close of the last century (eighteenth). “Great importance was at one time attached to the order of the Illuminati, whose secret influence was regarded as. a principal cause of many of the political events of the time of the French Revolution, and the works of Abbe Barruel and of Professor Kobison of Edinburgh upon this subject were eagerly read, but the highly exaggerated character of their views is now generally  acknowledged.” See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 636; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 519; Grosse Absichten d. Ordens d. Illuminaten, etc., von vier ehemaligen Mitgliedern (Munich, 1786); Nachtrag z. d. grossen Absichten (Mun. 1786); Grundsatze, Verfassung u. Schicksale d. Illuminatenordens in Bayern (1786); Weishaupt, Apologie d. Illuminaten (Frank. 1786); same, Einleitung z. meiner Apologie (Frank. 1787); same, Das verbesserte System d. illominaten, etc. (Frank. 1787); Philo's (Knigge's) Endliche Erklarung und Antwort, etc. (Hannov. 1788).; Die neuen Arbeiten d. Spartacus u. Philo in d. Illuminatenorden, etc. (1794); Voss, Ueber d. Illuminatenorden (1799); Einige Originalschrijfen d. IIluminatenordens, etc., auf hochsten Bejehl z. Druck befordert (Munich. 1787); Natchtragv. weiteren Originalschriften, und der Illusminatensekte überhaupt, etc. (Munch. 1787); Henke, Kirchengesch. 7, 206 sq.; Zeitschriftf hist. Theol. 6, art. 2; Ersch und Gruber, Allgemo. Encyklop. sect. 2, 16:206 sq.; Kahnis, Germans Protestantisms, p. 59 sq. SEE MYSTICS. (J. H. W.)

## Illuminatio[[@Headword:Illuminatio]]

             (sacramentun illuminationis). SEE ILLUMINATED.

## Illumination, Art of[[@Headword:Illumination, Art of]]

             The art of illuminating manuscripts with gold and color seems to prevail in countries where the art of printing is unknown. It has been erroneously supposed to have been originated by Christianity; it is certain, however, that under its sway it was brought to its known perfection. The time when the Christians first adapted the art of illumination it is impossible to determine definitely, but it most probably dates from the time when the ancient fashion of rolled manuscripts (comp. the article THOIAH), which the Jews still preserve, was changed for the present book form. The earliest specimens extant are from the first half of the 2nd century; and we find St. Jerome, no later than the 4th century, complaining of the abuse of filling up books with ornamental capital letters of an enormous size. In the 5th century many of the MSS. were illuminated, especially copies of the Gospels and other Scriptures. They were written on a blue ground in silver, with the name of God in gold. By the influence of Byzantine luxury there were even produced some copies on a gilded ground in letters of black. One of the best specimens of the perfection to which the art had been brought in that century is the Codex Argenteus, or copy of the Gothic (Ulphilas's) version of the N.T. in letters of silver, with the initials in gold,  now preserved in the royal library at Upsala. It is also supposed that at that time the various schools of illumination originated. “Rome had succumbed to barbarian violence, and her arts, though decaying, still exerted an influence in this new style of painting, then in its infancy. That influence was naturally stronger in Italy, and therefore the early illuminations of the Italian school bear traces of the old Roman style. In France the same influence was manifest, mixed up with national peculiarities, and this school was consequently called the Franco-Roman.” But, remarkable as it may appear, it is now found that Ireland was far in advance of other nations in the knowledge of this art, as she was generally in advance of them in the scale of civilization. “Her fame had extended over Europe, her monasteries were adorned with men of great piety and learning, who were the trainers of the leading spirits of the age. She was the first to break through the dense darkness of the times, and, as she gave Christianity to Scotland, so she also imparted to the Saxons the art of illumination.” The first illuminator seems to have been Dagaus, abbot of Iniskeltra, who flourished in the second half of the 6th century. Of English illumination, the finest specimen extant is from the 10th century, the celebrated “Benedictional” by St. Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, written and painted between 963 and 984. In the 13th century, and even down to its decline three centuries later, the art was greatly furthered by Bonaventura's series of meditations on the life of Christ, which gave minute descriptions of the several scenes of which it treated, and thus formed a sort of ideal. During the Byzantine period it was mainly the Scriptures, the works of the fathers, and books for Church service generally that were illuminated. Later, volumes for private devotion were also thus enriched, until, at the close of the 15th century, the art of illumination was generally applied not only to books, but to MSS. of almost any sort. The invention of printing seemed to sound its death-knell, and it is not to be wondered at that the monks, who, being cut off from secular business, and having found employment by the application of this art, then made a strong resistance to the introduction of an art that would deprive them, sooner or later, of their own employment. But the popular mind had become so accustomed to the illumination of works that its extinction was much more gradual than had been anticipated, and the earliest printed books were not only illuminated, but the printers even attempted, by a process of their art, to supersede manual labor. Perhaps the latest effort of this kind was an edition of the Liturgy, brought out in 1717 by John Short, entirely engraved on copper plates. “The pages were surrounded by borders, and embellished with  pictures and decorated initial letters.” See Hill, English Monasticism, ch. 12 where may also be found the details of the work as it was carried on for centuries in the various monasteries of Europe. Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art, 2, 193 sq.

## Illuminism[[@Headword:Illuminism]]

             SEE ILLUMINATI; SEE RATIONALISM.

## Illyes, Andreas[[@Headword:Illyes, Andreas]]

             a Hungarian prelate was born at Szont-Gyoergy, in Transylvania, in the first half of the 17th century, and educated at Rome. On his return to his native country he filled several positions of trust, then went to Posen as canon, and later became bishop of Weissenburg. On account of the political disturbances in Transylvania he removed to Vienna. The time of his death is not generally known. He published Verbun adverbiarum, 74 sermons in Hungarian (Vienna, 1693, 4to): — Vitce sanctorum (ibid. 1693), in Hungarian (Tyrnan, 1705, and often), etc. — Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. Add. 2, 2276.

## Illyrica, Council of[[@Headword:Illyrica, Council of]]

             (Conciliums Illyricum), held in the year 375, according to Ceillier and Hefele, by order of the emperor alentinian. It was attended by a large number of bishops, who met to consider the doctrine of the consubstantiality of the three divine persons, as it had been set forth at Nicaea. They issued a synodal letter to the churches of Asia, etc., confirming the doctrine with great emphasis, and they further decreed that the homousiastical trinity doctrine should be everywhere taught, and all those who should reject it be punished by anathema. See Hefele, Conciliengesch. 1, 716 sq.; Landon, Man. of Councils, p. 266 sq. SEE ARIANISM.

## Illyricum[[@Headword:Illyricum]]

             (Ι᾿λλυρικόν, lit. Illyrian, but the word is of unknown though prob. native etymology), or Illyria, a country lying to the northwest of Macedonia, and answering nearly to that which is at present called Dalmatia; by which name, indeed, the southern part of Illyricum itself was known, and whither St. Paul informs Timothy that Titus had gone (2Ti 4:10). The apostle Paul, in his third great missionary journey, after traversing Asia  Minor and Macedonia, tells the Church of Rome that “round about unto Illyricum (Κυκλῳ μέχρι τοῦ Ι᾿λλυρικοῦ) I have fully preached the Gospel of Christ” (Rom 15:19). The exact meaning of the passage is somewhat doubtful. The κύκλος may be joined with Jerusalem, and signify its neighborhood (as Alford, ad loc.); or it may be joined with the μέχρι τοῦ Ι᾿λλυρικοῦ, and denote the circuit of the apostle's journey “as far as Illyricum” (an expression warranted by the indefinite phrase of Luke, “those parts,” Act 20:2). Through the southern part of Illyria proper ran the great road called Via E'nnutia, which connected Italy and the East, beginning at Apollonia and Dyrrhachium, passing through Thessalonica and Philippi, and terminating at the Hellespont (Antonini Itinzerarium, ed. Wessel., p. 317)

Along this road Paul may have traveled on his third journey till he reached that region on the shore of the Adriatic which was called Illyricum. From Dyrrhachium he may have turned north into that district of Illyricum then called Dalmatia, and may have founded the churches subsequently visited by Titus (2Ti 4:10). Afterwards he may have gone southwards by Nicopolis to Corinth. (But see Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1, 389; 1. 128, 1st ed.) Illyricum is a wild and bare mountainous region. A ridge of rugged limestone mountains runs through it from north to south, affording a fitting home for a number of wild tribes, who now, as in ancient times, inhabit the country. The coastline is deeply indented, and possesses some excellent harbors (Grote, History of Greece, vol. iv; Wilkinson, Dalmatia and Montenegro). Its boundaries were not very distinct: Pliny (3, 28) and Strabo (7, 313) placing it east of the Adriatic Gulf, while Ptolemy (2, 17) divides it into Liburnia, Iapodia, and Dalmatia (compare Mannert, 7:306). The earliest notices state that certain tribes called Ι᾿λλύριοι inhabited the mountainous region along the coast between Epirus and Liburnlia (Scylax, ch. 19 sq.). On the invasion of the country by the Goths, these tribes were scattered eastward and northward, and gave their name to a wider region; and this was probably the geographical import of the name as used by Paul. At a later period, Illyricum became one of the four great divisions of the Roman empire, and embraced the whole country lying between the Adriatic, the Danube, the Black Sea, and Macedonia (Gibbon's Roman Empire, chap. 1). The best ancient description of it is that of Appian (Bell. Illyr.), and among moderns that of Cramer (Ancient Greece, i, 29 sq.). SEE DALMATIA. (For its history, see Anthon's Class. Dict. s.v.) — Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

## Illyricus[[@Headword:Illyricus]]

             SEE FLACIUS (MATTHIAS).

## Ilmarinen[[@Headword:Ilmarinen]]

             the third of the great deities of the Finns, and the god of earth and of metals.

## Image[[@Headword:Image]]

             (prop. צֶלֶם, tse'lem; εἰκών; but also designated by various other Hebrew. terms; often rendered “graven image,” “molten image,” etc.). SEE IDOL. For the interpretation of the colossal statue of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (Dan 2:31), SEE DANIEL, BOOK OF.

## Image of God[[@Headword:Image of God]]

             The notion of the “image of God in man” is one of the fundamental conceptions of Christian theology. It takes its root in the Mosaic account of creation, where we find God saying (Gen 1:26), “Let us make man, בְּצִלְמֵנוּ and כַּדנְמוּתֹנוּ, in our image, after our likeness.” This first expression is again used in the next verse, where the act of creation is recorded, and subsequently also, Gen 9:6, after sin had entered the world. There is consequently no further difference between צֶלְם and דְּמוּת than that the one is the concrete, the other the abstract expression of the same idea. This is also seen in comparing 5, 3 and Gen 9:6. The two synonyms are in fact used for the sake of emphasis, q. d. in exact resemblance of us.

“No one doubts that the phrase ‘image of God' denotes in general a likeness of God; but the opinions of theologians have always been different respecting the particular points of resemblance which Moses intended to express by the phrase. Nor is this strange, since Moses does not explain what he means by it, and it is used in very different significations in- the Bible, a fact that has not been sufficiently noticed. The common opinion is, that this phrase denotes certain excellences which man originally possessed, but which he lost, in part at least, by the fall. The principal texts cited in behalf of this opinion are Gen 1:26; compare Gen 2:15 sq.; and from the N.T., Col 3:19; compare Eph 4:24, where a renewal after the image of God is mentioned, which is understood to mean a restoration of this image, implying that man must have lost it; also  2Co 11:3. Against this common opinion it may be objected that the image of God is described in many passages as existing after the fall, and as still discoverable in men; as Gen 9:6; Jam 3:9; 1Co 11:6-7, and especially Gen 5:1-3, from which it appears that Seth, being made in the likeness of Adam, must have had the same image of God, whatever it was, which Adam possessed” (Knapp, Christian Theology, bk. 1, art. 6 sec. 53, p. 168).

In the works of the fathers we find great diversity of opinion concerning this image of God (Gregor. Nyss. De homin. opif c. 4:5, or 16). Some of the early Latin fathers also maintained a bodily likeness to God (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer. 5,6). The Audaeans (q.v.) admitted only the physical resemblance (Theodoret, Hist. Ecclesiastes 4, 9), while Augustine and the Church of Alexandria rejected it altogether (Clemens, Strom. 2, 19). They also agreed in making the divine image, in a moral point of view, to consist in uprightness before God, and in the harmony between the higher and the lower faculties of the soul; as also physically in the immortality of the body, and the mastership over all other creatures. Others admit a confirmation and strengthening of the image of God in man by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which they consider not only as a gift of free grace, but also as necessary to the completeness of man (Cyr. Alex. Thes. 34. dial. 6). These different parties make great use of the distinction between the two expressions imago and similitudo; the scholastics maintaining that by the inmago (which, though weakened by the fall. was still extant) is to be understood the essence of the innate, natural attributes of the spirit, especially reason and liberty; and by the similitudo (which was obliterated by the fall) the moral nature of man, which was agreeable to God, or, in other words, the thorough unison with the divine will originating in the divine grace (HugoVict. De Sacram. 1. 1, p. 6, c. 2; Petr. Lomb. Sent. 1. 2, dist. 16, D.).

The creed of Trent makes no positive mention concerning the image of God, but the Catechisimus Ramanus considers it as consisting in the peculiar inherent dispositions of the human soul, for after its definitions concerning Adam's body it says, “Quod autem ad animam pertinet, eum (hominem) ad imaginem et similitudinem suam formavit liberumque ei arbitrium tribuit,” which, however, does not satisfactorily explain in what relation this liberun arbitrium (free will) stands with regard to the imago dei (image of God) in the soul. It also leaves undecided the question whether the consequent submission of the desires to the dictates of reason is also to be considered as forming part of this image of God. From the  word addidit we can only infer that the originalis justitice admirable donum is something independent, not inherent (Cat. Rom. 1, 2,19). The Romish theologians still endeavor to maintain the distinctions made by the scholastics between imago and similitudo. “The ‘original justice' is further considered as a supernatural gift, which man possesses by a special grace, so that it is made to counterbalance the natural division between the higher and the lower forces (the spirit and the flesh reason and sensuality), thus directing the forces towards God, and introducing the similitudo in the imago (Bellarmine, De Grat. Prinm Ilonsini: 5, 5). Thus the Roman Catholic Church starts in its theory from the present state of man, as resulting from the fall, in regard to which state communion with God is something superadded. Some Romanist theologians distinguish between original justice and original holiness (communion with God), maintaining the former to be the attribute of pure nature as it came from the hand of the Creator, and holding the latter to be exclusively the gift of superadded and supernatural grace. The evangelical Church, on the contrary, by considering the image of God as belonging to Adam's true nature, as he came from the hands of his Creator, obtains a doctrine at once more clear, more simple, and more true (Apol. 1, 17; comp. Form. Concord. sol. decl. 1 10). It considers habitual communion with God as a state natural to man, and belonging to his normal organization before the fall, not as a special particular gift. It maintains, further, that this original image of God was lost by the fall of man.

“But in the papal anthropology, man, as he comes from God, is imperfect. He is not created sinful indeed, but neither is he created holy. To use the papal phrase, he is created in puris natusulibus; without positive righteousness and without positive unrighteousness. The body is full of natural carnal propensities, and tends downwards. The soul, as rational and immortal, tends upwards. But there is no harmony between the two by creation. An act subsequent to that of creation, and additional to it, is necessary to bring this harmony about; and this is that act by which the gift of original righteousness is superadded to the gifts of creation. In and by this act the higher part is strengthened to acquire and maintain dominion over the lower, and a positive perfection is imparted to human nature that was previously lacking in it. Original righteousness is thus, in reference to the created and natural characteristics of man, a supernatural gift.

“The second peculiarity in the papal anthropology consists in the tenet that apostasy, involves the loss of a supernatural, but not of a natural gift. By  the act of transgression, human nature lapses back into that condition of conflict between the flesh and the spirit in which it was created. In losing its original righteousness, therefore, it loses nothing with which it was endowed by the creative act, but only that superadded gift which was bestowed subsequently to this. The supremacy of the higher over the lower part is lost by the Adamic transgression, and the two parts of man, the flesh and the spirit, fall into their primitive and natural antagonism again. Original righteousness being a supernatural gift, original sin is the loss of it, and, in reality, the restoration of man to the state in which he was created” (Shedd, Hist. of Doct. 2, 146).

The “image,” or likeness of God, in which man was made, has, by some, been assigned exclusively to the body; by others simply to the soul; others, again, have found its essence in the circumstance of his having “dominion” over the other creatures. As to the body, it is not necessary to take up any large space to prove that in no instance can that literally bear the image of God, that is, be “like” God. Descant ever so much or ever so poetically upon man's upright and noble form, this has no more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one: God is incorporeal, and has no bodily shape to be the antitype of anything material. Not more tenable is the notion that the image of God in man consisted in the “dominion” which was granted to him over this lower world. Limited dominion may, it is true, be an image of large and absolute dominion; but man is not said to have been made in the image of God's dominion, which is accident merely, for, before any creatures existed, God himself could have no dominion but in the image and likeness of God himself, of something which constitutes his nature. Still further, man, according to the history was evidently made in the image of God, in order to his having dominion, as the Hebrew connective particle (“and”) imports. He who was to have dominion must necessarily be made before he could be invested with it, and therefore dominion was consequent to his existing in the “image” and “likeness” of God, and could not be that image itself.

The attempts which have been made to fix upon some one essential quality in which to place that “image” of God in which man was created, are not only uncalled for by any scriptural requirement, but are even contradicted by various parts of Scripture, from which alone we must derive our information on this subject. It is in vain to say that this “image” must be something essential to human nature, something only which cannot be lost. We shall, it is true, find that revelation places it in what is essential to  human nature; but that it should comprehend nothing else, or one quality only, has no proof or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is not essential to human nature, and what may be lost and be regained. As to both, the evidence of Scripture is explicit.

(1.) When God is called “the, Father of spirits” a likeness is certainly intimated between man and God in the spirituality of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of Paul with the Athenians: “Forasmuch, then, as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art, and man's device;” plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument against human representations of the Deity; but it imports, as Howe well expresses it, that. “we are to understand that our resemblance to him, as we are his offspring, lies in some higher, more noble, and more excellent thing, of which there can be no figure; as who can tell how to give the figure or image of a thought, or of the mind' or thinking power?” In spirituality, and consequently immateriality, this image of God in man, then, in the first particular, consists.

(2.) The sentiment expressed in Wisdom 2, 23, is evidence that, in the opinion of the ancient Jews, the image of God in man comprised immortality also: “For God created man to be immortal, and made him to be an image of his own eternity;” and though other creatures, and even the body of man, were made capable of immortality, and at least the material human frame, whatever we may think of the case of animals, would have escaped death, had not sin entered the world, yet, without running into the absurdity of the “natural immortality” of the human soul, that essence must have been constituted immortal in a high and peculiar sense, which has ever retained its prerogative of eternal duration amidst the universal death, not only of animals, but of the bodies of all human beings. SEE IMMORTALITY.

(3.) To these correspondences we are to add that of intellectual powers, and we have what divines have called, in perfect accordance with the Scriptures, the natural image of God in his creature, which is essential and ineffaceable. He was made capable of knowledge, and he was endowed with liberty of will.

(4.) This natural image of God, in which man was created, was the foundation of that moral image by which also he was distinguished. Unless he had been a spiritual, knowing, and willing being, he would have been wholly incapable of moral qualities. That he had such qualities eminently, and that in them consisted the image of God, as well as in the natural attributes just stated, we have also the express testimony of Scripture. “Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions.” There is also an express allusion to the moral image of God, in which man was first created, in Col 3:10, “And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him;” and in Eph 4:24, “Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness.” This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing the works of his hands “as very good.” This is pronounced with reference to each individually as well as to the whole: “And God saw everything that he had made, and behold, it was very good” But as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. Without them he would have been imperfect as man; and, had they existed in him, in their first exercises, perverted and sinful, he must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced “very good.” — Watson, Institutes, 2, 9-13.

From this point of view we may arrive at a correct apprehension of the idea of the divine image. God, as an absolute spirit, whose essential element of life is love, cannot but manifest himself in an eternal object of this love, of the same essence with himself. This is the Son, the eternal, absolute, immanent image of God. But as God, by virtue of his unfathomable, overflowing love, calls also forth (or creates) other beings, to whom he wills to impart his blissful life by the establishing of his kingdom, he, the type of all perfection, cannot create them but after his own image, as he sees it from all eternity in the Son. This created image of God is man in his primitive condition. Man was the real object of God's creative activity, as is seen in God's special decision with regard to his creation (Gen 1:26; comp. Psalms 8), and mankind are called to be the real population of his kingdom. The whole universe (and even in some sense the angels, Heb 1:14) was only created for man, which is the reason why he was not created till all other things were ready for him. The faculties which other creatures present only in a limited, disconnected manner, were in him (as the μικρόκοσμος) united into a harmonious whole; moreover, in him  alone (as the μικρόθεος), of all creatures, was the personal spiritual life of God mirrored; and by direct inspiration of the divine breath of life, the spirit was infused, by which he became a spiritual, self-conscious, free, and individual soul. Man was created God's image in his individualism.

As God is not an abstract, but a real spirit, full of the living powers which created the world, so the image of God in man embraced his whole nature. It extended also to the body as the outward image, the dwelling and organ of the soul. Man was created the image of God in the totality of his being. But, while man was thus made the image of God to himself, he was also made the image of God to the world before which he stands as the representative of God, a relation by which the mastery over the outer world ascribed to him in Scripture (Gen 1:28-30) is shown to have an inner foundation. Thus far the image of God was innate in man and inalienable. This innate state, however, bespoke a corresponding habitual state. Inasmuch as God the Spirit is love, man was destined to a life of love, and was at once brought into it by communion with God. From the heart, however, as the center of individual life, the power of love manifests itself in the direction of knowledge as truth and wisdom (objective and subjective directions), and in the direction of the will, as freedom and sanctity (formal and material directions), yet so that these spiritual conditions in their original working produced a state partly of untried innocence and partly of unfolding development. To the body, the image of God procured immortality (posse non mori), as the outward dissolution of the forces (death) is but the result of an inward dissolution of the principle of life. With regard to the world, however, man obtained by it a power, in consequence of which the world becomes subject to him by love, and not by force; and by his knowledge of its nature (Gen 2:19-20), he is enabled to carry out God's will in it.

This habitual resemblance to God, which, with the image of God innate in man's nature, formed the natural, original state of man, was lost by sin, as the life of love, coming from God, which formed its basis, was destroyed by selfishness coming from the heart of man. It could only be restored by the absolute image of God the Son, source of the life of love for the world, assuming himself the form of man. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made flesh, is the real, personal restoration of the image of God in humanity. Since in the flesh he overcame sin for us by his death, and raised our nature to glory in his resurrection, man can again become partaker of the righteousness and spiritual glory which belong to him. By the Holy Spirit,  which fills our hearts with love for God, the image of God is restored in us in truth and uprightness. See C. Sartorius, D. Lehre v. d. heiligen Liebe (Stuttg. 1843), 1, 34 sq.); J. T. Beck, D. christl. Lehrwissenschaft nach den bibl. Urkunden (Stutt. 1841), 1, § 19; H. Martensen, D. christl. Dogmatik (Kiel, 1850), p. 156; J. Chr. K. Hofmann, Der Schriftbeweis (Nordlingen, 1851), 1, 248-254: G. Thomasius, Christi Person u. Werk (Erlangen, 1853), 1, 147-224; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3, 614; Knapp, Theology, sect. 53 et sq.; Winer. Comparat. Darstellung, p. 33; Watson, Institutes vol. 2, ch. 1; Critici Sacri, “De Inmagine Dei,” 1, 40; Fawcett, Sermons, p. 234; Dwight, Theology, 1, 345; South, Sermons, 1, 45; Grinfield, Inquiry into the Image of God in Man (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Harness, Sermons on the Image of God (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Bibliotheca Sacra, 7, 409; Jackson, Thos., Original State of Man, in. Works, 9, 1; Van Mildert, Works, 5, 143; Harris, Man Primeval (N. Y. 1851,12mo).

## Image of Jealousy[[@Headword:Image of Jealousy]]

             SEE JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF.

## Image-breakers[[@Headword:Image-breakers]]

             SEE ICONOCLASTS.

## Image-worship[[@Headword:Image-worship]]

             the adoration of artificial representations of real or imaginary objects. SEE IDOLATRY.

I. Image-worship among the Jews. — It has always been a tendency of the human mind, untaught by true revelation, to embody the invisible deity in some visible form, and especially in the human form. This led to representations of God, or of the gods, as conceived by the mind, in painting or statuary, under all kinds of shapes, such as men, monsters, animals, etc. In the course of time these representations came to be considered as being themselves the gods, and to be worshipped in temples and on altars. The Jews, as worshippers of one God, were by the Law of Moses forbidden to make any image of Jehovah; but the people, corrupted by the example of the Egyptians, compelled Aaron to erect a golden calf in the Desert. After their entrance into Canaan, as the worship of Jehovah was not yet fully organized and accessible to all, they made use in their household devotions of images of the Invisible, and that practice became quite general; but, as the civil and religious organization of the Jews became more developed, this practice fell gradually into disuse, and-it was no longer tolerated under David and Solomon. After the separation between Judah and Israel, Rehoboam restored the use of images in the latter kingdom for political motives, erecting golden calves in Dan and Bethel. In the kingdom of Judah the worship of images found, however, but few partisans. After the captivity of Babylon we find no traces of it.

II. In the Christian Church. — Images were unknown in the worship of the primitive Christians; and this fact was, indeed, made the ground of a charge of atheism on the part of the heathen against the Christians. The primitive Christians abstained from the worship of images, not as the Romanists pretend, from tenderness to heathen idolaters, but because they thought it unlawful in itself to make any images of the deity. Tertullian, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Origen were even of opinion that, by the second commandment, painting and engraving were unlawful to a Christian, styling them evil and wicked arts (Tertullian, de Idol. c. 3; Clem. Alexand. Adunon. ad Gent. p. 41; Origen, contra Celsum, 6, 182). Some of the Gnostic sects, especially the Basilidians (q.v.) and the Carpocratians (q.v.), made effigies of Christ. St. Paul, etc. SEE GNOSTICS.

This example of professed philosophers was not without its influence on the Church, and it was seconded by a similar usage among the Manichmeans (q.v.), and by the steady pressure of heathen ideas and habits upon Christianity. Emblems, such as the dove, the fish, the anchor, vine, lamb, etc., engraved on seals, formed the first step; then came paintings representing Biblical events, saints or martyrs, etc., which were placed in the vestibule of the church. Yet this practice was unfavorably regarded by the synods of the 4th century. When, however, in the same century, Christianity was proclaimed the religion of the state, many distinguished persons embraced it, and its ceremonial became more imposing; and in the 5th century the use of painting, sculpture, and jewelry became general for the decoration of the churches. This resulted in the adoption of a regular system of symbolic religious images. Paulinus of Nola (q.v.) was chiefly instrumental in introducing these practices in the West, and, as the images were at first chiefly used in books intended for the instruction of the poor and the laity, SEE BIBLIA PAUPERUM, who were too ignorant to read, they probably did more good than harm at the time; but as the teachers of the Church became gradually more accommodating in their relations with the heathen, holding out greater privileges to them, and allowing them to retain their old usages while conforming to the outward forms of Christianity, the worship of images became so general that it had to be repeatedly checked by laws. In the 6th century it had grown- into a great abuse, especially in the East, where images were made the object of especial adoration: they were kissed, lamps were burned before them, incense was offered to them, and, in short, they were treated in every respect as the heathen were wont to treat the images of their gods. Some of the heads of the Church encouraged these practices from motives of  policy, while the more enlightened and evangelical portion strongly opposed them. This gave rise to the Iconoclasts (q.v.).

Neander describes the origin of the use of images in churches as follows: “It was not ‘in the Church, but in the family, that religious images first came into use among the Christians. In their daily intercourse with men, the Christians saw themselves everywhere surrounded by the objects of pagan mythology, or, at least, by objects offensive to their moral and Christian sentiments. Representations of this sort covered the walls in shops, and were the ornaments of drinking-vessels and seal rings, on which the pagans frequently had engraved the images of their gods, so that they might worship them when they pleased. It was natural that, in place of these objects, so offensive to their religious and moral sentiments, the Christians should substitute others more agreeable to them. Thus they preferred to have on the goblets the figure of a shepherd carrying a lamb on his shoulder, which was the symbol of our Savior rescuing the repentant sinner, according to the Gospel parable. Clement of Alexandria says, in reference to the seal-rings of the Christians, ‘Let our signets be a dove (the symbol of the Holy Spirit), or a fish, or a ship sailing towards heaven (the symbol of the Christian Church and of the individual Christian soul), or a lyre (the symbol of Christian joy), or an anchor (the symbol of Christian hope); and he who is a fisherman will not be forgetful of the apostle Peter, and of the children taken from the water; for no images of gods should be engraved on the rings of those who are forbidden all intercourse with idols; no sword or bow on the rings of those who strive after peace; no goblets on the rings of those who are the friends of sobriety.' Yet religious emblems passed from domestic use into the churches perhaps as early as the end of the 3rd century. The walls of them were painted in this manner. The Council of Elvira, in the year 303, opposed this innovation as an abuse, and forbade ‘the objects of worship and adoration to be painted on the walls'” (Neander, Church History, 1, 292).

III. Image worship in the Roman Catholic Church. The Romanists deny the charge of worshipping images, or idolatry, which has often been and is still made against them by Protestants. They have always carefully refrained from such doctrinal definitions on the subject as would fully convict the Church of idolatry. In this respect the course of the Romish Church is similar to its procedure with regard to the doctrine of good works, which it presents in such a manner as might lead one to think that it strictly asserts the merits of Christ as alone rendering our works useful, whilst in practice  the believer is pointed to good works as the means of salvation. So, with regard to prayers to the Virgin and the saints, it draws a clear distinction between the adoration and the worship of saints, but practically the prayers of the Roman Catholics are more generally addressed to the saints than to Christ. The same takes place with regard to images. The Council of Trent (See. 25:De invocatione Sanctorum, etc.) states, “that the images of Christ and of the ever virgin Mother of God, and in like manner of other saints, are to be kept and retained, and that due honor and veneration is to be awarded to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honor with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate ourselves.” The council quotes on this subject the second Synod of Nicaea. To this “honor and veneration” belong the solemn consecration of the images, offering up incense before them, the special prayers accompanying these ceremonies as contained in the Pontificae Romanum, other prayers for private use to be repeated before the images, and the indulgences granted to those who fulfill that duty, etc. All this shows that the Romish Church, while rejecting in form the doctrine of image worship, has introduced the practice among the people. The masses do not and cannot understand the subtle distinction made by the Church, and not always strictly observed even by the clergy.

The Church knows of this evil, but places it among things she tolerates for the sake of charity, though she does not approve them. Yet some Roman Catholic theologians appear to have come very close indeed to the same conception as the masses on this point. Thomas Aquinas expressed his views of images in a dilemma: “A picture considered in itself is worthy of no veneration, but if we consider it as an image of Christ it may be allowable to make an internal distinction between the image and its subject, and adoratio and latsica are as well due to it as to Christ” (3 Sent. dist. 9, qu. 1, art. 2, 3; Summa, qu. 23, art. 4, 5). Bonaventura drew a correct conclusion from the principle: “Since all veneration shown to the image of Christ is shown to Christ himself, then the image of Christ is also entitled to be prayed to” (Cultus latrice, 1. 3, dist. 9, art. 1, qu. 2). Bellarmine says that “the images of Christ and the saints are to be adored not only in a figurative manner, but quite positively, so that the prayers are directly addressed to them, and not  merely as the representatives of the original (Ita ut ipsi [imagines] terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur et non ut vicem gerunt exemplaris). The image itself is in some degree holy, namely, by its likeness to one holy, its consecration and its use in worship; from whence it follows that the images themselves are not entitled to the same honor as God, but to less” (De Inmaginibus, 1. 2, c. 10), i.e. the difference between the divine worship and image worship is one of degree or quantity, not of nature or quality. Such theories, although far overstepping the limits of the decree of Trent, are yet freely permitted by the Romish Church; it neither openly admits nor officially condemns them, and thus leaves an opening for all possible degrees of idolatry, over which many an honest Roman Catholic priest mourns in secret.

History shows that the first tendency to image-worship was the result of a slow but continued degeneracy. The same arguments now used by the Romish Church to defend image-worship were rejected by the Christians of the first three centuries when used in the defense of idol-worship. The heathen said, We do not worship the images themselves, but those whom they represent. To this Lactantius answers (Inst. Div. lib. 2, c. 2), “You worship them; for, if you believe them to be in heaven, why do you not raise your eyes up to heaven? why do you look at the wood and stone, and not up, where you believe the originals to be?” The ancient Church rejected the use of all images (Synod of Elkira, 305, c. 36: “Placuit, picturas in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod colitur aut adoratur, in parietibus depingatur”). The early Christians evidently feared that pictures in their churches would eventually become objects of prayer. The admission of images into the church in the 4th and 5th centuries was justified on the theory that the ignorant people could learn the facts of Christianity from them better than ‘from sermons or books. But the people soon lost sight of this use of the images, and made them the objects of adoration.

This took place earlier in the East than in the West; but the abuse gained ground in the latter region in a short time. Serenus, bishop of Marseilles, broke several images, and had them taken out of the church, because he found that the people prayed to them. Gregory the Great proclaims that he does not allow any praying to (adorari) the images, and adds to this that Paulinus of Nola and Nilus had already said that paintings were placed in the church only in order that the uneducated might read on the walls what they were unable to read in books (lib. 9, ep. 105). He also laid down, as a general principle, in his letter to Secundinus, that it was expedient to use  the visible to represent the invisible (lib. 9, ep. 52). But he shows evidently that he is not speaking of a mere objective representation of Deity, for he says that he prostrates himself (prosternimus) before the images, making the well-known Roman Catholic condition that he thus really prays to Christ. The second Council of Nicnea (A.D. 787) decreed the validity of image-worship, and anathematized all who opposed it. The Frankish Church, on the other hand, though it did not forbid the use of images in the church, formally declared against their being worshipped. Charlemagne opposed to the decrees of the synod the so-called Caroline books (q.v.), in which it is expressly said that images are allowed in the church, but not to be prayed to, only to excite the attention on the subjects they commemorate, and to adorn the walls. “For,” as it says further on, “if some enlightened persons, who do not pray to the image itself, but to him it represents, should pray before the image, it would mislead the ignorant, who pray only to what they see before their eyes” (lib. 3:16). The Synod of Frankfort (summoned by Charlemagne, A.D. 794, and consisting of 300 bishops) and the Synod of Paris (825) solemnly condemned image- worship. The latter council even ventured to reject the pope's contrary opinion in very strong terms. During the whole of the 9th century the matter was thus at rest, Claudius of Turin, Agobard, and other of the most important theologians of that period approving the action of the synods. Jonas of Orleans, an opponent of Claudius, expressly says, in his De cultu imaginum. that images are placed in the church “solummodo ad instruendas nescientium mentes.” The Council of Trent, as cited above, recommends images as means of instructing the people, and to incite the faithful to imitate the saints; but in later times the Romish Church has added to this what the Frankish Church of the 8th and 9th centuries had so wisely rejected. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 2, 233-235. The fluctuations of opinion and variations of discipline in the Romish Church on the subject of image-worship are well exhibited by Faber (Difficulties of Romanism, p. 10 et sq.). See White, Bampton Lectures, p. 8; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, chap. 13:§ 14; Spanheim, Hist. Imaginum, Opera, tom. 2; Bingham, Orig. Eccles., book 8:ch. 8; Tenison, On Idolatry, p. 269. sq.; Winer, Comp. Darstellung, 3, 1. See also articles SEE ICONOCLASTS; SEE ICONOGRAPHY; SEE GREEK CHURCH; SEE ROMAN CHURCH.

## Imagery[[@Headword:Imagery]]

             (מִשְׂכַּית, maskith', an image, as rendered Lev 26:1; or picture, as rendered Num 33:52), only in the phrase “chambers of his imagery” (Eze 8:12). The scenes of pictorial representation referred to by this phrase are connected with an instructive passage in the history of Ezekiel and the Jewish exiles, who were stationed in Assyria, on the banks of the Chebar. At one of their interesting prayer-meetings for the restoration of Israel, which had been held so often and so long without any prospect of brighter days, and when the faith and hopes of many of the unfortunates were waxing dim and feeble, Ezekiel, in presence of his friends, consisting of the exiled elders of Judah, was suddenly rapt in mystic vision, and graciously shown, for his own satisfaction, as well as that of his pious associates, the reasons of God's protracted controversy with Israel, and the sad necessity there was for still dealing hardly with them. Transported by the Spirit (not bodily, indeed, nor by external force, but in imagination) to the city and Temple of Jerusalem, he there saw, as plainly as if it had been with the eve of sense, atrocities going on within the precincts of the holy place-the perpetration of which in the very capital of Judaea, the place which God had chosen to put his name there, afforded proof of the woeful extent of national apostasy and corruption, and was  sufficient to justify, both to the mind of the prophet and his circle of pious associates, the severity of the divine judgments on Israel, and the loud call there was for prolonging and increasing, instead of putting a speedy end to, the dire calamities they had so long been suffering (Ezekiel 8), SEE EZEKIEL.

The first spectacle that caught his eye as he perambulated, in mystic vision, the outer court of the Temple that court where the people usually assembled to worship-was a colossal statue, probably of Baal, around which crowds of devotees were performing their frantic revelries, and whose forbidden ensigns were proudly blazoning on the walls and portals of the house of him who had proclaimed himself a God jealous of his honor (Eze 8:3; Lowth, ad loc.). Scarcely had the prophet recovered from his astonishment and horror at the open and undisguised idolatry of the multitude in that sacred enclosure, when his celestial guide bade him turn another way, and he would see greater abominations. Leading him to that side of the court along which were ranged the houses of the priests, his conductor pointed to a mud wall (Eze 8:7), which, to screen themselves from observation, the apostate servants of the true God had raised; and in that wall was a small chink, by widening which he discovered a passage into a secret chamber, which was completely impervious to the rays of the sun, but which he found, on entering it, lighted up by a profusion of brilliant lamps. The sides of it were covered with numerous paintings of beasts and reptiles-the favorite deities of Egypt; and with their eyes intently fixed on these decorations was a conclave of seventy persons, in the garb of priests — the exact number, and, in all probability, the individual members of the Sanhedrim who stood in the attitude of adoration, holding in their hands each a golden censer, containing all the costly and odoriferous materials which the pomp and magnificence of the Egyptian ritual required. “There was every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel portrayed round about.” The scene described was wholly formed on the model of Egyptian worship; and every one who has read the works of Wilkinson, Belzoni, Richardson, and others, will perceive the close resemblance that it bears to the outer walls, the sanctuaries, and the hieroglyphical figures that distinguished the ancient mythology of Egypt (see Kitto, Pict. Bible, note ad loc.). What were the strange and unsightly images engraved on the walls of this chamber discovered by Ezekiel, and that formed the objects of the profane reverence of these apostate councilors, may be known from the following  metrical description, which the late Mr. Salt, long the British consul in Egypt, has drawn of the gods worshipped by the ancient idolatrous inhabitants of that country (“Egypt,” in Hall's Life of Salt, 2, 416). Those who have prosecuted their researches among the rubbish of the temples, he says, have found in the deeply sequestered chambers they were able to reach

“The wildest images, unheard of, strange,

That ever puzzled antiquarians' brains:

Genii, with heads of birds, hawks, ibis, drakes,

Of lions, foxes, cats, fish, frogs, and snakes,

Bulls, rams, and monkeys, hippopotami,

With knife in paw, suspended from the sky;

Gods germinating men, and men turned gods,

Seated in honor, with gilt crooks and rods;

Vast scarabaei, globes by hands upheld,

From chaos springing, ‘mid an endless field:

Of forms grotesque, the sphinx, the crocodile,

And other reptiles from the slime of Nile.”

In order to show the reader still further how exactly this inner chamber that Ezekiel saw was constructed after the Egyptian fashion, we subjoin an extract from the work of another traveler, descriptive of the great temple of Edfu, one of the admirable relics of antiquity, from which it will be seen that the degenerate priests of Jerusalem had borrowed the whole style of the edifice in which they were celebrating their hidden rites — its form, its entrance, as well as its pictorial ornaments on the walls from their idolatrous neighbors of Egypt; “Considerably below the surface of the adjoining building,” says he, “my conductor pointed out to me a chink in an old wall, which he told me I should creep through on my hands and feet; the aperture was not two feet and a half high, and scarcely three feet and a half broad. My companion had the courage to go first, thrusting in a lamp before him: I followed. The passage was so narrow that my mouth and nose were almost buried in the dust, and I was nearly suffocated. After proceeding about ten yards in utter darkness, the heat became excessive, the breathing was laborious, the perspiration poured down my face, and I would have given the world to have got out; but my companion, whose person I could not distinguish, though his voice was audible, called out to  me to crawl a few feet further, and that I should find plenty of room. I joined him at length, and had the inexpressible satisfaction of standing once more upon my feet. We found ourselves in a splendid apartment of great magnitude, adorned with an incredible profusion of sacred paintings and hieroglyphics” (Madden's Travels in Turkey, Egypt, etc.; see also Maurice, Indian Antiq. 2, 212). In the dark recesses of such a chamber as this, which they entered like the traveler through a hole in the outer wall, and in which was painted to the eye the grotesque and motley group of Egyptian divinities, were the chief men at Jerusalem actually employed when Ezekiel saw them.

With minds highly excited by the dazzling splendor, and the clouds of fragrant smoke that filled the apartment, the performers of those clandestine rites seem to have surpassed even the enthusiastic zeal of their ancestors in the days of Moses, when, crowding round the pedestal of the golden calf, they rent the air with their cries of “These be thy gods, 0 Israel!” Beneath a calmer exterior, the actors in the scene pointed out to ‘Ezekiel concealed a stronger and more intense passion for idolatry. Every form of animal life, from the noblest quadruped to the most loathsome reptile that spawned in Egypt, received a share of their insane homage; and the most extraordinary feature of the scene was that the individual who appeared to be the director of these foul mysteries, the master of ceremonies, was Jaazaniah, a descendant of that zealous scribe who had gained so much renown as the principal adviser of the good king Josiah, and whose family had for generations been regarded as the most illustrious for piety in the land. The presence of a scion of this venerated house in such a den of impurity struck the prophet as an electric shock, and showed, better than all the other painful spectacles this chamber exhibited, to what a fearful extent idolatry had inundated the land. SEE IDOLATRY.

It might have been supposed impossible for men to have sunk to a lower depth of superstition than that of imitating the Egyptians in worshipping the monsters of the Nile, or the vegetable produce of their fields and gardens, had not the prophet been directed to turn yet again, and he would see greater abominations that they did. “Then he brought me to the gate of the Lord's house, which was towards the north; and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz” (Eze 8:14). This, the principal deity of the Phoenicians, and who was often called also by that people Adoni, that is, My Lord, became afterwards famous in the Grecian mythology under the well-known name of Adonis; and the circumstance of his ‘being selected  for the subject of their most beautiful fiction by so many of the classic poets is a sufficient proof of the great popular interest his name and ritual excited among the idolaters of the ancient world. It is said to have originated in a tragic adventure that befell an intrepid and beautiful prince of Phoenicia, who was killed while hunting a wild boar, by which that land was infested, and whose untimely death in the cause of his country was bewailed in an annual festival held to commemorate the disastrous event.

During the seven days that the festival lasted, the Phoenicians appeared to be a nation of mourners; and in every town and village a fictitious representation of Tammuz was got up for the occasion, and the whole population assembled to pour forth their unbounded sorrow for his hapless fate, more especially at Byblos, in Syria, where a temple was erected in honor of this national deity. A strange imposture was practiced to influence the public lamentations. There was in this temple a gigantic statue of the god, the eyes of which were filled with lead, which, on fire being applied within, of course melted and fell in big drops to the ground, a signal for the loud wailings of the by-standers, whose eyes, in sympathetic imitation, were dissolved in tears. Conspicuous among the crowd on such occasions, a band of mercenary females directed the orgies; and, in conformity with an ancient custom of bewailing the dead on anniversaries at the doors of houses (Potter's Grecian Antiq. bk. 4: ch. 3), others took their station at the gate, with their faces directed northwards, as the sun was said to have been in that quarter of the heavens at the time when Tammuz died. These violent efforts in mourning were always followed by scenes of the most licentious and revolting revelry, which, though not mentioned, are manifestly implied among the “greater abominations” which degraded this other group of idolaters. SEE TAMMUZ.

Besides the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the orgies of Tammuz, there was another form of superstition still, which in Jerusalem, then almost wholly given to idolatry, had its distinguished patrons. “Turn thee yet again,” said his celestial guide to the prophet, “and thou shalt see greater abominations than these” (Eze 8:16). So he brought him “unto the inner court of the Lord's house, and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five and twenty men, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east: and they worshipped the sun towards the east.” Perhaps of all the varieties of superstition, which had crept in among the Hebrews in that period of general decline, none displayed such flagrant dishonor to the God of Israel  as this (Clem. Alexandrinus, Strom. 7, 520); for, as the most holy place was situated at the west end of the sanctuary, it was impossible for these twenty-five men to pay their homage to the rising sun without turning their backs on the consecrated place of the divine presence; and accordingly this fourth circle is introduced last, as if their employment formed the climax of abominations the worst and most woeful sign of the times. Could stronger proofs be wasted that the Lord had not forsaken Israel, but was driven from them? This was the lesson intended, and actually accomplished by the vision; for while the prophet was made aware by this mystic scene of the actual state of things among his degenerate countrymen at home, he saw himself-and instructed the pious circle around him to see-a proof of the long-suffering and the just severity of God in deferring to answer their fervent and long-continued prayers for the emancipation of their country. SEE SUN.

## Imagination[[@Headword:Imagination]]

             (Lat. imaginatio). “The meaning of this word enters into many relationships, and is thereby rendered difficult to define. The principal  meaning is doubtless what connects it with poetry and fine art, from which the other significations branch off. The simplest mode of explaining this complicated relationship will be to state in separation-the different constituents of the power in question. We shall then see why and where it touches upon other faculties, which still require to be distinguished from it.

“1. Imagination has for its objects the concrete, the real, or the individual, as opposed to abstractions and generalities, which are the matter of science. The full coloring of reality is implied in our imagination of any scene of nature. In this respect, there is something common to imagination and memory. If we endeavor to imagine a volcano, according as we succeed, we have before the mind everything that a spectator would observe on the spot. Thus, sensation, memory, and imagination alike deal with the fullness of the actual world, as opposed to the abstractions of science and the reasoning faculties.

“The faculty called conception, in one of its meanings, has also to do with this concrete fullness, although, in what Sir William Hamilton deems the original and proper meaning of that word, this power is excluded. In popular language, and in the philosophy of Dugald, Stewart, conception is applied to the case of our realizing any description of actual life, as given in history or in poetry. When we completely enter into a scene portrayed by a writer or speaker, and approach the situation of the actual observer, we are often said to conceive what is meant, and also to imagine it; the best word for this signification probably is ‘realize.'

“2. It is further essential to imagination in its strictest sense that there should be some original construction, or that what is imagined should not be a mere picture of what we have seen. Creativeness, origination, invention, are names also designating the same power, and excluding mere memory, or the literal reproduction of past experience. Every artist is said to have imagination according as he can rise to new combinations or effects different from what he has found in his actual observation of nature. A literal, matter-of-fact historian would be said to be wanting in the faculty. The exact copying of nature may be very meritorious in an artist, and very agreeable as an effect, but we should not designate it by the term imagination. There are, however, in the sciences, and in all the common arts, strokes of invention and new constructions, to which it might seem at first sight unfair to refuse the term in question, if originality be a leading feature in its definition. But still we do not usually apply the term  imagination to this case, and for a reason that will appear when we mention the next peculiarity attaching to the faculty.

“3. Imagination has for its ruling element some emotion of the mind, to gratify which all its constructions are guided. Here lies the great contrast between it and the creativeness of science and mechanical invention. These last are instrumental to remote objects of convenience or pleasure. A creation of the imagination comes home at once to the mind, and has no ulterior view.

“Whenever we are under the mastery of some strong emotion, the current of our thoughts is affected and colored by that emotion; what chimes in with it is retained, and other things kept out of sight. We also form new constructions that suit the state of the moment. Thus, in fear, we are overwhelmed by objects of alarm, and even conjure up, specters that have no existence. But the highest example of all is presented to us by the constructions of fine art, which are determined by those emotions called aesthetic, the sense of beauty, the pleasures of taste; they are sometimes expressly styled ‘pleasures of the imagination.' The artist has in himself those various sensibilities to an unusual degree, and he carver and shapes his creations with a view to gratifying them to the utmost. Thus it happens that fine art and imagination are related together, while science and useful art are connected with our reasoning faculties, which may also be faculties of invention. It is a deviation from the correct use of language, and a confounding of things essentially distinct, to say that a man of science stands in need of imagination as well as powers of reason; he needs the power of original construction, but his inventions are not framed to satisfy present emotions, but to be instrumental in remote ends, which in their remoteness may excite nothing that is usually understood as emotion. Every artist exercises the faculty in question if he produces anything original in his art.

The name ‘Fancy' has substantially the meanings now described, and was originally identical with imagination. It is a corruption of fantasy, from the Greek φαντασία. It has now a shade of meaning somewhat different, being applied to those creations that are most widely removed from the world of reality. In the exercise of our imagination we may keep close to nature, and only indulge the liberty of recombining what we find, so as to surpass the original in some points, without forcing together what could not co-exist in reality. This is the sober style of art. But when, in order to  gratify the unbounded longings of the mind, we construct a fairyland with characteristics altogether beyond what human life can furnish, we are said to enter the regions of fancy and the fantastical.

“The ‘ideal' and ‘ideality' are also among the synonyms of imagination, and their usual acceptation illustrates still further the property now discussed. The ‘ideal' is something that fascinates the mind, or gratifies some of our strong emotions and cravings, when reality is insufficient for that end. Desiring something to admire and love beyond what the world can supply, we strike out a combination free from the defects of common humanity, and adorned with more than excellence. This is our ‘ideal,' what satisfies our emotions, and the fact of its so doing is the determining influence in the construction of it” SEE IDEALISM.

## Imam[[@Headword:Imam]]

             a name applied by way of excellence to each of the chiefs or founders of the four principal sects of the Mohammedans.

## Imamate[[@Headword:Imamate]]

             the office of an Imam, or Mohammedan priest. SEE IMAUM,

## Imams, The Twelve[[@Headword:Imams, The Twelve]]

             the twelve Islam chiefs, according to the Persian Mohammedans, who belong to the Shiites. Ali (q.v.) is reckoned the first Imam, and immediate spiritual successor of the Prophet. Hassan (q.v.) was the second Imam, being the eldest son of Ali. He was a feeble-minded prince, and surrendered his caliphate to Moawiyah, retaining only the spiritual office. Hossein (q.v.) was the third of the line. He was succeeded by his son Ali, the fourth Imam, who, from his constancy in prayer, received the names of "the Imam of the Carpet," and "the glory of pious men." He died in 712, and was succeeded by his son Mohammed, the fifth Imam, who was a diligent student of magic, and received the name of "the possessor of the secret." The sixth Imam was Jaafar, the son of Mohammed, who was thought to be equal in wisdom to Solomon. Jaafar nominated his son Ismail his successor, but the heir-apparent having died prematurely, he named his second son Mfsa his heir. Ismail, however, had left children; hence parties arose, some holding to one as the lawful Imam, others to the other. The two sects were called Ismailiyah (q.v.) and Assassins (q.v.). The claim of Mufsa to be the seventh Imam has been generally admitted. Ali, the son of Mufsa, was the eighth Imam. He is called by the Shiites "the beloved," and his tomb, termed Meshed Ali is a favorite object of pilgrimage. The ninth Imam was Mohammed, the son of Ali, who lived in retirement at Bagdad,- where he died at an early age, leaving behind him so great a reputation for benevolence that he received the name of "the generous." His son Ali, the tenth Imam, was but a child when his father died, and having been seized by the caliph Motawakkel, who was a determined enemy of the Shiites, he was confined for life in the city of Asker, from which circumstance he is called "the Askerite." He was poisoned by order of the caliph in 868. His son and successor, Hassan, also perished by poisoning, leaving the sacred office to his son Mohammed, the twelfth and last Imam, who, at his father's death, was a child only six months old. He was kept in close confinement by the caliph, but at about the age of twelve years he suddenly disappeared; the Sonnites allege that he was drowned in the Tigris, but the Shiites deny the fact of his death, and assert that he is wandering over the earth, and will continue so to wander until the appointed period shall arrive when he shall claim and receive universal empire.

## Imani[[@Headword:Imani]]

             is the name of the third sacred book of laws of the Turks, containing the directions for a reasonable conduct of life. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8:830.

## Imaum[[@Headword:Imaum]]

             or Imai is the title of a person belonging to a class of the Mohammedan Ulema (q.v.) or priestly body, but not set apart from the rest of the world like the clergy or priesthood, with whom he is usually classed. He is not ordained, nor is any sacred character conferred upon him. The name is Arabic, and signifies “he who is at the head.” In this sense it is applied even to the sultan, “Imaum ul-Muslemin,” or simply “Imaum,” and is given to the most honored teachers of Mohammedanism, who in the first centuries of the Hegira developed and settled the opinion and law of Islam, as “those whose teachings are followed.” The imaum, whose instruction generally extends only to the understanding of the Koran, calls the Moslem to prayer from the top of minarets, performs the rites of circumcision, marriage, burial, etc., and presides over the assembly of the faithful at prayers, except at the solemn noon prayers on Friday, which are under the superintendence of the khatib, a higher minister (“who is also called, from that circumstance, the Irnaumn ul-Jumuc, or Friday Iman”). He is elected to his office by the people, and confirmed by the authorities, to whom he remains subject in all civil and criminal matters; but he certainly enjoys many privileges; among others, he cannot be made to suffer death punishment as long as he retains his office as imaum. In spiritual affairs he becomes independent. He can resign his office and return to the laity whenever he  chooses. The imaums are greatly revered by the people. For striking an imaum a Turkish layman is punished with the loss of one of his hands, but a Christian with death. In dress he is distinguished from the laity by a turban somewhat broader, made of different material, by a long beard, and by long sleeves in his coat (tunic). See Taylor, History of Mohammedanism, ch. 8; Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8:830. (J. H.W.)

## Imitation of Christ[[@Headword:Imitation of Christ]]

             SEE EXAMPLE.

## Imla[[@Headword:Imla]]

             (Heb. Yinla', יִמְלָא, replenisher; Sept. Ιεμλά), the father of Micaiah, which latter was the prophet who ironically foretold the defeat of the allied kings of ‘Judah and Israel against Ramoth-Gilead (2Ch 18:8-9). In the parallel passage (1Ki 22:8-9) his name is written IMLAH (Heb. Yimlah',יִמְלָה, id.; Sept. Ιαμβλά). B.C. ante 896.

## Imlah[[@Headword:Imlah]]

             (1Ki 22:8-9). SEE IMLA. Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, a doctrine early broached in the Roman and Greek churches, that the Virgin Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin. Bernard, in the 12th century, rejected this doctrine in opposition to the canons of Lyons, but it was not much agitated until (1301) the Franciscan Duns Scotus took strong grounds in favor of the doctrine, and henceforward it became a subject of vehement controversy between the Scotists and Thomists. The Dominicans espoused the cause of the Thomists, who impugned the dogma; the Franciscans that of the Scotists, who defended it. Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan, in 1483 declared himself in favor of toleration on the point. The Council of Trent (Sess. 5) declared that the doctrine of the conception of all men in sin was not intended to include the Virgin. The controversy was revived in the University of Paris towards the close of the 16th century. During the pontificates of Paul V and Gregory XV, such was the dissension it occasioned in Spain, that both Philip and his successor sent special embassies to Rome in the vain hope that this contest might be terminated by a bull. The dispute ran so high in that kingdom that, in the military orders of St. James, of the Sword, of Calatrava, and of Alcantara, the knights, on their admission, vowed to maintain the doctrine. In 1708, Clement XI appointed a festival to be celebrated throughout the  Church in honor of the immaculate conception. It is firmly believed in the Greek Church, in which the feast is celebrated under the name of the Conception of St. Anne; but it was not till 1854 that it was made a dogma in the Roman Catholic Church.

Pope Pius IX, during his whole pontificate, has showed himself the most devoted of the worshippers of Mary. In his exile at Gaeta in 1849 he addressed his famous ‘Encyclical on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception' (Feb. 2) to the patriarchs, primates, archbishops, and bishops of the whole Catholic Church, affirming the existence of ‘an ardent desire throughout the Catholic world that the apostolic see should at length, by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin.' These desires,' he adds, ‘have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing dearer, nothing more at heart, than to revere the most blessed Virgin Mary with an especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship.' A commission was appointed for the examination of the question, under the presidency of cardinal Fornarini; cardinal Lambruschini produced his tract, and Perrone the work — De In 779 caculato B. V. Aarice conceptu; Passaglio also wrote a large essay, and the results of these investigations were issued by the Propaganda press (2 vols. 4to). The special commission reported, in a full conclave of the Sacred College, May 27,1854.

Answers had come from 602 bishops, all favorable to the dogma, though 52 doubted the opportuneness, and four the possibility of a decision. The ‘special congregation' demanded the definition with alacrity and zeal. A consistory of consultation was proclaimed, and held at Rome Nov. 4, 1854; it was not a general council, nor was any authority attributed to it. Fifty-four cardinals, 46 archbishops, and about 400 bishops are reported to have been present at these deliberations; 576 votes are said to have been cast for the dogma, and only four against it; among the latter were the archbishop de Sibour, of Paris, on the ground that the pope had no power to decide such a question; and also the bishop Olivier, of Evreux, lately deceased, who sent in his vote by proxy. On the 8th of December, in St. Peter's, in the midst of the celebration of the ‘Conception,' in the presence of more than 200 ecclesiastical dignitaries, and in answer to a petition presented by the Sacred College of the Cardinals, the supreme pontiff, with a ‘tremulous'  voice, read in Latin the following decree: ‘We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Savior of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and constantly be believed by the faithful.' The cannon of the castle of St. Angelo, the joyful chime of all the bells of Rome, the enthusiastic plaudits of the assembled thousands, the magnificent illumination of St. Peter's church, and the splendor of the most gorgeous festive rites, gave response to the infallible decree. It was a grand pageant, befitting an idolatrous enthusiasm.

The pope himself; with ‘trembling joy,' crowned the image of the Virgin; medals of Australian gold were struck, and distributed in her honor. ‘Rome,' say the beholders, ‘was intoxicated with joy.' An infallible voice had spoken; a new article of faith was announced by ‘divine' authority; the people rejoiced in hope that Mary would be yet more ‘propitious,' that her ‘prevalent intercession would give peace and plenty, would stay the power of infidelity, put an end to insurrection, and crown Rome with higher honor and success.' The controversy of seven hundred years is brought to a final decision; Rome is committed irrevocably to the worship of the ‘Virgin mother of God, conceived without original sin.' ‘Roma locuta est,' and doubt is now heresy. The work begun by the third general council at Ephesus in 431, proclaiming Mary ‘the mother of God,' is declared to be consummated by the papal decree of Dec. 8, 1854, asserting the privilege of her immaculate conception on the authority of Peter's chair.” For an account of the history of the dogma, and a full discussion of its theological merits, see Smith, in Methodist Quarterly Review, April 1855. See also The Official Documents connected with the Definition of the Dogma of the Immaculate Conception (Lat. and Eng.), published with the approbation of the Abp. of Baltimore (Balt. 1856, 8vo). SEE CONCEPTION.

Theology of the Doctrine. — The theology of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary has been the subject of many distinguished writers in the Roman, Greek, and Protestant churches. The greatest difficulties which the advocates of the doctrine have to contend against are really the following three: 1. It lacks the evident support of the Holy Scriptures. 2. It lacks the authority of the early Church, and may well be termed ‘a comparative novelty in theology.” 3. It is directly and most ‘distinctly opposed to the doctrine of original sin. As to the first, the scriptural arguments advanced by the advocates, they are certainly very slight and untenable, and have been virtually yielded by  the best of the Roman Catholic authorities, such as Perrone (De Inmnac. B. V. Marice conceptu., etc., p. 35 sq., 57 sq., 112 sq.). There are only two passages which the best and most learned of Rome have adduced. The first of these is Gen 3:15, the πρωτευαγγέλιον of divine revelation: “And I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; it (she) shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel.” “The argumentation here is curious. The received Vulgate reading, not found, however, in all the copies, is ‘ipsa,' she; while the Hebrew reads םהואhe, or it; Jerome, too, reads αὐτός;' Sixtus V's edition of the Septuagint reads abroq.” The best Roman critics (see De Rossi's criticism in Pusey's Eirenicon, 2, 385) discard the reading as it stands in the received Vulgate.

Perrone, however, contends that it is indifferent which reading is adopted, because, at any rate, Mary could not have had the power to conquer the serpent except through Christ. But how does this prove the immaculate conception-give to the dogma “a firm foundation?” Simply for the reason that in these words a “special privilege is conferred upon Mary,” and that special privilege could “only have been the immunity from original sin.” But the privilege conferred is solely, even on the author's own ground, that she should be in some way a means of subduing Satan, and that she was this as the mother of our Lord. To assert that in order to be the mother of Christ, she must be free from original sin, is purely to beg the whole question. The “Letters Apostolic” of Pius IX upon the dogma sanction infallibly the application of the clause “bruise thy head” to Mar, who, the pope says, “has crushed the serpent's head with her immaculate foot.” Another passage adduced, upon which Perrone lays less stress than on the one already cited, is the angelic salutation Luk 1:28, comp. Luk 1:30, coupled with the words spoken by Elizabeth, Luk 1:42 : “Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with' thee: blessed art thou among women  Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb.” They argue that the greeting Χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμἑνη, translated in the Vulgate by gratiaplena, means fullness of grace in a sense that necessitates exemption, from the very beginning of existence, from any possible taint of sin, and that the same meaning must necessarily be allowed to the expression “blessed art thou among women” (comp. Lie. bermann, Instit. Theol. 2, 833; Perrone, Praelect. Theol. 2, 651). Roman Catholic writers assign, however, no reason why these words should be so interpreted. “They are, in fact, uncritically and illogically forced into the service of the doctrine, and, as hi the case of the ‘Protevangelium' of the  O.T., they offer no real support of it whatever.” As for other passages of a mystical type which are used as a secondary evidence, they would be of value only' as confirming and illustrating any in which the fact was directly and undoubtedly stated, Certain it is that in the gospels Mary is represented as she is, and not as an immaculate being; that neither in the Acts nor in the Epistles, notwithstanding Paul's mute description of Christ's scheme of salvation, is she mentioned at all. The great trouble, in short, with Roman Catholic theologians, is that they transfer the sayings of the prophets and of the apostles concerning Jesus Christ, and all the passages which point to one mediator between God and man, virtually to Mary, the mother of Christ, instead of assigning this position to Christ, the Son of God.

The comparative novelty of the doctrine in theology is proved by history. There is not one great teacher of the Christian Church who, before the breaking out of the controversy between Lyons and Bernard in 1140 that is, Tor the first eleven centuries of our aera-was favorable to the doctrine as now propagated by the Church of Rome. “The question does not exist for them; they know nothing of this specific doctrine.; they speak in respect to original sin and the Seed of redemption in such a way as to prove that the immaculate conception of Mary could not have been any part of their creed. Their praises of the Virgin are often immoderate; they defend her perpetual virginity (Epiphanius, Haer. 78; Jerome, adv. Helvidianum, etc.); many of them believe that she was ‘sanctified' in the womb; most of them declare that she never was guilty of actual sin; but they do not know anything about her exemption from all infection of original sin. Augustine defends her only against the charge of actual sin (De Natura et Gracia, c. 36): ‘Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua propter honorem Domini nullam prorsus, cum de peccatis agitur, haberi volo quaestionem.' This passage is quoted in favor of the dogma, but it plainly refers only to actual transgression, and it is contained in a reply to the position of Pelagius, that there were saints who had not sinned. In his treatise on the Remission of Sins (bk. 2, ch. 24:§ 38), this greatest of the Latin fathers says explicitly that Christ alone was without sin: ‘Solus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, manens Deus, peccatum nullum habuit unquam;' nor does he intimate any exception.

In his work De Genesi, ad lit. c. 18, n. 32, he speaks of ‘the body of Christ as taken from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of a mother with sinful flesh;' and he indicates a clear distinction between Mary's nature and Christ's nature in this respect. Augustine's followers make similar statements. Eusebius Emissenus (supposed by some to be  Hilary) on the ‘Nativity' says, ‘From the bond of the old sin is not even the mother of the Redeemer free.' Fulgentius writes, ‘The flesh of Mary, which was conceived in unrighteousness in a human way, was truly sinful flesh;' and he adds that ‘this flesh is in itself truly sinful.' referring to Paul's use of the term ‘flesh' to designate our common hereditary sinfulness. Others of the fathers make use of similar statements, irreconcilable with a belief in the immaculate conception. (See Perrone, p. 40 sq. Bandellus, De Siygulari Puritate et Praerogativa Conceptionis Christi [1470], a work by a Dominican, contains some four hundred testimonies against the dogma from the fathers: see also the work of the cardinal Turrecamata, De Veritate Conceptionis [1550]). It is, indeed, true that the fathers do not often speak directly upon the point in question; but this is for the simple reason, conclusive against the claim of universality, that they did not know anything, about it. The doctrine is declared, A.D. 1140, by Bernard, to be a ‘novelty;' and he says that the festival is ‘the mother of presumption, the sister of superstition, and the daughter of levity' (Ep. 174, ad Canon Lugd. § 5 sq.; comp. Serm. 78 in Song of Solomon).

Others of the earlier fathers speak of Mary in such a way as is absolutely irreconcilable with the idea that they believed in her immaculate conception. Hilary (Psalms 119, lib. 3, § 12; comp. Tracts for the Times, No. 79, p. 36) declares that she is exposed to the fire of judgment. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen, Basil the Great, and Chrysostom, do not hesitate to speak of faults of Mary, of her being rebuked by Christ. ‘If Mary.' says Origen, ‘did not feel offence at our Lord's sufferings, Jesus did not die for her sins;' Chrysostom ascribes to her ‘excessive ambition at the marriage festival at Cana;' Basil thinks that she, too, ‘wavered at the time of the crucifixion;' all of which statements are utterly inconsistent, not only with the dogma of the immaculate conception, but also with a belief in her perfect innocency (comp. Gieseler, Ch. Hist. § 99, note 30, with the references to Irenaeus, 3, 18; Tertullian, De Carne Christi, 7; Origen, in Lucam Hom. 17; Basil, Ep. 260 (317); Chrysostom, Hom. 45 in Matthew, Hom. 21 in John). Tertullian, De Carne Christi, § 16, declares that ‘Christ, by putting on the flesh, made it his, and made it sinless;' Irenaeus, that ‘Christ made human nature pure by taking it;' Athanasius, on the ‘Incarnation,' teaches the same doctrine, that ‘Christ sanctified his own body,' and that ‘he hath purified the body, which was in itself corruptible.' Of course, the body he assumed was not in and of itself sinless. Gregory of Nazianzum, and John of Damascus (730), teach expressly that the Virgin was sanctified by the Holy Ghost. If Christ, by assuming human nature in Mary, ‘made it sinless,' it was not so before his  incarnation” (Smith, ut sup.). The view which some hold on the title of θεοτόκος, given to Mary at the Council of Ephesus, we think bears so wholly on the incarnation of Christ that we refrain from introducing it here. SEE NESTORIANISM.

Of the numberless passages from the fathers which set forth the doctrine of the universality of sin, and the universal. need of redemption through Christ, without making the Virgin Mary the exception, we will speak under the third head. An additional source of evidence is afforded us by the early liturgies of offices of the Church. “They exalt Mary and her conception but they do never call it an ‘immaculate' conception. It is only in the latest years that the term ‘immaculate' has been introduced into the Western offices of the highest authority. The offices themselves, in honor of the Virgin, did not become current in the West till the 11th century. In the office for her birth, in the ancient churches, it is read that ‘she was sanctified from the stain of sin;' in one of the German liturgies, ‘that she was born with a propensity to sin;' in the Roman Church itself, the office spoke of the ‘sanctification of the Virgin.' This silence, and the late alteration of these offices, are conclusive as to the non-existence of the dogma. In the year 791 (al. 796) a council was held at Friuli (Concilium Forojuliense), called by Paulinus (Paulus), patriarch of Aquileia, during the pontificate of Adrian I, to consider the Trinity and the Incarnation, in respect to the procession of the Holy Spirit, and ‘Adoptianism,' that is, the opinion maintained by archbishop Elipandus of Toledo, and others, that Christ in his human nature was the Son of God only by ‘adoption.'

A long and explicit Confession of Faith was published by this council, in the course of which it is said, ‘Solus enim sine peccato natus est homo, quoniam solus est incarnatus de Spiritu Sancto et immaculata Virgine novus homo. Consubstantialis Deo Patri in sua, id est, divina; consubstantialis etiam matri, sine sordepeccati, in nostra, id est, humana natura' ‘(Harduin, Acta Concil. 1714, 4:856, C.). If the belief in the immaculate conception of the Virgin had been any part of the orthodoxy of the times, it would have been impassible for a council to have spoken in this way of Christ, as ‘alone born without sin;' and the ‘immaculateness' ascribed to the Virgin cannot possibly, in the connection, be interpreted of her conception, or even of her birth; for, if it could, then Christ could not be said to be the ‘only' one of men born without sin” (professor Smith, ut sup.).

No better does the case fare in the medieval Church. “The amount of the argument and the result of the testimony here are, that the doctrine was  first invented in the 12th century, that it was opposed by the greatest and best of the scholastics, and that it made its way, in spite of this opposition, through the force of popular superstition, and from the necessary working out of the inherent tendencies of a system of creature-worship. Some of the mediaeval testimony we have already adduced; we add only the most important citations. Anselm (1070), though cited for the immaculate conception, teaches in his Cur Deus Homo (2:16) that Mary was conceived in sin: ‘Virgo tamen ipsa, unde assumptus est, est in iniquitatibus concepta, et inpeccatis concepit eam mater ejus, et cumn originali peccato nata est, quoniam et ipsa in Adam peccavit, in quo omnes peccaverunt.'” (See also the close of that chapter and the next, 2:17.) We thus notice that, up to the time of Bernard, that is, for the first eleven centuries of our era, no writer of the Church used such strong language about the holiness of the Virgin Mary as he did in his letter to the canons of Lyons (1140) already referred to. He writes “The mother of God was, without doubt, sanctified before she was born; nor is the holy Church in error in accounting the day of her nativity holy. I think that even a more abundant blessing of sanctification descended on her, which not only sanctified her birth, but also preserved her life from all sin, as happened to none other of the children of men. It was befitting, indeed, that the queen of virgins should pass her life in the privilege of a singular sanctity, and free from all sin, who, in bearing the Destroyer of all sin and death, obtained for all the gift of life.” There is certainly, even here, no advocacy of the immaculate conception of Mary. Exactly similar views were held by Peter Lombard, whose Four Books of Sentences were “the theological text-book of the Middle Ages,” and “upon which all the great scholastics made their comments and built their systems. He says (Liber Sentent. 3, distinct. 3) of the flesh of Mary, which our Lord assumed, that it was ‘previously obnoxious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but by the operation of the Spirit it was cleansed.' The Holy Spirit, coming into Mary, purified her from sin, and from all desire of sin.'” Very explicit is also the testimony of Alexander of Hales, the irrefragable doctor and master of St. Bonaventura, the commentator on Lombard: “It was necessary that the blessed Virgin; in her generation should contract sin from her parents; she was sanctified in the womb.”

Bonaventura, the seraphic doctor, the glory of the Franciscans, who died in 1274, and was canonized in 1482, is exhaustless in the praise of Mary in his Speculum and Corona. He sanctifies her veneration in the most rapturous terms. Yet on this question he is also decided, explicitly declaring that “the sanctification  of the Virgin was after she had contracted' original sin;” she was “sanctified in the womb” (lib. 3 dist. 3, p. 1, qu. 2, 3). Albertus Magnus, who taught in Cologne 1260 to 1280, made the same avowals. Bonaventura was the pupil of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus of Bonaventura, and next succeeds the greatest of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas Aquinas, “the angelic doctor,” who died in 1274, was canonized in 1323, and in 1567 was declared by Pius V to be “teacher of the Church.” In his Summa Theologiae, p. 3, qu. 27, art. 1, it stands, “Mary was sanctified in the womb.” Art. 2. “Not before the infusion of the soul; for if she had been she would not have incurred the stain of original sin, and would not have needed the redemption of Christ.” Art. 3. The complete deliverance from original sin was only given her when she conceived Christ (“Ex prole redundaverit in matrein totaliter fomite subtracto”). About the festival of the Conception, he says that the Roman Church does not observe it herself, yet it tolerates the custom of other churches: “Unde talis celebritas non est totaliter reprobanda.” Such is the testimony of the most eminent mediaeval divines, to which we need not add names of less weight. It is not to be wondered at that, in the face of the difficulties to be encountered by the modern defenders of the immaculate conception, cardinal Perrone, “the general rector of the Roman College,” and “the prince of contemporary theologians,” is led to argue that if these scholastic divines had reasoned correctly from what they conceded about the birth of the Virgin, they would have made her conception immaculate; also, that what they teach can all be best explained in harmony with the doctrine; or, if not so, that they taught what they did as private teachers; as also that they were ignorant of antiquity; and again, that their views on original sin were such as allowed them to speak as they did; in fine, that they did not have any guidance from an infallible decision in what they uttered; and that while they were wrangling in the schools, the dogma was making its way among the people.

All this goes to show that the mediaeval testimony is against it; that, as far as the Middle Ages are concerned, only isolated opinions are for the doctrine, and the weight of authority is against it. The only distinct argumentative attempt which Perrone makes to parry the force of their authority and arguments is the assertion that these doctors of the schools, when they speak of the conception of Mary, have reference to what he calls the first, or active conception, and not tooth passive, or the infusion of the soul into the seed. But this explanation is irrelevant, for two reasons; one is, that many of these doctors do not make this distinction, and, of course, they include both parts of the conception in  their statement. They make the distinction between “conception” and “sanctification,” and say that all that precedes sanctification belongs to the “conception,” and is infected with original sin; this, of course, includes the “passive” conception. Another reason that invalidates this mode of explanation is, that some of these doctors do make the very distinction in question, and yet maintain that the whole conception, both active and passive, was in original sin. Thus Alexander of Hales says that “the Virgin after her nativity, and after the infusion of the soul into the body, was sanctified;” Bonaventura asserts that the infusion of grace may have been soon after the infusion of the soul, and Aquinas declares expressly that the cleansing can only be from original sin; that the fault of original sin can only be in a rational creature, and, therefore, that before the infusion of the rational soul the Virgin was not sanctified. In fact, this mode of meeting the difficulty can' only be carried through by supposing that the mediaeval divines believed that original sin could exist in the mere fleshly material derived from parents, an opinion widely abhorrent to their well-known views. We may therefore well say that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary, the mother of Christ, is a “novelty in theology,” for the historical records of antiquity are silent; in the Middle Ages the great authorities are divided; and in modern times, as our historical sketch has shown, there have been perpetual contests and divisions. Twenty years ago hardly a single name of eminence among the Roman Catholics of Germany would have pronounced in its favor. Spain, it is true, continued her devotions, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the papacy.

There remains for us now only to consider the doctrine as opposed to the doctrine of original sin. The very necessity for a miraculous conception in the case of him who was to be without sin SEE INCARNATION is in itself a proof that every person conceived in a natural manner must be conceived in sin SEE NATURE, HUMAN, and the Bible is too express and unmistakable on this point, that all are conceived in sin, SEE ORIGINAL SIN.

In the position which the Roman Catholic Church thus assumes, we encounter again the vital defects of her theology on original sin, that semi- Pelagianlism against which all the Protestant Confessions. have protested as unscriptural. “The Roman Catholic doctrine puts the essence of original sin solely in defect; makes it negative; asserting that it is only the want of that righteousness in which Adam was created; this is, in scholastic usage,  the ‘formal' part, or the very essence of original, sin. Concupiscence is not of the nature of sin. This is the doctrine of original sin, which Perrone expressly lays down in the opening of his treatise (p. 2, 3 sq.), ‘that the essence of original sin is in the defect of grace or of original righteousness.' This is the only view of the matter with which the dogma of the immaculate conception can possibly be reconciled. If this view is false-if original sin, as Protestants hold, according to the Scriptures, be positive and not negative, and come by descent, then the conclusion is irresistible that Mary, by descent, must have had a part therein. The dogma of her immaculate conception is possible only with a false view of the nature of the ‘sin of birth.' Augustine could not have held it, nor could Aquinas.

The dogma is conceived in a defective notion of original sin. Yet again, even with this defective view of original sin, the dogma is involved in difficulties and internal conflicts by what it asserts and implies as to the origin of the soul of Mary. The theory on which it rests is, that Mary's soul was directly created by God. It declares that the Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception,' was preserved immaculate. What is meant by ‘conception' here? It is the so called ‘passive conception,' or the infusion of the soul into the seed, the union of the soul of Mary with the body, prepared beforehand in the ‘active conception.' Whence, now, this soul? It as ‘created.' The ‘Letters,' in another passage, say that Mary was the ‘tabernacle created by God himself.' Pius IX also cites the formula of Alexander VII as having ‘decretive' authority, and that formula declares ‘that Mary's soul, at the first instant of creation and of infusion into the body.' was preserved free from original sin. This hypothesis of ‘creationism' is also the only hypothesis consonant with the doctrine. But now put these two positions together, namely, that original sin consists essentially in privation; that is, in the defect of original justice; and that Mary's soul was directly created by God, and we arrive at the following difficulties and dilemmas. The position is this: When Mary's soul was created and infused into her body, she was by grace preserved free from original sin. Would the original sin, from which she was kept, have come to her from her body or from her soul? — for it must have come from one or the other. If one says that it would have come from the soul, this involves the consequence that God usually creates original sin in the soul before it is united with the body, and, of course, before it is connected with Adam by descent. If one says, on the other hand, that original sin would have come to Mary from her ‘active conception,' that is, from her prepared body, then it was already there, in germ and seed, before the infusion of the soul. God  either creates the human soul with original sin, or the original sin is from the parents. If the former, we have original sin without any connection with Adam; if the latter, Mary must have been really possessed of it. But it may be said original sin consists in defect, privation, and that the dogma means that God created Mary's soul perfectly holy.

This raises another difficulty; for it is also asserted that he created her thus holy on the ground of Christ's merits, and that, had it not been for Christ's merits, she would have shared the sin of the race. This creation, now, must have been either through the race (the connection with Adam) or above the race either mediate or immediate. If through the race or mediate, then she must have had a part in its sinfulness; if above the race, or an immediate creation, then there is no theological, or rational ground for saying that, as far as her creation was concerned, she was liable to sin, or could be saved from it through Christ's merits. Nor can any relief be found by conjoining the two points, and asserting that the exemption from original sin concerns the time or point of union of the soul with the seed, the conjunction of the active with the passive conception. For the still unanswered question here is, and must be this: In the union of the soul with the body, from which of the two, soul or body, would the original sin have come, if grace had not prevented? — for it must have come from one or the other. If from the soul, then you have original sin without any connection with Adam; if from the body, then original sin must already have been there; if from both together, this simply dodges the question, or else resolves original sin into some act consequent upon the union-that is, into actual transgression. Nor is the matter helped by saying that original sin is essentially negative, privative; for the privation has respect to either the soul or the body, or to both conjoined, and the same dilemmas result.

The ‘Letters Apostolic,' in other passages, speak of the dogma in this wise: that the ‘Blessed Virgin was free from all contagion of body, soul, and mind;' that she had ‘community with men only in their nature, but not in their fault:' and that ‘the flesh of the Virgin taken from Adam did not admit the stain of Adam, and on this account that the most blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself, formed by the Holy Spirit.' These expressions imply that the fault in the case could have been a fault of ‘nature;' that the contagion might have been of the ‘body;' that the ‘stain from Adam' would, under other circumstances, have come to her through the ‘flesh.' But in her ‘active conception,' before the infusion of the soul and of grace, the ‘nature.' the ‘body,' the ‘flesh,' were already extant, ere the ‘passive conception' took place: were they with or without the fault? If with the fault, then you have original sin; if without,  then it would follow that the flesh, the body, the nature, before the passive conception, had been already delivered from the bondage of corruption. In short, if original sin come from the race, from the ‘active conception,' then Mary must have had it; if it come from the ‘passive conception,' then God is its direct author in every individual case. This dogma of the immaculate conception, then, contains contradictory elements; it rests on a false view of original sin. Even that false view cannot well be reconciled: it assumes the theory that souls are directly created, and here again it involves itself in inextricable difficulties in relation to original sin. It is opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and it is self-opposed.”

In conclusion, there is left to us only the present attitude of the Roman pontiff, who, since his declaration of infallibility, more than ever, is forced into a position which puts the matter of papal infallibility in a disagreeable dilemma and dualism. “The decree of Pius IX is in opposition to the express declarations of preceding pontiffs; pope is arrayed against pope; infallibility is discordant with infallibility. Not only has ‘a probable opinion become improbable.' but Peter's chair is divided against itself; and how, then, can that kingdom stand? The Jansenist Launov, in his Praescriptions, has collected the opinions adverse to or irreconcilable with the dogma, of seven of the successors of St. Peter, who never change. From pope Leo (440-461), the greatest and most learned of the early bishops of Rome, he cites four passages in which Leo declares that Christ alone ‘was innocent in his birth,' alone was ‘free from original sin,' and that Christ received from his mother ‘her nature, but not her fault;' and he asserts that Mary obtained ‘her own purification through her conception of Christ.' This is wholly averse to the dogma. Innocent III, who called the Lateran Council in 1213, in a sermon on the ‘Assumption of Christ,' comparing Eve and Mary, writes': ‘Illa fuit sine culpa producta, sed in culpa produxit; haec autem fuit in culpa producta, sed sine culpa produxit.' Gregory says (590-604), ‘John the Baptist was conceived in sin; Christ alone was conceived without sin.' Innocent V (1276), in his Commentary on the Master of Sentences: ‘Non convenit tantae Virgini ut diu morata sit in peccato;' and he adds that she was sanctified quickly after the animation (that is, of the body by the soul), although not in the very moment. This is directly against the dogma. John XXII or Benedict XII (c. 1340) says that Mary ‘passed at first from a state of original sin to a ‘state of grace.' Clement VI (1342-52), ‘I suppose, according to the common opinion as yet, that the blessed Virgin was in  original sin' modicca moula, ‘because, according to all, she was sanctified as soon as she could be sanctified.'

“Thus the papacy, in committing itself to this new and idolatrous dogma, is in hostility to Scripture, to universal consent, and also to itself. It explains the sense of Scripture by tradition; and it explains the sense of tradition by an infallible expositor, and that infallible expositor contradicts itself. The new dogma makes the whole of the early Church to have been ignorant of a truth which is now declared to be necessary to the faith; it makes Leo, Innocent III, Innocent V, and Clement V to have taught heresy; it puts the greatest scholastic divines under the ban; and, while doing this, it declares that what is now decreed has always been of the faith of the Church, and that it is a part of the revelation of God, given through Christ and the apostles, and handed down b constant succession and general consent.”

See Smith, in Meth. Qu: Rev. April 1855; Christian Remembrancer, Oct. 1855, p. 419; Jan. 1866, p. 175; July, 1868, p. 134; Westminster Rev. April. 1867, p. 155 sq.; Ffoulkes, Christendom's Divisions, 1, 103; Neander, Chr. Dogmas, 2, 599; Haag, Hist. des Dogmes Chretiennes, 1, 291 sq., 435 sq.; Cramp, Text-book of Popery, p. 104 sq.; Milman. Lat. Ch ristiasity, p. 8,208; Preuss, Die romische Lehre v. d. unbefleckten Emphfadngeiss a. d. Quellen dargestellt u. a Gottes Wort widerlegt (Berlin, 1865); Blunt, Theol. Encyclop. 1, 328 sq. SEE MARY; SEE MARIOLATRY.

## Immaculate-Conception Oath[[@Headword:Immaculate-Conception Oath]]

             is among the Roman Catholics the assurance by oath of a belief in and support of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. It was introduced by the Sorbonne in consequence of the disputes on this subject between the Franciscans and Dominicans SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION, as a test oath for admission to an academical degree. The Jesuits made this a test oath also for other privileges. — Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 404. (J. H. W.)

## Immanent Activity of God[[@Headword:Immanent Activity of God]]

             the pantheistical tenet that God does not exist outside of the world, as a free personal (transcendental) being, but inside of it as the highest unity of the world, because God cannot, according to it, be conceived of without the world. Saisset (Mod. Pantheism, 2, 91) thus sums it up:  “He (God) creates the world within himself, and thenceforth these is no separation of the Creator and the creature, for the creature is still the Creator considered in his eternal and necessary action.” SEE PANTHEISM.

## Immanuel[[@Headword:Immanuel]]

             (Heb. Immanuel', עַמָּנוּאֵל, sometimes separately עַמָּנוּ אֵל, God with us, as it is interpreted Mat 1:23, where it is written Εμμανουήλ, as in the Sept.. and Anglicized “Emmanuel;” the Sept. however, in Isa 8:8. translates it μεθ᾿ ἡμῶν ὁ θεός; Vulg. Enmmanuel), a figurative name prescribed through the prophet for a child that should be born as a sign to Ahaz of the speedy downfall of Syria (B.C. cir. 739; see 2Ki 16:9) and violent interregnum of the kingdom of Israel (B.C. 737-728; see 2Ki 15:30; comp. 17:1), before the infant should become capable of distinguishing between wholesome and improper kinds of food. The name occurs only in the celebrated verse of Isaiah (vii, 14), “Behold, a [rather the] virgin shall conceive and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel,” and in another passage of the same prophet (Isa 8:8), where the ravaging army of the Assyrians is described as ere long to “fill the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel,” i.e. Judaea, with evident allusion to the former declaration. SEE AHAZ.

In the name itself there is no difficulty; but the verse, as a whole, has been variously interpreted. From the manner in which the word God, and even Jehovah, is used in the composition of Hebrew names, there is no such peculiarity in that of Immanuel as in itself requires us to understand that he who bore it must be in fact God. Indeed, it is used as a proper name among the Jews at this day. This high sense has, however, been assigned to it in consequence of the application of the whole verse, by the evangelist Matthew (Mat 1:23), to our divine Savior. Even if this reference did not exist, the history of the Nativity would irresistibly lead us to the conclusion that the verse-whatever may have been its intermediate signification-had an ultimate reference to Christ. SEE ISAIAH.

The state of opinion on this point has been thus concisely summed up by Dr. Henderson in his note on the text: “This verse has long been a subject of dispute between Jews and professedly Christian writers, and among the latter mutually. While the former reject its application to the Messiah altogether-the earlier Rabbins explaining it of the queen of Ahaz and the birth of his son Hezekiah, and the later, as Kimchi and Abarbanel, of the prophet's own wife--the great body of Christian interpreters have  held it to be directly and exclusively a prophecy of our Savior, and have considered themselves fully borne out by the inspired testimony of the evangelist Matthew. Others, however, have departed from this construction of the passage, and have invented or adopted various hypotheses in support of such dissent. Grotius, Faber, Isenbiehl, Hezel, Bolten, Fritzsche, Pluschke, Gesenius, and Hitzig, suppose either the then present or a future wife of Isaiah to be the , almah [rendered ‘virgin'], referred to. Eichhorn, Paulus, Hensler, and Ammon are of opinion that the prophet had nothing more in view than an ideal virgin, and that both she and her son are merely imaginary personages, introduced for the purpose of prophetic illustration. Bauer, Cube, Steudel, and some others, think that the prophet pointed to a young woman in the presence of-the king and his courtiers. A fourth class, among whom are Richard Simon, Lowth, Koppe, Dathe, Williams, Vou Meyer, Olshausen, and Dr. J. Pye Smith, admit the hypothesis of a double sense (q.v.): one, in which the words apply primarily to some female living in the time of the prophet, and her giving birth to a son according to the ordinary laws of nature; or, as Dathe holds, to some virgin, who at that time should miraculously conceive; and the other, in which they received a secondary and plenary fulfillment in the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus Christ.” (See the monographs enumerated by Volbeding, Index, p. 14; and Furst, Bib. Jud. 2, 60; also Hengstenberg, Christol. des A. T. 2, 69, and the commentators in general; compare the Stud. u. Krif. 1830, 3:538.) This last seems to us the only consistent interpretation. That the child to be so designated was one soon to be born and already spoken of is clear from the entire context and drift of the prophecy. It can be no other than the Maher-shalal-hash-baz (q.v.), the offspring of the prophet's own marriage with the virgin prophetess, who thus became an eminent type of the Messiah's mother (Isa 8:18). SEE VIRGIN.

## Immanuel, ben-Salomon Romi[[@Headword:Immanuel, ben-Salomon Romi]]

             a Jewish philosopher, commentator, and poet, was born at Rome about 1265. Endowed with great natural ability, and with a fondness for study, he soon made himself master of Biblical and Talmudic, as well as of Grecian and Latin literature. He was a contemporary of Dante, and, being much given to a cultivation of the same art in which Dante immortalized his name, “the two spirits, kindred, and yet different in many respects, formed a mutual and intimate attachment.” He died about 1330. Immanuel wrote commentaries on the whole Jewish Bible, excepting the minor prophets and  Ezra. They are enriched not only by valuable grammatical and archaeological notes, but contain also some able remarks on the nature and spirit of the poetical books. ‘It is greatly to be regretted that of all his exegetical works, which are in different public libraries of Europe, the Commentary on Proverbs and Some Glosses on the Psalms are the only ones as yet published, the former in Naples in 1486, and the latter in Parma in 1806. The introduction of his commentary on the Song of Songs has been published, with an English translation, by Ginsburg: Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs (Lond. 1857, p. 49-55)” (Ginsburg in Kitto). He wrote also some philosophical treatises, and translated for his Jewish brethren the philosophical writings of Albertus the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and other celebrated philosophers. See Gratz, Gesch. der Juden. 7, 307 sq.; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1839, iv. 194 sq.; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 92 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Immateriality[[@Headword:Immateriality]]

             is a quality of God and of the human soul. The immateriality of God denotes that he forms an absolute contrast to matter; he is simple, and has no parts, and so cannot be dissolved; matter, on the other hand, is made up of parts into which it can be resolved. God is also free from the limitations to which matter is subject, i.e. from the limits of space and time. The immateriality of God is therefore the basis of the qualities of eternity, omnipresence, and unchangeableness. Thus the immateriality of the soul includes likewise simplicity as another of its qualities. This, of course, does not absolutely set it above the limitations of space and time, since the soul needs the body for a necessary organ of its life; nor does it set aside any further development, but it certainly includes indestructibility, and thus serves as a proof of immortality (q.v.). The materiality of the soul was asserted by Tertullian, Arnobins, and others, during the first three centuries. Near the close of the fourth, the immateriality of the soul was maintained by Augustine, Nemesius, and Mamertfus Claudianus. See Guizot, History of Civilization, 1, 394; Krauth, Vocab. of Philos. p. 245. SEE IMMENSITY OF GOD; SEE SOUL, TRADUCTION OF.

## Immediate Imputation of Sin[[@Headword:Immediate Imputation of Sin]]

             SEE IMPUTATION.

## Immensity of God[[@Headword:Immensity of God]]

             is explained by Dr. J. Pye Smith (First Lines of Christ. Theol. p. 138) to be the absolute necessity of being, considered in relation to space. ‘There is with God no diffusion nor contraction, no extension nor circumspection, or any such relation to space as belongs to limited natures. God is equally near to, and equally far from, every point of space and every atom of the universe. He is universally and immediately present, not as a body, but as a spirit; not by motion, or penetration, or filling, as would be predicated of a diffused fluid, or in any way as if the infinity of God were composed of a countless number of finite parts, but in a way peculiar to his own spiritual and perfect nature, and of which we can form no conception.” In the passages of Job 11:7-9; 1Ki 8:27 (2Ch 6:18); Psa 139:7-13; Isa 66:1; Jer 23:23-24; Amo 9:2-3; Mat 6:4; Mat 6:6; Act 17:24; Act 17:27-28; also Isa 40:12-15; Isa 40:21-22; Isa 40:25-26, “the representations are such as literally indicate a kind of diffused and filling subtle material; but this is the condescending manner of the Scriptures, and is evidently to be understood with an exclusion of material ideas. Metaphysical or philosophical preciseness is not in the character of scriptural composition, nor would it ever suit the bulk of mankind; and no language or conceptions of men can reach the actual expression of the truth, or be any other than analogical. When the Scriptures speak of “God being in heaven,” they mean his supremacy in all perfection, and his universal dominion.”

Immensity and omnipresence, again, are distinguished in that “the former is absolute, being the necessary inherent perfection of the Deity in itself, as infinitely exalted above all conception of space; and that the latter is relative, arising out of the position of a created world. The moment that world commenced, or the first created portion of it, there was and ever remains the divine presence (συνουσία, αδεσσεντια).”

The qualities of extension and divisibility are those of body, not of a pure, proper, highest spirit. “Socinus and his immediate followers denied a proper ubiquity, immensity, or omnipresence to the essence or substance of the Deity, and represented the universal presence of God spoken of in Scripture as denoting only the acts and effects of his power, favor, and aid.” Des Cartes and his followers held “that the essence of the Deity is thought, and that it has no relation to space.” See J. Pye Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, edited by W. Farrar (2nd ed. Lond. 1861);  Augustine, De Civ. Dei, 20; Bretschneider, Dogmatik, 1, 396 sq. SEE OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.

## Immer[[@Headword:Immer]]

             (Heb. Immer', אַמֵּר, talkative, or, according to Furst, high; Sept. Ε᾿μμἡρ), the name of several priests, mostly near the time of the Exile.

1. The head of the sixteenth sacerdotal division; according to David's appointment (1Ch 24:14). B.C. 1014.

2. The father of Pashur, which latter so grossly misused the prophet Jeremiah (Jer 20:1). B.C. ante 607. By many the name is regarded here as put patronymically for the preceding.

3. One whose descendants to the number of 1052 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra 2, 37; Neh 7:40). He is very possibly. the same with the father of Meshillemoth (Neh 11:13) or Meshillemith (1Ch 9:12), certain of whose descendants took a conspicuous part in the sacred duties at Jerusalem after the Exile; and probably the same with the one some of whose descendants divorced their Gentile wives at the instance of Ezra (Ezr 10:20). B.C. much ante 536. By some he is identified with the two preceding.

4. One who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon, but was unable to prove his Israelitish descent (Ezr 2:59; Neh 7:61). B.C. 536. It does not clearly appear, however, that he claimed to belong to the priestly order, and it is possible that the name is only given as that of a place in the Babylonian dominions from which some of those named in the following verses came.

5. The father of Zadok, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh 3:29). B.C. ante 446. — He was, perhaps, the same as No. 3.

Immersion, the act of plunging into water, especially the person of the candidate in Christian baptism, as performed by the Baptist (q.v.) denomination, and occasionally by others. There are two controversies that require to be noticed under this head.

I. Is this mode or act essential to the validity of the ordinance itself? — The affirmative of this question is maintained by those denominationally  styled “Baptists,” and is denied by nearly all other classes of Christians. For the arguments on both sides, see the article SEE BAPTISM.

II. Are the terms “immerse,” “immersion,” etc. preferable or more correct in a version of the Scriptures, than “baptize,” “baptism,” etc.? — The affirmative of this question is taken by many, but not by all Baptists, and it is approved, to some extent at least, by certain scholars in most other denominations, while the negative is held by the vast majority of Bible readers. The change was actually made by Dr. Campbell in his work on the Gospels, and recently a systematic effort has been made on a large scale to give currency to the alteration by the translations put forth under the auspices of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. SEE BIBLE SOCIETIES, 5. The arguments for this rendering are set forth in all their strength by Dr. Conant, in a note to his translation of Mat 2:6, as follows (to each of which we subjoin the counter arguments):

“1. This word expressed a particular act, viz. immersion in a fluid or any yielding substance. See the Appendix to this volume, sections 1-3.” The Appendix thus referred to is Dr. Conant's treatise On the Meaning and Use of Baptism, etc. The proofs there given, however, do not seem to sustain this precise point; the passages cited do indeed show that βαπτίζειν means to whelm or envelop with a liquid, but do not indicate any uniform method, such as dipping, plunging; nor do they necessarily imply motion on the part of the subject into the fluid, as “‘immersion” clearly does.

“2. The word had no other meaning; it expressed this act, either literally or in a metaphorical sense, through the whole period of its use in Greek literature. Append. sect. 3.” This assertion is palpably refuted by the fact that Dr. Conant himself, in but a part of these very quotations here appealed to, has ventured to render βαπτίζειν by “immerse;” for he is very frequently constrained to translate it “immerge,” “submerge,” “dip,” “plunge, “imbathe,” “whelm,” etc. These words, it is true, have the same general signification; but, supposing that they were in every case suitable renderings (which in many cases they are not), yet they do not establish the identical point in dispute, namely, the exclusive translation by “immerse,” etc. as if “the word had no other meaning.”

“3. Its grammatical construction with other words, and the circumstances connected with its use, accord entirely with this meaning, and exclude  every other. Append. sect. 3:2.” On the contrary, the prepositions and cases by which it is followed, being generally iv with the dative, indicate precisely the opposite conclusion; insomuch that in even the comparatively few instances where “immerse” can be given as a rendering at all, it is scarcely allowable except by the ambiguity “immersed in,” which in English is used for “immersed into.” In the Greek language, as every scholar knows, no such imprecision exists.

“4. In the age of Christ and his apostles, as in all periods of the language, it was in common use to express the most familiar acts and occurrences of everyday life; as, for example, immersing an axe in water, to harden it; wool in a dye, to color it; an animal in water, to drown it; a ship submerged in the waves; rocks immersed in the tide; and (metaphorically) immersed in cares, in sorrow, in ignorance, in poverty, in debt, in stupor and sleep, etc. Append. sect. 3:1.” Rather these examples should be rendered, an axe tempered by cold water, wool tinged with dye, drowned in water, sunk by the waves, covered with the tide, overwhelmed with cares, etc. The familiarity of the word is another matter, belonging to the next argument.

“5. There was nothing sacred in the word itself, or in the act which it expressed. The idea of sacredness belonged solely to the relation in which the act was performed. Append. sect. 4:7.” This fact is no good reason why, when it is manifestly employed in such sacred relations, it should not be rendered by a term appropriate to such a sacredness. This argument applies only to those passages in which the word occurs in a secular sense; about these there is no dispute.

“6. In none of these respects does the word baptize, as used by English writers, correspond with the original Greek word.” This has already been met in substance above. The remainder of the arguments, with one exception, need not be reproduced, as they are of a doctrinal character, aimed at the odium theoloaicum, which is a method of reasoning inconclusive, if not unworthy in a philological question.

“11. In rendering the Greek word by immerse, I follow the example of the leading vernacular versions, made from the Greek, in the languages of Continental Europe, and also of the critical versions made for the use of the learned.” Facts, however, do not support this claim with any uniformity. The modern versions, of course, render according to the theological leanings of their authors, and, were they unanimous, they could  not be permitted to decide a question of this kind by authority. The best and oldest guides, the early Latins, freely transfer the term baptizo, giving it a regular termination like other native verbs; they rarely, if ever, render by “immergo,” “immersio,” etc., but usually give “tingo,” or, at most, “mergo.” See Dale, Classic Baptism (Philad. 1867), which thoroughly reviews the instances of the use of βαπτίζω. In a subsequent volume, Judaic Baptism (Philad. 1870), Dr. Dale meets the whole controversy in question, and proves conclusively the incorrectness of translating βαπτίζω by “immerse.”

There are other positive arguments against the substitution of “immerse” as an equivalent to βαπτίζειν

1. The word is no more English than “baptize;” one is of Latin derivation, and the other Greek, while neither is of Saxon origin. Yet both are perfectly intelligible, and it is pretty certain that, but for the advantage which “immerse” gives to one party in polemics, it would never have been thought worth while to make the exchange.

2. “Immerse,” as a compound word, does not correspond etymologically with the Greek. There is nothing answering to the “in” in βαπτίζω; it should have been ἐμβαπτίζω (which seldom occurs), or, rather, εἰσβαπτίζω (which is never used at all, obviously on account of the incongruity between the native force of the primitive, and the motion inherently implied in εἰς).

3. The outrageous awkwardness of such phrases as “he will immerse you in holy spirit and fire” (sic Conant), rendered necessary by this change, is a sufficient critical objection to the proposed rendering, were there no other argument against it. A theory that breaks down in this shocking manner the moment it is applied deserves only a summary rejection.

4. These translators are consistent with themselves in rejecting the expression “John the Baptist,” calling him instead John the Immerser. But they ought to go one step further, and themselves abjure the title of “Baptists,” which they pre-eminently arrogate, and should name themselves appropriately “the Immersionists.” It is highly creditable that the mass of that large denomination are not disposed to be drawn into this specious innovation.

## Immer, Albert[[@Headword:Immer, Albert]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born August 10, 1804, at Unterseen, Switzerland. He studied at Berne, was in 1838 vicar at Burgdorf, in 1840 pastor at Buren, and in 1850 professor of theology at Berne. In 1881 he retired from his professorship, and died March 23, 1884. Besides some theological essays and lectures, he published Hermeneutik des Neuen Testaments (Wittenberg, 1873; Engl. translation by A.H. Newman, Andover, 1877): — Neutestamentliche Theologie (Bonn, 1877). (B.P.)

## Immolation[[@Headword:Immolation]]

             (Lat. immolatio) is the name of a ceremony performed in the sacrifices of the Romans. It consisted in throwing some sort of corn or frankincense, together with the mola or salt cake, and a little wine, on the head of the victim. See Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art, 2, 197. SEE SACRIFICE. (J. H.W.)

## Immorality[[@Headword:Immorality]]

             SEE MORALS.

## Immortality[[@Headword:Immortality]]

             is the perpetuity of existence after it has once begun (Lat. immortalitas, not dying). ‘‘If a man die, shall he live again?' is a question which has naturally agitated the heart and stimulated the intellectual curiosity of man, wherever he has risen above a state of barbarism, and commenced to exercise his intellect at all.” Without such a belief, Max Muller (Chips from a German Workshop, 1, 45) well says, “religion surely is like an arch resting on one pillar, like a bridge ending in an abyss.” It is very gratifying, therefore, to the believer, and a fact worthy of notice, that the affirmative on this question is assumed more or less by all the nations of earth, so far as our information reaches at the present day, although, it is true, their views often assume very vague and even materialistic forms.

I. Ideas of rude Nations. — We concede that the views of most rude heathen nations, both ancient and modern, respecting the state of man after death are indeed dark and obscure, as well as their notions respecting the nature of the soul itself, which some of them regard as a kind of aerial substance, resembling the body, though of a finer material. Still it is found that the greater part of mankind, even of those who are entirely uncultivated, though they may be incapable of the higher philosophical idea of the personal immortality of the soul, are yet inclined to believe at least that the soul survives the body, and continues either forever, or at east for a very long time. This faith seems to rest in uncultivated nations, or, better perhaps, races,

1, upon the love of life, which is deeply planted in the human breast, and leads to the wish and hope that life will be continued even beyond the grave;

2, upon traditions transmitted from their ancestors;

3, upon dreams, in which the dead appear speaking or acting, and thus confirming both wishes and traditions. SEE NECROMANCY.

1. Hindus. — In the sacred books of the Hindus called the Veda, “immortality of the soul, as well as personal immortality and personal responsibility after death, is clearly proclaimed” (Miller, Chips, 1, 45). (We have here a refutation of the opinion that has hitherto been entertained, that the goal of Hinduism is absorption [q.v.] into the Universal Spirit, and therefore loss of individual existence, and that the Hindus as well as Brahmans believe in the transmigration [q.v.] of the soul, and a refutation by a writer who is most competent to speak. Professor Roth, another great Sanskrit scholar, in an article in the Journal of the German Oriental Society [iv, 427], corroborates Prof. Muller in these words: “We here [in the Veda] find, not without astonishment, beautiful conceptions on immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the view which has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Persia was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter. As if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able [which Müller (2, 267) holds] to arrive at it by its own strength.”)

Thus we find these passages: “He who gives alms goes to the highest place in heaven; he goes to the gods” (Rev. 1, 125, 56). “Even the idea, so frequent in the later literature of the Brahmans, that immortality is secured by a son, seems implied, unless our translation deceives us, in one passage of the Veda (7, 56, 24): ‘O Maruts, may there be to us a strong son, who is a living ruler of men; through whom we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode; then may we come to your own house!' One poet prays that he may see again his father and mother after death (Rev 1:2; Rev 4:1); and the fathers are invoked almost like gods, oblations are offered to them, and they are believed to enjoy, in company with the gods, a life of never-ending felicity. We find this prayer addressed to Soma (Rev 9:1; Rev 13:7): ‘Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortal, imperishable world place me, O Soma! Where king Vaivasvata reigns, where the secret plague of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal! Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal! Where wishes and desires are, where the bowl of the bright Soma is, where there is food and rejoicing,  there make me immortal! Where there is happiness and delight, where joy. and pleasure reside, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal!'”

2. Chinese. — While it is true that Confucius himself did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, that he rather purposely seems to have avoided entering upon this subject at all, taking it most probably like Moses, as we shall see below, simply for granted (comp. Muller, Chips, 1, 308), it is nevertheless implied in the worship which the Chinese pay to their ancestors. Another evidence, it seems to us, is given by the absence of the word death from the writings of Confucius (q.v.). When a person dies, the Chinese say “he has returned to his family.” “The spirits of the good were, according to him (Confucius), permitted to visit their ancient habitations on earth, or such ancestral halls or places as were appointed by their descendants, to receive homage and confer benefactions. Hence the duty of performing rites in such places, under the penalty, in the case of those who, while living, neglect such duty, of their spiritual part being deprived after death of the supreme bliss flowing from the homage of descendants” (Legge, Life and Teachings of Confucius, Philadelphia, 1867, 12mo).

3. Egyptians. — Perhaps we may say that the idea of immortality assumed a more definite shape among the Egyptians, for they clearly recognized not only a dwelling-place of the dead; but also a future judgment. “Osiris, the beneficent god, judges the dead, and, ‘having weighed their heart in the scales of justice, he sends the wicked to regions of darkness, while the just are sent to dwell with the god of light.' The latter, we read on an inscription, ‘found favor before the great God; they dwell in glory, where they live a heavenly life; the bodies they have quitted will forever repose in their tombs, while they rejoice in the life of the supreme God.' Immortality was thus plainly taught, although bound up with it was the idea of the preservation of the body, to which they attached great importance, as a condition of the soul's continued life; and hence they built vast tombs, and embalmed their bodies, as if to last forever.”

4. Persians. — In the religion of the Persians, also, at least since, if not previous to the time of Zoroaster, a prominent part is assigned to the existence of a future world, with its governing spirits. “Under Ormuz and Ahriman there are ranged regular hierarchies of spirits engaged in a perpetual conflict; and the soul passes into the kingdom of light or of  darkness, over which these spirits respectively preside, according as it has lived on the earth well or ill. Whoever has lived in purity, and has not suffered the divs (evil spirits) to have any power over him, passes after death into the realms of light.”

5. American Indians. — The native tribes of the lower part of South America believe in two great powers of good and evil, but likewise in a number of inferior deities. These are supposed to have been the creators and ancestors of different families, and hence, when an Indian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who presides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, Researches into the early History of Mankind, and the Development of Civilization, Lond. 1868). Another American tribe of Indians, the Mandans, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: “The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterraneous lake.

A grapevine ‘extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buffalo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight and closed upon herself and the rest of the nation the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die. to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the sins of the wicked will not enable them to cross” (Tyler). The Choctaw tribe's belief in a future state is equally curious. “They hold that the spirit lives after death, and that it has a great distance to travel towards the west; that it has to cross a dreadful, deep, and rapid stream, over which, from hill to hill, there lies a long, slippery pine log, with the bark peeled off. Over this the dead have to pass before they reach the delightful hunting grounds. The good walk on safely, though six people from the other side throw stones at them: but the wicked, trying to dodge the stones, slip off the log, and fall thousands of feet into the water which is dashing over the rocks” (see Brinton, p. 233 sq.).

6. Polynesians. — The natives of Polynesia “imagine that the sky descends at the horizon and incloses the earth. Hence they call foreigners ‘palangi' or ‘heaven-bursters,' as having broken in from another world outside. According to their views, we live upon the ground floor of a great house, with upper stories rising one over another above us, and cellars down below. There are holes in the ceiling to let the rain through, and as men are supposed to visit the dwellers above, the dwellers from below are believed to come sometimes up to the surface, and likewise to receive visits from men in return.”

7. New Hollanders. — The native tribes of Australia believe that all who are good men, and have been properly buried, enter heaven after death. “Heaven, which is the abode of the two good divinities, is represented as a delightful place, where there is abundance of game and food, never any excess of heat or cold, rain or drought, no malign spirits, no sickness or death, but plenty of rioting, singing, and dancing for evermore. They also believe in an evil spirit who dwells in the nethermost regions, and, strange to say, they represent him with horns and a tail, though one would think that, prior to the introduction of cattle into New Holland, the natives could not have been aware of the existence of horned beasts” (Oldfield).

8. Greenlanders. — “The Greenlander believes that when a man dies his soul travels to Torlgarsuk, the land where reigns perpetual summer, all sunshine, and no night; where there is good water, and birds, fish, seals, and reindeer without end, that are to be caught without trouble, or are found cooking alive in a huge kettle. But the journey to this land is difficult; the souls have to slide five days or more down a precipice, all stained with the blood of those who have gone down before. And it is especially grievous for the poor souls when the journey must be made in winter or in tempest, for then a soul may come to harm, or suffer the other death, as they call it, when it perishes utterly, and nothing is left. The bridge Es-Sirat, which stretches over the midst of the Moslem hill, finer than a hair, and sharper than the edge of a sword, conveys a similar conception.” Tyler, on whose works we mainly rely for the information here conveyed on rude nations, traces the idea of a bridge in Java, in North America, in South America, and he also shows how in Polynesia the bridge is replaced by canoes, in which the dead were to pass the great gulf. It is noteworthy that the Jews, also, when they first established a firm belief in immortality, imagined a bridge of hell, which all unbelievers were to pass.

II. Ideas of more cultivated Nations. — Wherever pagan thought and pagan morality reach the highest perfection. we find their ideas of the immortality of the soul gradually approaching the Christian views. The first trace of a belief in a future existence we find in Homer's Iliad (23, 103 sq.), where he represents that Achilles first became convinced that souls and shadowy forms have a real existence in the kingdom of the shades (Hades) by the appearance to him of the dead Patroclus in a dream. These visions were often regarded as divine by the Greeks (comp. II. 1, 63, and the case of the rich man and Lazarus in Luk 16:27). Compare also the article HADES SEE HADES .

But, while in the early Greek paganism the idea of the future is everywhere melancholic, Hades, or the realms of the dead, being to their imagination the emblem of gloom. as may be seen from the following: “Achilles, the ideal hero, declares that he would rather till the ground than live in pale Elysium,” we find that, with the progress of Hellenic thought, a higher idea of the future is found to characterize both the poetry and philosophy of Greece, till, in the Platonic Socrates, the conception of immortality shines forth with a clearness and precision truly impressive. “For we must remember, O men,” said Socrates, in his last speech, before he drained the poison cup, “that it depends upon the immortality of the soul whether we have to live to it and to care for it or not. For the danger seems fearfully great of not caring for it. [Compare Locke's statement: If the best that can happen to the unbeliever be that he be right, and the worst that can happen to the believer be that he be wrong, who in his madness would dare to run the venture?] Yea, were death to be the end of all, it would be truly a fortunate thing for the wicked to get rid of their body, and, at the same time, of their wickedness.

But now, since the soul shows itself to us immortal, there can be for it no refuge from evil, and no other salvation than to become as good and intelligible as possible.” More clearly are his views set forth in the Apology and the Phaedo, in language at once rich in faith and in beauty. “The soul, the immaterial part, being of a nature so superior to the body, can it,” he asks in the Phaedo, “as soon as it is separated from the body, be dispersed into nothing, and perish? Oh, far otherwise. Rather will this be the result. If it take its departure in a state of purity, not carrying with it any clinging impurities of the body, impurities which during life it never willingly shared in, but always avoided, gathering itself into itself, and making the separation from the body its aim and study-that is, devoting itself to true philosophy, and studying how to lie calmly; for this is true philosophy, is it not? — well, then, so prepared, the soul departs into that invisible region which is of its  own nature, the region of the divine, the immortal, the wise, and then its lot is to be happy in a state in which it is freed from fears and wild desires, and the other evils of humanity, and spends the rest of its existence with the gods.” This view, or better doctrine of the immortality of the soul, held by Socrates and his disciple Plato, implied a double immortality, the past eternity as well as that to come. They certainly offer a very striking contrast to the popular superstitions and philosophy of their day, which in many respects recall the views held by the Hindus. The people, especially those who held the most enlarged views up to this time, had “entertained what might be termed a doctrine of semi-immortality. They looked for a continuance of the soul in an endless futurity, but gave themselves no concern about the eternity which is past. But Plato considered the soul as having already eternally existed, the present life being only a moment in our career; he looked forward with an undoubting faith to the changes through which we must hereafter go” (Draper, Istell. Development of Europe, p. 118; compare below, Philosophical Argument).

III. Ideas of the Jewish Nation. —

1. It has frequently been asserted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the O.T. The Socinians in the 16th and 17th centuries took this ground. Some have gone so far as to construe the supposed silence of the O.T. Scriptures on this subject into a formal denial of the possibility of a future life, and have furthermore fortified their positions by selecting some passages of the Old Testament that are rather obscure, e.g. Ecc 3:19 sq.; Isa 38:18; Psa 6:6; Psa 30:10; Psa 88:11; Psa 115:17; Job 7:7-10; Job 10:20-22; Job 14:7-12; Job 15:22. In the most odious manner were these objections raised by the “Wolfenb Uittel Fragments” (see the fourth fragment by Lessing, Beitrdge z. Gesch. u. Lit. a. d. Wolfenbüttelschen Bibliothek, 4:484 sq.). Bishop Warburton, on the other hand, derived one of his main proofs of the divine mission of Moses from this supposed silence an the subject of immortality. “‘Moses,” he argues, “being sustained in his legislation and government by immediate divine authority, had lot the same necessity that other teachers have for a recourse to threatenings and punishments drawn from the future world, in order to enforce obedience.” In a similar strain argues professor Ernst Stahelin in an article on the immortality of the soul (in the Foundations of our Faith, Lond. and N. York, 1866, 12mo, p. 221 sq.): “Moses and Confucius did not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, nay, they seemed purposely to avoid entering-upon the subject; they simply took it for granted. Thus  Moses spoke of the tree of life in Paradise of which if the man took he should live forever, and called God the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus implying their continued existence, since God could not be a God of the dead, but only of the living; and Confucius, while in some respects avoiding all mention of future things, nevertheless enjoined honors to be paid to departed spirits (thus assuming their life after death) as one of the chief duties of a religious man.” Another evidence of the belief of the Jews at the time of Moses and in subsequent periods in the immortality of the soul, as a doctrine self-evident, and by them universally acknowledged and received, is the fact that the Israelites and their ancestors resided among the Egyptians, a people who, as we have seen above, had cherished this faith from the remotest ages (comp. Herodotus, 2, 123, who asserts that they were the first who entertained such an idea). It is further proved that the Jews believed in immortality,

(a) from the laws of Moses against Necromancy (q.v.), or the invocation of the dead, which was very generally practiced by the Canaanites (Deu 18:9-12), and which, notwithstanding these laws, is found to have been prevalent among the Jews even at the time of king Saul (1 Samuel 28), and later (Psa 106:28, and the prophets);

(b) from the name which the Jews gave to the kingdom of the dead, שְׁאוֹל (¯δης), which so frequently occurs in Moses as well as subsequent writings of the O.T. That Moses did not in his laws hold up the punishments of the future world to the terror of transgressors is a circumstance which redounds to his praise, and cannot be alleged against him as a matter of reproach, since to other legislators the charge has been laid that they were either deluded or impostors for pursuing the Very opposite course. Another reason why Moses did not touch the question of the immortality of the soul is that he did not intend to give a system of theology in his laws. But so much is clear from certain passages in his writings, that he was by no means ignorant of this doctrine. Compare Michaelis, Argumenta pro Immortalitate Animi e Mose Collecta, in the Syntagm. Comment. 1 (Göttingen, 1759); Lüderwald, Unters. von d. Kenntniss eines künffigen Lebens i. A. Test. (Helmstudt, 1781); Semler, Beantwortung d. Fragen d. Wolfenbüttelschen Ungenonnten; Seiler, Observ. ad psychologiam sacran (Erlang. 1779).

“The following texts from the writings of Moses may be regarded as indications of the doctrine of immortality, viz. Gen 5:22; Gen 5:24, where it is  said respecting Enoch, that because he lived a pious life God took him, so that he was no more among men. This was designed to be the reward and consequence of his pious life, and it points to an invisible life with God, to which he attained without previously suffering death. Gen 37:35, Jacob says, ‘I will go down to “the grave” (שְׁאוֹל) unto my son.' We have here distinctly exhibited the idea of a place where the dead dwell connected together in a society. In conformity with this idea we must explain the phrase to go to his fathers (Gen 15:15), or to be gathered to his people [more literally, to enter into their habitation or abode] (Gen 25:8; Gen 35:29; Num 20:24, etc.). In the same way many of the Indian savages (as we have already seen) express their expectation of an immortality beyond the grave. Paul argues from the text Gen 47:9, and similar passages where Jacob calls his life a journey, that the patriarchs expected a life after death (Heb 11:13-16; yet he says, very truly, πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες τὰς ἐπαγγελίας). In Mat 22:23, Christ refers, in arguing against the Sadducees, to Exo 3:6, where Jehovah calls himself the God of Isaac and Jacob (i.e. their protector and the object of their worship), long after their death. It could not be that their ashes and their dust should worship God; hence he concludes that they themselves could not have ceased to exist, but that, as to their souls, they still lived (comp. Heb 11:13-17). This passage was interpreted in the same way by the Jews after Christ (Wetstein, ad loc.). In the subsequent books of the O.T. the texts of this nature are far more numerous. Still more definite descriptions are given of שְׁאוֹל, and the condition of the departed there; e.g. Isa 14:9 sq.; also in the Psalms and in Job. Even in these texts, however, the doctrine of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked in the kingdom of the dead is not so clearly developed as it is in the N.T.; this is true even of the book of Job. All that we find here with respect to this point is only obscure intimation, so that the Pauline πόῤῥωθεν ἰδόντες is applicable, in relation to this doctrine, to the other books of the O.T. as well as to those of Moses. In the Psalms there are some plain allusions to the expectation of reward and punishment after death, particularly Psa 17:15; Psa 49:15-16; Psa 73:24. There are some passages in the prophets where a revivification of-the dead is spoken of, as Isa 26:19; Dan 12:2; Ezekiel 27; but, although these do not teach a literal resurrection of the dead, but rather refer to the restoration of the nation and land, still these and all such figurative representations presuppose the proper idea that an invisible part of man survives the body, and will be hereafter united to it. Very clear is also the passage  Ecc 12:7, The body must return to the earth from whence it was taken, but the spirit to God who gave it,' evidently alluding to Gen 3:19. SEE SHEOL.

“From all this we draw the conclusion that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not unknown to the Jews before the Babylonian exile. It appears also from the fact that a general expectation existed of rewards and punishments in the future world, although in comparison with what was afterwards taught on this point there was at that time very little definitely known respecting it, and the doctrine, therefore, stood by no means in that near relation to religion and morality into which it was afterwards brought, as we find it often in other wholly uncultivated nations. Hence this doctrine is not so often used by the prophets as a motive to righteousness, or to deter men from evil, or to console them in the midst of suffering. But on this very account the piety of these ancient saints deserves the more regard and admiration. It was in a high degree unpretending and disinterested. Although the prospect of what lies beyond the grave was, as Paul said, the promised blessing which they saw only from afar, they yet had pious dispositions, and trusted God. They held merely to the general promise that God their Father would cause it to be well with them even after death (Psa 73:26; Psa 73:28, ‘When my strength and my heart faileth, God will be the strength of my heart, and my portion forever'). But it was not until after the Babylonian captivity that the ideas of the Jews on this subject appear to have become enlarged, and that this doctrine was brought by the prophets, under the divine guidance, into a more immediate connection with religion. This result becomes very apparent after the reign of the Greciai kings over Syria and Egypt, and their persecutions of the Jews.

The prophets and teachers living at that time (of whose writings, however, nothing has come down to us) must therefore have given to their nation, time after time, more instruction upon this subject, and must have explained and unfolded the allusions to it in the earlier prophets. Thus we find that after this time, more frequently than before, the Jews sought and found in this doctrine of immortality and of future retribution, consolation, and encouragement under their trials, and a motive to piety. Such discourses were therefore frequently put in the mouths of the martyrs in the second book of Maccabees, e.g. 6:26; 7:9 sq.; comp. 12:4345; see also the Book of Wisdom , 2, 1 sq.; and especially 3:1 sq., and the other apocryphal books of the O.T. At the time of Christ, and afterwards, this doctrine was universally received and taught by the Pharisees, and was, indeed, the  prevailing belief among the Jews, as is well known from the testimony of the N.T., of Josephus, and also of Philo. Tacitus also refers to it in his history, ‘Animas praelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternas putant.' Consult an essay comparing the ideas of the apocryphal books of the O.T. on the subjects of immortality, resurrection, judgment, and retribution, with those of the N.T., written by Frisch, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur, b. 4; Ziegler, Theol. Abhandl. pt. 2, No. 4; Flugge, Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, etc., pt. 1. The Sadducees, boasting of a great attachment to the O.T., and especially to the books of Moses, were the only Jews who denied this doctrine, as well as the existence of the soul as distinct from the body” (Knapp, Theology, § 149). (See Johannsen, Vet. Heb. notiones de rebus post mortem, Hafni 1826.) SEE RESURRECTION.

2. Among the modern Jews, the late celebrated Jewish savant and successor to Ronan at the Sorbonne, professor Munk, regarded as one of the strongest evidences which the O.T. affords for a doctrine of the immortality of the soul the expression “He was gathered to his people,” so frequent in the writings of the O.T. The Rev. D. W. Marks, in a series of Sermons (Lond. 5611 1851), p. 103 sq., says of it: “It has generally been supposed that ‘to be gathered to one's people' is an ordinary term which the sacred historian employs in order to convey the idea that the person to whom it is applied lies buried in the place where the remains of the same family are deposited. But whoever attentively considers all the passages of the Bible where this expression occurs will find, says Dr. Munk, that being gathered to one's ancestors' is expressly distinguished from the rite of sepulture. Abraham is ‘gathered unto his people,' but he is buried in the cave which he bought near Hebron, and where Sarah alone is interred. This is the first instance where the passage ‘to be gathered to one's people' is to be met with; and that it cannot mean that Abraham's bones reposed in the same cave with those of his fathers is very clear, since the ancestors of the patriarch were buried in Chaldaea, and not in Canaan. The death of Jacob is related in the following words: ‘And when Jacob had finished charging his eons, he gathered up his feet upon the bed, and he expired, and was gathered unto his people' (Gen 49:33).

It is equally certain that the phrase ‘he was gathered unto his people' cannot refer to the burial of the patriarch, because we learn from the next chapter that he was embalmed, and that the Egyptians mourned for him seventy days; and it is only after these three score and ten days of mourning are ended that Joseph  transports the remains of his father to Canaan, and inters them in the cave of Machpelah, where the ashes of Abraham and ‘Isaac repose. When the inspired penman alludes to the actual burial of Jacob he uses very different terms. He makes no mention then of the patriarch ‘being gathered to his people,' but he simply employs the verb קָבִר, ‘to bury:' ‘And Joseph went, up to bury his father.' The very words addressed by Jacob on his deathbed to his sons, ‘I am about to be gathered unto my people; bury me with my fathers,' afford us sufficient evidence that the speaker, as well as the persons addressed, understood the expression ‘being gathered to one's people' in a sense totally different from that of being lodged within a tomb. But a stronger instance still may be advanced. The Israelites arrive at Mount Hor, near the borders of Edom, and immediately is issued the divine command, ‘Aaron shall be gathered unto his people, for he shall not come into the land which I have given to the children of Israel. Strip Aaron of his garments, and clothe in them Eleazar his son. And Aaron shall be gathered, and there he shall die.' No member of his family lay buried on Mount Hor; and still Aaron is said to have been there ‘gathered to his people.' Again, Moses is charged to chastise severely the Midianites for having seduced the Israelites to follow the abominable practices of בעל פור (‘Baal Peor'); and, this act accomplished, the legislator is told ‘that he will be gathered unto his people.' This passage certainly cannot mean that Moses was to be gathered in the grave with any of his people. The Hebrew lawgiver died on Mount Abarim; and the Scripture testifies ‘that no one ever knew of the place of his sepulcher;' and still the term to be gathered to his people is there likewise employed. Sufficient instances have now been cited to prove that האס אל עמיוis to be understood in a different sense from the rite of sepulture, and that the Hebrews in the times of Moses did entertain the belief in another state of existence, where spirit joined spirit after the death of the body.

“But, although the position here assumed seems very tenable, it is nevertheless true that the Israelites certainly did not have a very clear conception of the future existence of the soul, and ‘that life and immortality' were not brought to light very distinctly before Christ came, for whom the office was reserved of making clearly known many high matters before but obscurely indicated” (Journal of Sacred Literature, 8, 179).

IV. New-Testament Views. — When Jesus Christ appeared in this world, the Epicurean philosophy (q.v.), the fables of poets of a lower world, and the corruption which was prevalent among the nations had fully destroyed the hope, to say nothing of a belief, in future existence. It was left for him to declare the existence of the soul after death, even though the “earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved” (2 Corinthians 5, 1), with great certainty and very explicitly, not only by an allusion to the joys that await us in the future world, and to the dangers of retribution and divine justice (Mat 10:28), but also in refutation of the doctrines of the unbelieving Sadducees (Mat 22:23 sq.; Mar 12:18 sq.; Luk 20:28 sq.). Jesus Christ, said Paul, “hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light” (2Ti 1:10), and “will render to every man according to his deeds. To them who by patient continuance in well doing seek for glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life' (ἀφθαρσίαν) (Rom 2:6 sq.). The original for eternal life here used (ἀφθαρσία) denotes nothing else than the immortality of the soul, or a continuation of the substantial being, of man's person, of the ego, after death, by the destruction of the body (comp. Mat 10:28; Luk 12:4). SEE ETERNAL LIFE; and on the origin of the soul, and its pre-existence to the body, the article SEE SOUL.

It is evident from the passages cited that Christ and his apostles did more to illustrate and confirm the belief in the immortality of the soul, as cherished at the present day, than had been done by any nation, even the Jews included. “He first gave to it that high practical interest which it now possesses;” and it is owing to Christianity that the doctrine of the soul's immortality has become a common and well-recognized truth — no mere result of speculation, as are those of the heathen and Jewish philosophers, nor a product of priestly invention-but a light to the reason, and a guide to the conscience and conduct. “The aspirations of philosophy, and the materialistic conceptions of popular mythology, are found in the Gospel transmuted into a living, spiritual, and divine fact, and an authoritative influence, not only touching the present life, but governing and directing it.”

V. Christian Views. — In the early Christian Church the views on the immortality of the soul were very varied. There were none that actually denied, far from it, nor even any that doubted its possibility. “But some of them, e.g. Justin, Tatian, and Theophilus, on various grounds, supposed  that the soul, though mortal in itself, or at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality as a promised reward, by its union with the spirit and the right use of its liberty, or, in the opposite case, perishes with the body. They were led to this view partly because they laid so much stress on freedom, and because they thought that likeness to God was to be obtained only by this freedom; and partly, too, because they supposed (according to the trichotomistic division of human nature) that the soul (ψυχή) receives the seeds of immortal life only by the union with the spirit (πνεῦμα),) as the higher and free life of reason.” This view was also afterwards introduced into the Greek Church by Nicholas of Methone (compare Hagenbach, Doctrines, 2, 16). “And, lastly, other philosophical hypotheses concerning the nature of the soul doubtless had an influence. On the contrary, Tertullian and Origen, whose views differed on other subjects, agreed on this one point, that they, in accordance with their peculiar notions concerning the nature of the soul, looked upon its immortality as essential to it” (Hagenbach, 1, 158). “The schoolmen of the Middle Ages in the Western Church considered the immortality of the soul a theological truth; but their chief leaders, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, were at issue on the question whether reason furnishes satisfactory proof of that doctrine. As Anselm of Canterbury had inferred the existence of God himself from the idea of God, so Thomas Aquinas proved the immortality of the soul, in a similar manner, by an ontological argument: ‘Intellectus apprehendit esse absolute et secundum omne tempus. Unde omne habens intellectum naturaliter desiderat esse semper, naturale autem desiderium non potest est inane. Omnis igitur intellectualis substantia est incorruptibilis' (compare Engelhardt, Dogmzengesch. 2, 123 sq.). On the other hand, Scotus, whose views were more nearly allied to those of the Nominalists, maintained: ‘Non posse demonstrari, quod anima sit immortalis' (Comm. in M. Sentent. bk. 2, dist. 17, qu. 1; comp. bk. 4, dist. 43, qu. 2). Bonaventura, on the contrary, asserted: ‘Animam esse immortalem, auctoritate ostenditur et ratione' (De Nat. Deor. 2, 55). Concerning the further attempts of Moneta of Cremona (13th century), William of Auvergne (bishop of Paris from 1228 to 1249), and Raimund Martini (Pugio Fidei adv. Maur. p. 1, ch. 4), to prove the immortality of the soul, compare Minscher, Dogmengeschichte, ed. by Von Colln, p. 92 sq.” (Hagenbach). On the views since the Reformation, SEE SOUL, IMMORTALITY OF.

VI. Philosophical Argument. — There are many writers, both in philosophy and theology, who deny that the immortality of the soul can be proved apart from revelation. E. Stahelin (Foundations of our Faith, p. 232) says: “We might take up a line of argument used by philosophy both in ancient and modern times-from Socrates down to Fichte-to prove the immortality of the inner being; an argument derived from the assertion that the soul, being a unity, is, as such, incapable of decay, it being only in the case of the complex that a falling to pieces, or a dissolution, is conceivable.” “But;” he continues, “the abstruse nature of this method leads us to renounce a line of argument from which, we freely confess, we expect little profitable result. For, after all, what absolute proof have we of this unity of the soul? Can we subject it to the microscope or the scalpel, as we can the visible and tangible? It must content us for the present simply to indicate that the instinct and consciousness of immortality have nothing to fear from the most searching examination of the reason, but find far more of confirmation and additional proof than of contradiction in the profoundest thinking. Further, that this instinct and consciousness do actually exist, and are traceable through all the stages and ramifications of the human race, is confirmed to us by our opponents themselves that there is in man something which is deeper and stronger than the maxims of a self-invented philosophy, namely, the divinely created nobility of his nature, the inherent breath of life, breathed into him by God, the relation to the Eternal, which secures to him eternity.” Watson (Institutes, 2, 2) goes even further, and declares that nowhere else but in the Bible is there any “indubitable declaration of man's immortality,” or “any facts or principles so obvious as to enable us confidently to infer it. All observation lies directly against the doctrine of man's immortality. He dies, and the probabilities of a future life which have been established upon the unequal distribution of rewards and punishments in this life, and the capacities of the human soul, are a presumptive evidence which has been adduced, as we shall afterwards show, only by those to whom the doctrine had been transmitted by tradition, and who were therefore in possession of the idea; and even then, to have any effectual force of persuasion, they must be built upon antecedent principles furnished only by the revelations contained in holy Scripture. Hence some of the wisest heathens, who were not wholly unaided in their speculations on these subjects by the reflected light of these revelations, confessed themselves unable to come to any satisfactory conclusion. The doubts of Socrates, who expressed himself the most hopefully of any on the subject of a future life, are well known; and Cicero,  who occasionally expatiates with so much eloquence on this topic, shows, by the skeptical expressions which he throws in, that his belief was by no means confirmed.”

The first attempt of a philosophical tenet on the doctrine of immortality is offered in Plato's Phaedo. On it the New Platonics reared their structure, adorned with many fanciful additions. All scientific attempts throughout the Middle Ages, and up to our own day, have been modified views, allied more or less to Platonism. In opposition to these, the French materialism of the 18th century attempted to destroy, or at least undermine, the belief in immortality.' Not less materialistic is the position of the Pantheists, headed by Spinoza. “These hold that the World-Soul, which, in their opinion, produces and fills the universe, also fills and rules man; nay, that it is only in him that it reaches its-special end, which is self-consciousness, and attains to thought and will. It is true, they go on to say, that at the death of the individual this World-Soul retreats from him, just as the setting sun seems to draw back its rays into itself; and that self-consciousness now sinks once more into the great, unconscious, undistinguished spirit-ocean of the whole.” The answer to this ridiculous position has been best given by M'Cosh (Intuitions of the Mind, p. 392 sq.): “We can conceive of air thus rushing into air, and of a bucketful of-water losing itself in a river; and why? because neither air nor water ever had a separate and conscious personality. The soul, as long as it exists, must retain its personality as an essential property, and must carry it along with it wherever it goes. The moral conviction clusters round this personal self. The being who is judged, who is saved or condemned, is the. same who sinned and continued in his sin, or who believed and was justified when on earth.”

Kant, Locke, and other metaphysicians, on the other hand, like some theologians, as we have seen above, also exclude the immortality of the soul from the province of natural theology. “They deem it impossible to prove our future existence from the creation, or even from the admitted attributes of the Creator, and are thus in singular opposition to the ancient Platonists, who regarded the eternal continuance of our being as the more obvious doctrine of natural theology, and inferred from it the divine existence as the less direct intimation of nature. It is said that much of the reasoning employed by pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul is unsound. This is a fact, and yet by no means invalidates their right to believe in the conclusion which they deduced illogically. There are many truths, the proof of which lies so near to us that we overlook it. Believing a  proposition firmly, we are satisfied with the mere pretence of an argument for its support; and searching in the distance for proofs which can only be found in immediate contact with us, we discover reasons for the belief which, long before we had discovered them, was yet fully established in our own minds; and yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine, although, in point of fact, the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them. If they were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their weakness would be: obvious at once; but, as they have nothing to sustain, their insufficiency is the less apparent; our belief continues, notwithstanding the frailness of the arguments which make a show of upholding it, and thus the very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion, which remains firm in despite of them.

That the immortality of the soul has been firmly believed in by men destitute of a written revelation will not be denied by fair-minded scholars. It probably would never have been doubted had not some learned, though injudicious controversialists, as Leland and others, deemed it necessary to magnify the importance of the Bible by undervaluing the attainments of heathen sages. The singular attempt of Warburton to prove that the authority of the Mosaic writings is evinced by their not teaching the doctrine of a future state led him to an equally paradoxical attempt to show that the phraseology of pagan sages furnishes no valid evidence of their belief in the soul's immortality. But each of these efforts was abortive; and if each had been successful, such a kind of success would have resulted in even greater evils than have come from the want of it.

The fact, then, that our existence in a future world has been an article of faith among pagan philosophers indicates that this doctrine is an appropriate part of natural theology. But, even if it had not been thus believed by heathens, it ought to have been; and the arguments which convince the unaided judgment of its truth are also reasons for classifying the doctrine among the teachings of nature. These arguments may be conveniently arranged under six different classes: first, the metaphysical, which prove that the mind is entirely distinct from the body, and is capable of existing while separate from it; that the mind is not compounded, and will not therefore be dissolved into elementary particles; that, being imperceptible, it cannot perish except by an annihilating act of God (comp. Dr. M'Cosh's argument above cited); secondly, the analogical, which induces us to believe that the soul will not be annihilated, even as matter does not cease to exist when it changes its form; thirdly, the teleological, which incline us to think that the mental powers and the tendencies so imperfectly developed in this life will not be  shut out from that sphere of future exertion for which they are so wisely adapted; fourthly, the theological, which foster an expectation that the wisdom of God will not fail to complete what otherwise appears to have been commenced in vain, that his goodness will not cease to bestow the happiness for which our spiritual nature is ever longing, and that his justice will not allow the present disorders of the moral world to continue, but will rightly adjust the balances, which have now for a season lost their equipoise; fifthly, the moral, which compel us to hope that our virtues will not lose their reward, and to fear that our vices will not go unpunished in the future world, which seems to be better fitted than the present for moral retribution; and, sixthly, the historical, the general belief in a future state of rewards and punishments, the expectations of dying men, the premonitions of the guilty, and the tenacious hopes of the beneficent. All these arguments are in favor of our unending existence, and there are none in opposition to it; and it is an axiom that whatever has existed and now exists, will, unless there be special proof to the contrary, continue to exist” (Bibliotheca Sacra, May, 1846, art. 2).

The natural proofs of the immortality of the soul are treated very skillfully by professor Chace, in the Bibliotheca Sacra for February, 1849. First he analyzes the Phaedo of Plato, and finds it to contain the following arguments for immortality:

1. From the capacity and desire of the soul for knowledge, beyond what in this life is attainable;

2. From the law of contraries, according to which, as rest prepares for labor, and labor for rest; as light ends in darkness, and darkness in light; so life, leading to death, death must, in turn, terminate in life;

3. From the reminiscences of a previous existence, which the soul brings. with it into the present life;

4. From the simple and indivisible nature of the soul; only compound substances undergo dissolution;

5. From the essential vitality of the soul itself. He adds that although these arguments did not amount, in the estimation of Socrates, “to an absolute proof of the doctrine, he thought them sufficient not only to deprive death of all its terrors, but to awaken in the mind of a good man, when approaching death, the calm and cheerful hope of a better life.” These  arguments, however, are far behind the present state of science. The second and third rest on purely imaginary foundations; the fourth and fifth are inconclusive; and the first only, we grant, has a real, though subordinate value. Cicero adds to these arguments one from the consensus gentium, a universal prevalence of a belief in immortality. Of Butler's argument for immortality in the Analogy, the professor remarks that it is perhaps less fortunate than any other part of that great work. “Both of the main arguments employed by him are no less applicable to the lower animals than to man, and just as much prove the immortality of the living principle connected with the minutest insect or humblest infusoria as of the human soul.

It is not a little remarkable that this fact, which in reality converts the attempted proof into a reductio ad absurdum of the principles from which it is drawn, should not have awakened in the cautious mind of Butler a suspicion of their soundness, and led him to seek other means of establishing the truth in question. These he would have found, and, as we think, far better suited to his purpose, in the facts and principles so ably and so fully set forth in his chapters on the moral government of God, and on probation considered as a means of discipline and improvement. Indeed, we have always been of the opinion that these two chapters contain the only real and solid grounds for belief in a future life which the work presents; the considerations adduced in the one particularly appropriated to that object serving at furthest only to answer objections to the doctrine.” Professor Chace founds his own argument chiefly upon the gradual and progressive development of life in our planet, from the epoch of its earliest inhabitant down to the present hour, which development, taken in connection with the capacities and endowments of the soul, indicates, on the part of the Creator, a purpose to continue it in being.

See, besides the authorities already referred to, Marsilius Ficinus, De Imortalitate Animae (Par. 1641, fol.); an extract of it is given in Buhle, Gesch. d. neueren Philosophie, 2, 171 sq.; Spalding, Bestimmung des Menschen (Leips. 1794); Struvius, Hist. Doct. Graecorum et Romanorum1n, de Statu Aniaruru post nortem (Alten, 1803 8vo); Meier, Philosophische Lehre v. Zustand der Seele Mendelssohn, Phaedon (Berlin, 1821); Hamann, Unsterblichkeit (Leips. 1773, 8vo); Jacobi, Philos. Beweis. d. Unsterblichkeit (Dessau, 1783); Fichte (J. G.), Destination of Man (tr. by Mrs. R. Sinnett, London, 1846, 12mo); Jean Paul Richter, Das Campaner-Thal. (Frankf. 1797, 8vo); Olshausen, Antiq. Patrum de Immortalitate Sententice (Regiom. 1827, 4to); Herrick, Sylloqe  Scriptorum de Immortalitate, etc. (Regensb. 1790, 8vo); Knapp, Theology, § 149; Htiffell, Ueber d. Unsterblichkeit d. menschlichen Seele (Carlsruhe, 1832); Hase, Evangel. Protest. Dogmatik, § 82, 8; Duncan, Evidence of Reason for Immortality (1779, 8vo); Tillotson, Sermons, 9, 309; Hale, Sir Matthew, Works, 1, 331; Stanhope, Boyle Lectures (1702, 4to, senn. 3); Foster, Sermons, 1, 373; Sherlock, Works, 1, 124; Dwight, Sermons, 1, 145; Channing, Works, 4, 169; Chalmers, Works, 10, 415; Drew, on Immortality (Philadel. 1830, 12mo); Newman, The Soul (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Quarterly Review, Aug. 1834, p. 35; New York Review, 1, 331; Coleridge, Aids to Reflection, p. 209-212; Robert Hall, Works, 1, 189; 2, 373; Howe, Works, 8vo ed., p. 193; Amer. Bible Repository, 10, 411; Christian Spectator, 8, 556; New Englander, 9, 544 sq.; 11:362 sq.; 14:115 sq., 161 sq.; Alfeth. Quart. Rev. July 1864, p. 515; Oct. 1863, p. 685; July, 1860, p. 510; Jan. 1865, p. 133; Bib. Sacra, 1860, p. 810 sq.; Baptist Quart. Rev. 1870, April, art. 5; Journal of Speculative Philosophy, April, 1870, art. 1; Schalberg (Dr. J.), Unsterblichkeit o. d. pers. Fortdauer d. Seele a. d. Tode (3rd edit. Naumberg, 1869); Egomet, Life and Immortality (Lond. 1860); Schott, Sterben u. Unsterblichkeit (Stuttg. 1861); Dumesnil, ‘lmmiortalite (Paris, 1861); Naville, La Vie Eternelle (Par. 1863); Huber, Idee d. Unsterblichkeit (MAunich, 1864); Baguenault de Pullihesse, L'Immortalite (Par. 1864); Pfaff, Ideen e. Artzes ü. d. Unsterblichkeit d. Seele (Dresden, 1864); Wilmarshof, Das Jenseits (Lpz. 1863); Nitzsch, Systema of Christian Doctrine (see Index); Pye Smith, First Lines of Christ. Theol. p. 144, 352, 357; Saisset, Modern Pantheism (Edinburgh, 1863, 2 vols. 12mo), 1, 140 sq., 263; 2, 36 sq.; Alger, History of Future Life (3rd ed. Phila. 1864); Schneider, Die Unsterblichkeitsidee, etc. (Regensb. 1870, 8vo); Brinton. Myths of the New World (N. Y. 1868, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

## Immovable Feasts[[@Headword:Immovable Feasts]]

             SEE FEASTS.

## Immunities of the Clergy[[@Headword:Immunities of the Clergy]]

             SEE IMMUNITY.

## Immunity, Ecclesiastical[[@Headword:Immunity, Ecclesiastical]]

             In ecclesiastical jurisprudence a distinction is made between ecclesiastical immunity (immnunitas ecclesiastica) and the immunity of the Church  (inmunitas ecclesice). The latter is the right of refuge or asylum (q.v.), the former denotes the exemption of the Church from the general obligations of the community. The ministers of religion have at all times and in all countries enjoyed particular privileges and liberties. This was the case with the priests of pagan Rome, whose privileges were transferred to the Christian clergy by Constantine. Among these privileges we notice particularly exemption from taxes (census), from menial service (munera sordida), etc. To this was added also the privilege of separate spiritual jurisdiction. SEE JURISDICTION, ECCLESIASTICAL. These immunities belonged to the members of the clergy, their wives, children, domestics, and to the goods of the Church, but did not extend to their private property, or to persons entering the clergy simply to free themselves from civil charges. In 532 Justinian added to these privileges that of guardianship, permitting presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons to act as guardians or trustees, but not extending the privilege to bishops or monks (Nov. 123, cap. 5; Anth. Presbyteros C. cit. 1, 3). The ancient Germans also granted great privileges to their priests. Julius Caesar considered them as the next class to the nobility, and said, “Magno (Druides) sunt apud eos honore” (De bello Gallico, lib. 6, cap. 13). “Druides a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquis pendunt, militiae vocationis omniumque rerum habent immunitatem” (ib. cap. 14). When Germany was Christianized, the clergy preserved the same privileges, besides those granted them by the Roman law, which was recognized as the standard (secundum legema Romanum ecclesia vivit [Lex Ribuaria, tit. 58, § 1, etc.]). The stipulation of the third Council of Toledo in 589, can. 21 (c. 69, can. 12, qu. 2) that the auditors, bishops, and clergy should not be subject to compulsory services, was also granted afterwards (Capitulare a. 744, cap. 7; compare Benedict's Capitularien-sammlung, lib. 3, cap. 290). The protection which the Church granted to all who connected themselves with it soon became a source of great profit; it was known in the 6th century under the name of mitium, or mittium legitimum (Roth, Gesch. d. Benefcialwesens [Erlangen, 1850], p. 163 sq.).

To this right of protection of the Church was subsequently added that of collecting and appropriating to its own use the taxes which would otherwise have been levied on its proteges by the fiscal officers: this right was called emunitas, and was conferred by the kings. These fiscal taxes included fines, etc., of which the holders of immunities became the recipients. In after times the Church obtained also the right of assembling armies, which was called territorium (see Formuloe Andegavenses, 4, 8, 21, 22, etc.), and which laid the  foundation of the subsequent ecclesiastical principalities (see Rettberg, Kirchengeschichte Deutchlands, vol. 2, § 97; Waitz, Deutsche Veifassungsgeschichte, 2, 290 sq., 570 sq.). These immunities were further specified in the laws of the French kingdom (see Capitula synodi Vernensis a. 755, c. 19, 28; Cap. Motens. a 756, c. 8, etc.), as were also those of the individual members of the clergy, and of the Church properties. St. Louis decided that each church should have a piece of land (mansus) free from all taxations, etc. (Capit. a. 816, c. 10, 25; can. 23, qu. 8). Such properties subject to taxes as did come into the hands of the Church did not, however, become free on that account, unless by an especial favor of the king (Capit. 3, Caroli ill. a. 812, c. 11; Capit. 4, Ludov. a. 819, c. 2). The immunities were, however, greatly abused, and lost their importance, notwithstanding the decisions of the Council of Trent, Sess. 25:cap. 20 (“Ecclesise et ecclesiarum personarum immunitatem Dei ordinatione et canonicis sanctionibus constitutam esse”), and the bull In caena Domini (q.v.). To what extent the properties of the clergy and of the Church are now free has been settled by subsequent decrees. As a rule, the clergy are free from the general taxes, and from the personal duties of private citizens. The candidates for priests' orders and students in theology are usually exempt from military service. The churches and their property enjoy generally the same privileges as the government buildings and state property. Personal immunity from taxes, military services, etc., is regularly granted to the clergy, as also to teachers, in Protestant as well as in Roman Catholic countries. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 642; Gosselin, Power of the Pope (see Index); Augusti, Handbuch d. christ. Archaöl. 1, 303 sq.

## Immutability[[@Headword:Immutability]]

             the divine attribute of unchangeableness indicated in the great title of God, I AM. So Jam 1:17 : “Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.” Psa 33:11 : “The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations;” Psa 102:25-27 : “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end.” God is immutable as to his essence, being the one necessary being. He is immutable also in ideas and knowledge, since these are eternal. “If we consider the nature of God, that he is a self-  existent and independent Being, the great Creator and wise Governor of all things; that he is a spiritual and simple Being, without parts or mixture such as might induce a change; that he is a sovereign and uncontrollable Being, whom nothing from without can affect or alter; that he is an eternal Being, who always has and always will go on in the same tenor of existence; an omniscient Being, who, knowing all things, has no reason to act contrary to his first resolves; and in all respects a most perfect Being, who can admit of no addition or diminution; we cannot but believe that, both in his essence, in his knowledge, and in his will and purposes, he must of necessity be unchangeable. To suppose him otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect being; for if he change it must be either to a greater perfection than he had before or to a less; if to a greater perfection, then was there plainly a defect in him, and a privation of something better than what he had or was; then, again, was he not always the best, and consequently not always God: if he change to a lesser perfection, then does he fall into a defect again; lose a perfection he was possessed once of, and so ceasing to be the best being, cease at the same time to be God. The sovereign perfection of the Deity, therefore, is an invincible bar against all mutability; for, whichever way we suppose him to change, his supreme excellency is nulled or impaired by it. We esteem changeableness in men either an imperfection or a fault: their natural changes, as to their persons, are from weakness and vanity; their moral changes, as to their inclinations and purposes, are from ignorance or inconstancy, and therefore this quality is no way compatible with the glory and attributes of God” (Charnock, On the Divine Attributes).

“Various speculations on the divine immutability occur in the writings of divines and others, which, though often well intended, ought to be received with. caution, and sometimes even rejected as bewildering or pernicious. Such are the notions that God knows everything by intuition; that there is no succession of ideas in the divine mind; that he can receive no new idea; that there are no affections in God, for to suppose this would imply that he is capable of emotion; that if there are affections in God, as love, hatred, etc., they always exist in the same degree; or else he would suffer change: for these and similar speculations, reference may be had to the schoolmen and metaphysicians by those who. are curious in such subjects; but the impression of the divine character, thus represented, will be found very different from that conveyed by those inspired writings in which God is not spoken of by men, but speaks of himself; and nothing could be more easily  shown than that most of these notions are either idle, as assuming that we know more of God than is revealed; or such as tend to represent the divine Being as rather a necessary than a free agent, and his moral perfections as resulting from a blind physical necessity of nature more than from an essential moral excellence; or, finally, as unintelligible or absurd. The true immutability of God consists, not in his adherence to his purposes, but in his never changing the principles of his administration; and he may therefore, in perfect accordance with his preordination of things, and the immutability of his nature, purpose to do, under certain conditions dependent upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that an immutable adherence to the principles of a wise, just, and gracious government requires it. Prayer is in Scripture made one of these conditions; and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he has not, we may be assured, entangled his actual government of the world with the bonds of such an eternal predestination of particular events as either to reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able himself, consistently with his decrees, to answer it, whenever it is encouraged by his express engagements.” See Watson, Institutes, 1, 401; 2, 492; Perrone, Tractctus de Deo, part 2, ch. 2. Knapp, Theology, § 20; Graves, Works, 3:283; Dorner, in Jahrbuch f. deutsche Theologie, 1859, 1860 (see Index). SEE ATTRIBUTES; SEE GOD.

## Imna and Imnah[[@Headword:Imna and Imnah]]

             the name of several men, of different form in the original, which is not accurately observed in the English Version.

1. Hebrew YIMNA' ( םיַמְנָעrestrainer; Sept. Ι᾿μανά, Vulg. Jemnna, Auth. Vers. “Irmna”), one of the sons apparently of Helem, the brother of Shamer, a descendant of Asher, but at what distance is not clear (1Ch 7:35). B.C. prob. cir. 1618. SEE HOTHAM.

2. Hebrew YIMNAH' יַמְנָה , fortunate; Sept. in Gen 46:17, Ι᾿εμνά, Vulg. Jemna, Auth. Vers. “Jimnah;” in Num 26:44, Ι᾿αμίν and Ι᾿αμινί, Jemnsa and Jemnaitce, “Jimna” and “Jimnites;” in 1Ch 7:30, Ι᾿εμνά, Jemna, “Imnah”), the first-named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family who bore his name. B. C. 1874.  3. (Same Hebrew name as last; Sept. Ι᾿εμνά, Vulg. Jemnta, Auth.Vers. “Imnah'). The father of Kore, which latter was the Levite in charge of the east gate of the Temple, and appointed by Hezekiah over the free-will offerings (2Ch 31:14). B. C. 726.

## Impanation[[@Headword:Impanation]]

             (Latin, impanatio; from in and panis, bread; otherwise assumptio), a name given to one of the many different shades of the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist. The theory was first presented in the 12th century by Ruprecht of Deutz in the following shape (Opera ed. Col. 1602, 1, 267; Comm. in Exodus 2, 10): “As God did not alter human nature when he incarnated divinity in the womb of the Virgin Mary, uniting the Word and the flesh into one being, so he does not alter the substance of the bread and the wine in the Eucharist, which still retain the material properties by which they are known to our senses (sensibus subacium), while by his Word he brings them (the component elements) into combination with the identical body and the identical blood of Christ. As the Word descended from on high (a summo), not to become flesh, but to assume the flesh (assumnendo camern), so are the bread and wine, from their inferior (ab imo) position, raised into becoming flesh and blood of Christ, without, therefore, being transmuted (non mutatum) in such a manner as to acquire the taste of flesh or the appearance of blood, but do, on the contrary, imperceptibly become identical with both in their essence, partaking of the divine and human immortal substance, which is in Christ. It is not the effect of the Holy Ghost's operation (affectus) to alter or destroy the nature of any substance used for his purpose, but, on the contrary, to add to that substance some qualities which it did not at first possess” (De Opp. Spirit. s. 3, p. 21, 22). In his work De divinis Officiis (2, 9; Opp. 2, 762), he says: “The Word of the Father comes in between the flesh and the blood which he received from the womb of the Virgin, and the bread and wine received from the altar, and of the two makes a joint offering. When the priest puts this into the mouth of the believer, bread and wine are received, and are absorbed into the body; but the Son of the Virgin remains whole and unabsorbed in the receiver, united to the Word of the Father in heaven. Such as do not believe, on the contrary, receive only the material bread and wine, but none of the offering.” His contemporary, Alger, or Adelher, of Lüttich, writing in defense of the dogma of transubstantiation (1. 3, De sacram. corp. et sarng. D. in Bibl. Max. Patr. t. 21, Lugdun. 1677), was the first to make use of the  expression inpanatio in this sense (p. 251), “In pane Christum impanatun sicut Deum in carne personaliter incarnatum.” Before him, however, Guitmund of Aversa had, in 1190, used the same word to express the probable meaning of Berengar (Bibl. Max. Patr. Lugdun. 18:441), whose supporters are sometimes called Adessenarii (q.v.) (from adesse, to be present).

The doctrine of impanation was afterwards, in the Reformation period, but wrongly, attributed to Osiander by Carlstadt. Some Roman Catholic writers, e.g. Bellarmine (Dissert. de impan. et consubstant. Jense, 1677), Du Cange, and others, accused Luther of having revived the old error of impanation. The Formula Concordice (1577) declares that the “mode of union between the body of Christ and the bread and wine is a mystery,” and does not decide positively what that mode is, but only negatively what it is not. “It is not a personal union, nor is it consubstantio; still less is it a union in which change of substance is wrought (transubstantiatio), nor a union in which the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread and wine (impanatio), but a union which exists only in this sacrament, and therefore is called sacramsentalis.” See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 644; Knapp, Theology, § 146; and the articles SEE LORD'S SUPPER; SEE CONSUBSTANTIATION; SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

## Impanation (2)[[@Headword:Impanation (2)]]

             (from in pane, "in the bread"), the doctrine that Christ's presence is in the bread in the Lord's supper. It is synonymous with consubstantiation (q.v.).

## Impeccabiles[[@Headword:Impeccabiles]]

             a name given to certain heretics in the ancient Church, who boasted that they were incapable of sin, and that there was no need of repentance; such were some of the Gnostics, Priscillianists, etc. SEE IMPECCABILITY.

## Impeccability[[@Headword:Impeccability]]

             the state of a person who cannot sin, or who, by grace, is delivered from the possibility of sinning. Some speculations have appeared in the world upon the supposed peccability of the human nature of Christ, founded chiefly on certain expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 4:15) and elsewhere, asserting that Christ was “in all points tempted like as we are.” It is argued, on, the other hand, that as the Scripture has been silent on this point, it is both needless and presumptuous to attempt to draw any inferences from such expressions as that above cited; and that we should acquiesce in, and be satisfied with, the declaration that “in him is no sin” (1Jn 3:5). See Art. 15 of Church of England, “Of Christ alone without sin.” Impeccability, or, at least, sinless perfection, has also been  claimed for every true child of God upon the authority of 1Jn 3:9, though improperly, the word “cannot” requiring to be taken (as in many other passages of Scripture) in such a latitude as to express, not an absolute impossibility of sinning, but “a strong disinclination,” in the renewed nature, to sin “in such a manner and to such a degree as others.” — Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Ullmann, Sinlessness of Jesus (Edinb. 1858,12mo), p. 46; Haag, Hist. des Dogmas Chret. (see Index). SEE CHRIST, SINLESSNESS OF; SEE PERFECTION; SEE SANCTIFICATION.

## Imperiali, Joseph Rene[[@Headword:Imperiali, Joseph Rene]]

             an Italian prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Oria, April 26, 1651. Descending from a high family, and enjoying the intercession of great prelates, he took orders in his Church, and was rapidly promoted. In 1690 Innocent XI created him cardinal, and he was sent as ambassador to Ferrara. At the papal conclave in 1730 he came within one vote of being elected the incumbent of the papal throne. He died Jan. 15, 1737. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:833; Migne, Encyclop. Theol. 30, 1094 sq.

## Imperiali, Laurent[[@Headword:Imperiali, Laurent]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of whose early life nothing is known, was born about the year 1612, and was created cardinal in 1652 by pope Innocent X. He died Sept. 21, 1673. — Migne, Encyclop. Thsol. 31, 1094.

## Implicit Faith[[@Headword:Implicit Faith]]

             SEE FAITH.

## Impluvium[[@Headword:Impluvium]]

             anciently a large area or spot of ground between the great porch of the church and the church itself. Because uncovered and exposed to the air, it was called atrium or impluvium. Eusebius called it αἴθριον. “In this court or church-yard was the station of the energumens (q.v.), and that class of penitents called προσκλαίοντες or flentes. These persons were commonly entitled χειμάζοντες or χειμαζόμενοι, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all changes of the weather” (Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 725 sq.). The practice of burning their dead in the impluvium was initiated in the 4th century, but it did not become general  until after the 6th century. There were also frequently buildings auxiliary to the church edifice placed in the impluvium, such as the baptisteries, places where the candidates of the Church were instructed and prepared for baptism, etc. See Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Importunity[[@Headword:Importunity]]

             (ἀναιδεία) IN PRAYER, an important element of success (Luk 11:8), as evincing earnestness, a faith that takes no denial, and especially a perseverance that continues to intercede until the request is granted (compare Luk 18:1; 1Th 5:17); SEE PRAYER.

## Imposition of Hands[[@Headword:Imposition of Hands]]

             a ceremony used by most Christian churches in ordination, and by others in confirmation. The expressions generally used in the Scriptures for the rite of imposition of hands are: םשַׂיםor ם‹סמ ִ שַׁיתwith םעִל םידetc., in the O.T.; and ἐπιτιθημι, τίθημι χεῖρα τινί, ἐπί τινα, ἐπίθεσις χειρῶν in the N.T. SEE HAND.

I. Origin and synbolical Meaning of the Act. — The practice of the imposition of hands as a symbolical act is of remote antiquity. It is “a natural form by which benediction has been expressed in all ages and among all people. It is the act of one superior either by age or spiritual position towards an inferior, and by its very form it appears to bestow some gift, or to manifest a desire that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guiltiness was thus transferred by the high-priest to the scape-goat from the congregation (Lev 14:21); but, in general, the gift is of something good which God is supposed to bestow by the channel of the laying on of hands.” The principle of the practice seems to rest on the importance of the hand itself, both in the bodily organism and in the moral activity of man, in its power and in its action. Thus we find the hand raised in anger, extended in pity, the avenging hand, the helping hand, etc. In Greek a distinction exists between the hand extended to shelter or protect (χεῖρα ὐπερέχειν), and the hand held out imploringly (χεῖρας ἀνασχεῖν); consequently between the powerful, directing hand of God, and the imploring hand of man.

The Biblical signification of the imposition of hands rests, in general, on the consideration of the hand as the organ of transmission, both in the real and in the symbolical sense. This results from the fact that not only did the  party offering sacrifice bless the offering by the imposition of hands, but by the same act he, as sinner, imparted to it also his sins and his curse (see Lev 1:4; Lev 3:2; Lev 8:14 sq.; Lev 16:21; Lev 16:24). Bähr (Symbolik d. moscischen Cultus, 2, 339) rejects this idea of transmission of sin by the laying on of hands on the expiatory victim; he considers it only as a symbol of “renunciation of one's own,” and argues from the fact of a like imposition of hands in the case of thanksgiving offerings. According to Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, 2, 1, p. 155), the imposition of hands in sacrifices signified the power of the party offering it over the life of the victim. Baumgarten, on the contrary (Comanentar z. Pentateuch, 1, 2, p. 180), and Kurtz (Das mosaische Opfer, p. 70; Gesch. d. A. B. p. 332), maintain the idea of transmission. The imposition of hands on all offerings presents no difficulty when we adhere to the general notion of transmission; the thanksgiving offering is by it made the recipient of the giver's feelings. This idea of transmission is especially manifest in the imposition of hands in consecration or blessing. Thus, “in the Old Testament, Jacob accompanies his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with imposition of hands (Gen 48:14); Joshua is ordained in the room of Moses by imposition of hands (Num 27:18; Deu 34:9); cures seem to have been wrought by the prophets by imposition of hands (2 Kings 5, 11); and the high-priest, in giving his solemn benediction, stretched out his hands over the people (Lev 9:22). The same form was used by our Lord in blessing, and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly regarded by the Jews as customary or befitting (Mat 19:13; Mar 8:23; Mar 10:16). One of the promises at the end of Mark's Gospel to Christ's followers is that they should cure the sick by laying on of hands (Mar 16:18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his sight (Act 9:17), and Publius's father was healed of his fever (Act 28:8) by imposition of hands.”

II. Classification of Biblical Uses. — More particularly, the imposition of hands, in the O.T., may be divided into (1) the patriarchal-typical laying on of hands in blessing; (2) the legal-symbolical, in consecration to office; and (3) the prophetico-dynamical in healing. The former (see Gen 48:14) is a sort of typical transmission of a promised hereditary blessing continued, through the party thus blessed, on his posterity; the second (see Exo 29:10; Num 27:18) is a legal figurative imparting of the rights of office, and a promise of the blessing attached to it; the third is the transmission of a miraculous healing power for the restoration of life (2  Kings 4:34). Yet in the latter case we must notice that the prophet put his hands on the hands of the child, and covered it with his whole body.

Thus this transmission points us, in its yet imperfect state, to the N. Test. The N.T. imposition of hands is symbolical of the transmission of spirit and life. Here, as in the O.T., we find three uses: (1) the spiritual-patriarchal imposition of hands by our Lord and the apostles; (2) the spiritual-legal, or official imposition of hands; (3) the healing imposition of hands. Christ lays his hands on the sufferers, and they are cured. But the bodily gifts he thus transmits are joined to spiritual gifts; he cures under the condition of faith (Mar 6:5). The more the people become imbued with the idea that the curative effects are connected with the material imposition of hands, the more: he operates without it (Mar 5:23; Mar 5:41; Mar 7:32). Sometimes he healed only by a word. The full grant of his Spirit and of his calling he represented in a real, but symbolical manner, when he extended his hands over his apostles in blessing at the Mount of Olives (Luk 24:50). This imposition of the hands of the Lord on his apostles, in connection with the imparting of his Spirit, is the source of the apostolical imposition of hands. It was also originally a blending of the symbol and its fulfillment (see Act 8:17), as well as of the bodily and spiritual imparting of life (Act 9:17). From this general imposition of hands, under which Christians received the baptism of the Spirit, came the official, apostolic imposition of hands (Act 13:3; 1Ti 4:14). At the same time, the example of Cornelius (Acts 10) shows that the apostolical imparting of the Holy Spirit was not restricted to the forms of official or even general imposition of hands.

III. Ecclesiastical Uses. — In the early Church, the imposition of hands was practised in receiving catechumens, in baptism, in confirmation, and in ordination. Cyprian derives its use from apostolical practice (Ep. 72, ad Stephan.; Ep. 73, ad Jubaean.)'; so also does Augustine (De Bapt. 3, 16). That the imposition of hands in receiving catechumens was different from that used in baptism, etc., is shown by Bingham (bk. 10:ch. 1). Its use in baptism was general as early as Tertullian's time (Coleman; Ancient Christianity, ch. 19:§ 4). This probably gave rise to confirmation. After that rite was introduced, imposition of hands became its chief ceremony. It was generally performed by the bishop, but elders were authorized to do it in certain cases, in subordination to the bishop. SEE CONFIRMATION.  In ordination, the imposition of hands was an essential part of the ceremony from an early period, but not in the ordination of any class below deacons. SEE ORDINATION.

In the modern Church, imposition of hands is considered by the Romanists as an essential part of the sacraments of baptism, ordination, and confirmation (Concil. Tri Deuteronomy Sess. 23). “As in the ancient Church this rite existed in two forms-the actual laying on of hands, which was called chirothesia; and the extending the hand over or towards the person, which was styled chirotonia — so in the Roman Catholic Church the former is retained as an essential part of the sacraments of confirmation and holy orders; the latter is employed in the administration of the priestly absolution. Both forms are familiarly used in blessing. In the mass, also, previous to the consecration of the elements of bread and wine, the priest extends his hands over them, repeating at the same time the preparatory prayer of blessing” (Wetzer's Kirchen-Lexikon, 4:853). The Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church employ it as a symbolical act, in confirmation and ordination; the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and Congregational churches employ it only in ordination.

Great stress is also laid on the performance of this rite in the Greek Church. In the Russo- Greek Church there exist some sects without priests, “because in their idea the gift of consecration by laying on of hands, which had continued from the apostles down to Nicon (q.v.), had been lost by the apostacy of Nicon, and of the clergy seduced by him, and thus all genuine priesthood had become impossible” (Eckardt, Modern Russia, p. 261 sq., London, 1870, 8vo). It is particularly pleasing to notice the many ingenious devices of these sects to provide for a” priesthood descended from the apostles, in order to enable at least the performance of the rite of marriage, which they do not legalize unless performed by an accepted priest. The Jews assert that the laying on of hands, together with the Sanhedrim, ceased after the death of Rabbi Hillel, the “prince,” who flourished in the 4th century. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 5, 504; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 2, ch. 22; bk. 3, ch. 1; bk. 12, ch. 3; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 122, 369, 411; Apost. and Primit. Ch. (Phila. 1869, 12mo), p. 185 sq.; Augusti, Handb. d. Archäologie, 3 222; Hall, Works, 2, 876; B. Baur, in the Stud. und Krit. 1865, p. 343 sq.; Rothe, Arfange d. christl. Kirche, p. 161, etc. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index, p. 74, 145. SEE BENEDICTION.

## Impost[[@Headword:Impost]]

             (Lat. impositus) is an architectural term for the horizontal moldings or capitals on the top of a pilaster, pillar, or pier, from which an arch-springs. “In classical architecture the form varies in the several orders; sometimes the entablature of an order serves for the impost of an arch. In Middle-Age architecture imposts vary according to the style; on pillars and the small shafts in the jambs of doorways, windows, etc., they are usually complete capitals.” See Parker, Concise Glossary of' Architecture, p. 128; Wolcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 325.

## Impostor, Religious[[@Headword:Impostor, Religious]]

             a name appropriately given to such as pretend to an extraordinary commission from heaven, and who terrify the people with false denunciations of judgments. Too many of these have abounded in almost all ages. They are punishable in some countries with fine, imprisonment, and corporeal punishment.

## Impostoribus[[@Headword:Impostoribus]]

             SEE IMPOSTORS, THE THREE.

## Impostors, the Three[[@Headword:Impostors, the Three]]

             (Impostoribus, De tribus). Towards the end of the 10th century a rumor became current that there had appeared a book under the above title, in which the author attempted to prove that the world had been grossly deceived three times (by the founders of the three principal religions). In the latter part of the 13th century this supposed work attracted great attention among theologians and savans, particularly on account of the mystery which shrouded its origin, its author, and even its contents, for it was not only well-nigh impossible to procure a copy of the book, but even the contents were hardly known definitely to anybody. Towards the close of the 16th century the rumors concerning this book were again set on foot. The most extravagant ideas prevailed, and the authorship of the unknown work was in turn attributed to the emperors Frederick I and II, Averrhoes, Petrus a Vineis, Alphonso X, king of Castile, Boccaccio, Poggio, L. Aretin, Pomponazzio, Machiavelli, Erasmus, P. Aretino, Ochinus, Servetus, Rabelais, Gruetus, Barnaud, Muret, Nachtigall,  Giordano Bruno, Campanella, Milton, etc. It is no wonder that soon a number of books, entirely different from each other, made their appearance, each claiming to be the original work. The four most important were:

1. Vincentii Panurgi Epistola ad cl. virum Joannem Baptistum Morinum de tribus imspostoribus (Paris, 1644);

2. De tribus Nebulonibus (namely, Thomas Aniello, Oliver Cromwell, Julius Mazarinus);

3. History of the three famous Impostors (Lond. 1667);

4. Christiani Kortholdi Liber de tribus magnis impostoribus (nempe Eduardo Herbert de Cherbury, Thoma Hobbes, et Benedicto de Spinosa) (Kiloni, 1680).

In 1716 an unknown person of Haag claimed to possess the original in his library, and that it was the work of Petrus a Vireis, containing the thoughts of the emperor Frederick II, and written in 1230. Several copies of this work appeared soon after in French; the owner claimed to have made a vow not to copy the book, which, however, did not prevent him from translating it. A German chevalier d'industrie named Ferber finally published a work under the title of De tribus impostoribus, des trois imposteurs (Franefort sur le Main, 1721), but it was found to be only the work L'Esprit de-Spinoze (which had been published in MS. at the beginning of the 18th century) under a new name. In the mean time there appeared a Latin work of the same title, the MS. of which bears the date of 1598. This may be the original work, though probably the date has been altered, as it bears internal evidence of having been written about 1556 or 1560. Nothing is known of its author, except that, judging from the bad Latin in which it is written, he could not have belonged to the educated classes. Some think that the original title could hardly have been De tribus impostoribus, as it does not call either of the founders of the three religions — Moses, Christ, Mohammed outright impostors, but that the real title must have been De imposturis religionum. The existing MSS. present two different recensions: ‘one, the shortest, bears the latter title; the other, which is longer, and is evidently an enlarged and altered edition, has the title De tribus impostoribus. Yet, with the exception of a few unimportant passages, the two are essentially alike.  The author attacks the morality of the Jews and of the Christians, saying that Abraham wished to honor God by offering up human sacrifices, and that the Christians wickedly pray for the destruction of their enemies that polygamy is permitted by Moses, and even by some of the passages of the N.T., etc. “That twice two make four is so self-evident that there is no necessity of bringing all the mathematicians together to demonstrate it; but religions are so diversified that they do not agree either in the premises, the arguments, or the conclusions, and any one brought up in one of them is likely to continue to believe his own, whatever it be, the only true religion, to the exclusion of all others.” Hence the author rejects equally the Jewish, Christian, and Mohammedan religions, and proposes that every point of belief should be established by a system of witnesses and counter- witnesses, forming a regular processus in infinitum. See Rosenkranz, Der Zweifel am Glauben (Halle, 1830); F.W. Genthe, De impostura relig. breve compendium (Lpz. 1833); Prosper Marchand, Dict. Historique, 1, 312 sq.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 212 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Iist; bk. 3:cent. 13:pt. 1, ch. 2, p. 284, note 5; Herzog, Theol. Encyklop. 6, 645; Am. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1862, p. 164 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Impotency[[@Headword:Impotency]]

             the want of procreative power, is, according to the ecclesiastical law of the Roman Catholic Church, a good ground for either of the two parties annulling the marriage, if the impotency existed at the time the contract was entered into (cap. 2, 3, 4, X, De frigidis, 4,15). But the defect must not only be proved by competent medical advisers, but also pronounced by them as incurable (cap. 4:14, X, De probationibus, 2, 19; cap. 5, 6, 7, X, De frigidis, 4, 15; Resolutio 96 to Sess. 24 of the Tridentine Council of 1731, 1732, in the Leipzig edition by Richter, p. 258 sq.). If any doubt arises the marriage contract continues in force three years longer, to further test the impotency of the person so accused. At the expiration of this additional term of trial the oath of one or both of the parties is necessary to obtain permission for separation. The oldest ecclesiastical laws of the Protestants follow in the main these practices (compare Goschen, Doctrina de matrimonio, note 6, p. 102-106; Eichhorn, Kirchenrecht, 2, 348; Permanender, Kirchenrecht, p. 697; Walter, Kirchenrecht, p. 305). In Great Britain this practice is sanctioned by the civil law of the land (compare Chambers, Encyclop, 5, 1127). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 3:474. SEE MATRIMONY. (J. H.W.)

## Imprecation[[@Headword:Imprecation]]

             an appeal to God, invoking his curse upon (1) either one's self or (2) another. For the former, SEE OATH. The latter, which occurs frequently in the so-called “imprecatory Psalms” (see Edwards, On the Divine Imprecations, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, 1, 97; Presb. Quart. Rev. App. 1861; British and For. Ev. Rev. July, 1864; Heine, Abus. Psalms , 109, imprec. Helmst. 1739), is justified partly by the atrocity of some of the crimes execrated (e.g. that of Doeg), and partly by the fact of special authority in the act of inspiration. SEE ACCURSED; SEE CANAANITES, DESTRUCTION OF; SEE PSALMS.

## Imprisonment[[@Headword:Imprisonment]]

             SEE PRISON; SEE PUNISHMENTS.

## Improperia[[@Headword:Improperia]]

             (Lat. taunts).

(1.) Reproaches of Jesus against the Jewish people. SEE CAPERNAUM; SEE JERUSALEM.

(2.) In the Roman Catholic ritual, certain verses which reproach the Jews with ingratitude, and which, while the priest and other ecclesiastics present kiss the cross, are chanted by two singers personifying Christ, in such a manner that after each verse one chorus replies in the Greek and another in the Latin, praises to God; or the accusation as uttered by the priests is repeated on the part of the choir. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 838. (J. H.W.)

## Impropriation[[@Headword:Impropriation]]

             in Great Britain, a parsonage or ecclesiastical living, the profits of which are in the hands of a layman; in which case it stands distinguished from appropriation, which is where the profits of a benefice are in the hands of a bishop, college, etc., though the terms are now used promiscuously in England.

## Impulse[[@Headword:Impulse]]

             The desires or sensations of the soul are manifested by impulses, which tend either to the realization of some idea, the acquirement of something exterior to ourselves, or the repulsion of something disagreeable or hurtful.  The impulses accompanying divers thoughts and feelings may, according to their expression, be corporeal, spiritual, or intellectual. We must be careful how we are guided by impulses in religion. “There are many,” as one observes, “who frequently feel singular impressions upon their minds, and are inclined to pay a very strict regard unto them. Yea, some carry this point so far as to make it almost the only rule of their judgment, and will not determine anything until they find it in their hearts to do it, as their phrase is. Others take it for granted that the divine mind is notified to them by sweet or powerful impressions of some passages of sacred writ. There are other; who are determined by visionary manifestations, or by the impressions made in dreams, and the interpretations they put upon them. All these things, being of the same general nature, may very justly be considered together; and it is a matter of doubt with many how far these things are to be regarded, or attended to by us, and how we may distinguish any divine impressions of this kind from the delusions of the tempter, or of our own evil hearts. But whoever makes any of these things his rule and standard, forsakes the divine word; and nothing tends more to make persons unhappy in themselves, unsteady in their conduct, or more dangerously deluded hi their practice, than paying a random regard to these impulses, as notifications of the divine will.”-Buck, Theolog. Dictionary, s.v.; Kant,. Grundlegung z, Metaphysik der Sitten (pref. p. 10, 63); Evang. Kirchenzeitung (1853, No. 15); Ersch u. Gruber, Encyklopadie; Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 2, 126. SEE ENTHUSIASM; SEE PROVIDENCE.

## Impurity[[@Headword:Impurity]]

             want of that regard to decency, chastity, or holiness which our duty requires. Impurity, in the law of Moses, is any legal defilement. Of these there were several sorts: some were voluntary, as the touching a dead body, or any animal that died of itself; of any creature that was esteemed unclean; or touching things holy by one who was not clean, or was not a priest; the touching one who had a leprosy, one who had a gonorrhea, or who was polluted by a dead carcass, etc. Sometimes these impurities were involuntary, as when any one inadvertently touched bones, or a sepulcher, or anything polluted; or fell into such diseases as pollute, as the leprosy, etc. The beds, clothes, and movables which had touched anything unclean, contracted also a kind of impurity, and in some cases communicated it to others. These legal pollutions were generally removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged overhead in the water, and either had his clothes on when he did so, or washed himself  and his clothes separately. Other pollutions continued seven days, as that which was contracted by touching a dead body. Some impurities lasted forty or fifty days, as that of women who were lately delivered, who were unclean forty days after the birth of a boy, and fifty after the birth of a girl. Others, again, lasted till the person was cured. Many of these pollutions were expiated by sacrifices, and others by a certain water or lye made with the ashes of a red heifer sacrificed on the great day of expiation. When the leper was cured, he went to the Temple and offered a sacrifice of two birds, one of which was killed, and the other set at liberty. He who had touched a dead body, or had been present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor. The saints and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Savior, in the Gospel, has strongly inculcated that they are not outward and corporeal pollutions which render us unacceptable to God, but such inward pollutions as infect the soul, and are violations of justice, truth, and charity. SEE UNCLEANNESS.

## Imputation[[@Headword:Imputation]]

             in the O.T. םחָשִׁב in the N.T. λογίζομαι, is employed in the Scriptures to designate any action, word, or thing, as accounted or reckoned to a person; and in all these it is unquestionably used with reference to one's own doings, words, or actions, and not with reference to those of a second person (comp. Gen 15:6; Psa 105:31; Num 25:6; Num 18:27; 2Sa 19:19; Psa 31:2; Lev 7:18; Lev 17:4; Pro 27:14; 2Co 5:19; 2Ti 4:16; Rom 4:3-23; Gal 3:6; Jam 2:23). The word imputation is, however, used for a certain theological theory, which teaches that

(1) the sin of Adam is so attributed to man as to be considered, in the divine counsels, as his own, and to render him guilty of it;

(2) that, in the Christian- plan of salvation, the righteousness of Christ is so attributed to man as to be considered his own, and that he is therefore justified by it. SEE FALL OF MAN.

I. “Whatever diversity there may exist in the opinions of theologians respecting imputation, when they come to express their own views definitely. they will yet, for the most part, agree that the phrase God imputes the sin of our progenitors to their posterity, means that for the sins committed by our progenitors God punishes their descendants. The term to impute is used in different senses.

(a.) It is said of a creditor, who charges something to his debtor as debt, e.g. Phm 1:18.

(b.) It is transferred to human judgment when any one is punished, or declared deserving of punishment. Crime is regarded as a debt, which must be cancelled partly by actual restitution and partly by punishment.

(c.) This now is applied to God, who imputes sin when he pronounces men guilty, and treats them accordingly, i.e. when he actually punishes the sin of men (Ο᾿φι β-ωφξ, λογίζεσθαι ἁμαρτίαν, Psa 32:2).

The one punished is called נָשָׂא עָוֹן, in opposition to one to whom חָשִׁב לַצְדָּקָח, who is rewarded (Psa 106:31; Rom 4:3)” (Knapp, Theology, § 76).

1. The stronghold of the doctrine of imputation, with those who maintain the high Calvinistic sense of that tenet, is Rom 5:12-19. “The greatest difficulties with respect to this doctrine have arisen from the fact that many have treated what is said by Paul in the fifth of Romans-a passage wholly popular, and anything but formally exact and didactic-in a learned and philosophical manner, and have defined terms used by him in a loose and popular way by logical and scholastic distinctions. Paul shows, in substance, that all men are regarded and punished by God as sinners, and that the ground of this lies in the act of one man; as, on the contrary, deliverance from punishment depends also upon one man, Jesus Christ. If the words of Paul are not perverted, it must be allowed that in Romans 5, 12-14 he thus reasons: The cause of the universal mortality of the human race lies in Adam's transgression. He sinned, and so became mortal. Other men are regarded and treated by God as punishable, because they are the posterity of Adam, the first transgressor, and consequently they too are mortal. Should it now be objected, that the men who lived from Adam to Moses might themselves have personally sinned, and so have been punished with death on their own account, it might be answered that those who lived before the time of Moses had no express and positive law which  threatened the punishment of sin, like those who lived after Moses. The positive law of Moses was not as yet given; they could not, consequently, be punished on account of their own transgressions, as no law was as yet given to them (Rom 5:12 to Rom 14:14). Still they must die, like Adam, who transgressed a positive law. Hence their mortality must have another cause, and this is to be sought in the imputation of Adam's transgression. In the same way, the ground of the justification of man lies not in himself, but in Christ, the second Adam.

“We find that the passage in Romans 5 was never understood in the ancient Grecian Church, down to the 4th century, to teach imputations in a strictly philosophical and judicial sense; certainly. Origen, and the writers immediately succeeding him, exhibit nothing of this opinion. They regard bodily death as a consequence of the sin of Adam, and not as a punishment, in the strict and proper sense of this term. Thus Chrysostom says, upon Rom 5:12,Ε᾿κείνου πεσόντος (Α᾿δάμ), καὶ οὑ μὴ φαγόντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ξύλου, γεγόνασιν ἐξ ἐκείνου θνητοί. Cyril (Adv. Anthropom. c. 8) says, Οἱ γεγονότες ἐξ αὐ τοῦ (Α᾿δάμ), ὡς ἀπὸ φθαρτοὶ γεγόναμεν.

“The Latin Church, on the other hand, was the proper seat of the strict doctrine of imputation. There they began to interpret the words of Paul as if he were a scholastic and logical writer. One cause of their misapprehending so entirely the spirit of this passage was, that the word imputare (a word in common use among civilians and in judicial affairs) had been employed in the Latin versions in rendering Rom 5:13 of Romans 5; and that ἐφ᾿ ῳ (Rom 5:12) had been translated in quo, and could refer, as they supposed, to nobody but Adam. This opinion was then associated with some peculiar philosophical ideas at that time prevalent in the West, and from the whole a doctrine de imputatione was formed, in sense wholly unknown to the Hebrews, to the N.T., and to the Grecian Church. This clearly proves that the Grecian teachers, e.g. those in Palestine, took sides with Pelagius against the teachers of the African Church.

2. “Many have inferred the justice of imputation from the supposition that Adam was not only the natural or seminal, but also the moral head of the human race, or even its representative and federal head. They suppose, accordingly, that the sin of Adam is imputed to us on the same principle on which the doings of the head of a family, or. of the plenipotentiary of a state, are imputed to his family or state, although they had no personal  agency in his doings. In the same way they suppose Christ took the place of all men, and that what he did is imputed to them. According to this theory, God entered into a league or covenant with Adam, and so Adam represented and took the place of the whole human race. This theory was invented by some schoolmen, and has been adopted by many in the Romish and Protestant Church since the 16th century, and was defended even in the 18th century by some Lutheran theologians, as Pfaff of Tiibingen, by some of the followers of Wolf (e.g. Carpzov, in his Comm. de Imputatione facti proprii et alieni), and by Baumgarten, in his Dogmatik, and disputation ‘de imputatione peccati Adamitici.' But it was more particularly favored by the Reformed theologians, especially by the disciples of Cocceius, at the end of the 17th and commencement of the 18th century, e.g. by Witsius, in his (Economia feaderum. They appeal to Hos 6:7, They transgressed the covenant, like Adam, i.e. broke the divine laws. But where is it said that Adam was the federal head, and that his transgression is imputed to them? On this text Morus justly observes, ‘Est mera comparatio Judaeorum peccantium cum Adamo peccante.' Other texts are also cited in behalf of this opinion.

“But, for various reasons, this theory cannot be correct. For

(a.) the descendants of Adam never empowered him to be their representative and to act in their name.

(b.) It cannot be shown from the Bible that Adam was informed that the fate of all his posterity was involved in his own.

(c.) If the transgression of Adam is imputed, by right of covenant, to all his posterity, then, in justice, all their transgressions should be again imputed to him as the guilty cause of all their misery and sin. What a mass of guilt, then, would come upon Adam! But of all this nothing is said in the Scriptures.

(d.) The imputation of the righteousness of Christ cannot be alleged in support of this theory; for this is imputed to men only by their own will and consent. This hypothesis has been opposed, with good reason, by John Taylor, in his work on original sin.”

3. “Others endeavor to deduce the doctrine of imputation from the scientia media of God, or from his fore-knowledge of what is conditionally possible. The sin of Adam, they say, is imputed to us because God foresaw  that each one of us would have committed it if he had been in Adam's stead, or placed in his circumstances. Even Augustine says that the sin of Adam is imputed to us propter consensionem, or consensum praesumptum. This theory has been advanced, in modern times, by Reusch, in his Introductio in Theologiasn revelatam, and in Bremquell's work Die gute Sache Gottes, bei Zurechnung des Falls (Jena, 1749). But it is a new sort of justice which would allow us to be punished for sins which we never: committed, or never designed to commit, but only might possibly have committed under certain circumstances. Think a moment how many sins we all should have committed if God had suffered us to come into circumstances of severe temptation. An innocent man might, by this rule, be punished as a murderer because, had he lived at Paris on St. Bartholomew's night, in 1572, he might, from mistaken zeal, have killed a heretic.”

II. “Since none of these hypotheses satisfactorily explain the matter, the greater part of the moderate and Biblical theologians of the Protestant Church are content with saying, what is manifestly the doctrine of the Bible, that the imputation of Adam's sin consists in the prevailing mortality of the human race, and that this is not to be regarded as imputation in the strict judicial sense, but rather as the consequence of Adam's transgression” (Knapp, Theology, § 76).

III. “The enlightened advocates of imputation do after all disclaim the actual transfer of Adam's sin to his posterity. They are well aware that the human mind cannot be forced up to such a point as this. But they do still urgently contend for the idea that all Adam's posterity are punished for his sin, although they did not, in fact, commit it; and that in this sense, therefore, they are all guilty of it. Turretin's view is, that Adam's sin imputed is the ground or cause why men are born-with original sin inherent, i.e. with natural depravity; and this is, in his view, the punishment inflicted because of Adam's sin imputed to them. And with him many others agree. But Calvin, Edwards, Stapfer, and others, reject the doctrine of the real imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, while they maintain that native inherent depravity is the consequence of it, which is chargeable to us as sin. This Turretin declares to be no imputation at all, i.e. a real rejection of his doctrine. Rejecting these views of Turretin, then, Edwards, in order to account for it how all men came to be born with inherent sin, labors to show that there is a physical and psychological unity between  Adam and all his posterity. According to him, this would account for the commencement of native depravity, and when commenced it is imputed to us as sin, and therefore punishable, on legal ground, with temporal and eternal evil. But Turretin makes all to be punishment from the outset, and that on the ground of the sin of Adam, which is actually imputed to his descendants” (Stuart on Romans, 5, 19, p. 592). Dr. H. B. Smith, in an article in the Christian Union, takes the advanced ground that while it must be con ceded “that there is a proper interpretation,” and that Adam's posterity do inherit, “by virtue of their union with him, certain penal consequences of the great apostasy.” man can be “delivered” from these evils by “divine grace,” and “that for original sin, without actual transgression, no one will be consigned to everlasting death” [italics are ours]. In an article in the Princeton Theological Essays (1, 138 sq.), a member of the Presbyterian Church takes even more liberal ground. “We know that it is often asserted that Augustine and his followers held the personal unity of Adam and his race ... Let it be admitted that Augustine did give this explication of the ground of imputation. Do we reject the doctrine because we reject the reason which he gives to justify and explain it? .. It is no special concern of ours what Augustine held on this point. .. Any man who holds that there is such an ascription of the sin of Adam to his posterity as to be the ground of their bearing the punishment of that sin, holds the doctrine of impatation, whether he undertakes to justify this imputation merely on the ground that we are the children' of Adam, or on the principle of representation, or of scientia media; or whether he chooses to philosophize on the nature of unity until he confounds all notions of personal identity, as President Edwards appears to have done.”

IV. The question of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to believers is very skillfully treated by Watson (Theological Institutes, pt. 2, chap. 23), himself a believer in the doctrine of imputation in a modified way. We give here a summary of his statement of the subject.

There are three opinions as to imputation.

(I.) The high Calvinistic, or Antinomian scheme, which is, that “Christ's active righteousness is imputed unto us as ours” In answer to this, we say,

1. It is nowhere stated in Scripture.

2. The notion here attached to Christ's representing us is wholly gratuitous.  3. There is no weight in the argument that, “as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness was accounted ours ‘for our sins were never so accounted Christ's as that he did them.

4. The doctrine involves a fiction and impossibility inconsistent with the divine attributes.

5. The acts of Christ were of a loftier character than can be supposed to be capable of being the acts of mere creatures. 6. Finally, and fatally, this doctrine shifts the meritorious cause of man's justification from Christ's “obedience unto death” to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law.

(II.) The opinion of Calvin himself, and many of his followers, adopted also by some Armenians. It differs from the first in not separating the active from the passive righteousness of Christ, for such a distinction would have been inconsistent with Calvin's notion that justification is simply the remission of sins. This view is adopted, with certain modifications, by Armenians and Wesley. But there is a slight difference, which arises from the different senses in which the word imputation is used: the Armenian employing it in the sense of accounting to the believer the benefit of Christ's righteousness; the Calvinist, in the sense of reckoning the righteousness of Christ as ours. An examination of the following passages will show that this latter notion has no foundation in Scripture: Psalms 32 -l; Jer 23:6; Isa 45:24; Rom 3:21-22; 1Co 1:30; 2Co 5:21; Rom 5:18-19. In connection with this last text, it is sometimes attempted to be shown that, as Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity, so Christ's obedience is imputed to those that are saved; but (Goodwin, On Justification);

(1.) The Scripture nowhere affirms either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe.

(2.) To impute sin, in Scripture phrase, is to charge the guilt of sin upon a man, with a purpose to punish him for it. And

(3.) as to the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity if by it is meant simply that the guilt of Adam's sin is charged upon his whole posterity, let it pass; but if the meaning be that all Adam's posterity are made, by this imputation, formally sinners, then the Scriptures do not justify it.

(III.) The imputation of faith for righteousness.

(a.) Proof of this doctrine. —

1. It is expressly taught in Scripture (Rom 4:3-24, etc.); nor is faith used in these passages by metonymy for the object of faith, that is, the righteousness of Christ.

2. The testimony of the Church to this doctrine has been uniform from the earliest ages — Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, etc., down to the 16th century.

(b.) Explanation of the terms of the proposition that “faith is imputed for righteousness.”

1. Righteousness. To be accounted righteous is, in the style of the apostle Paul, to be justified, where there has been personal guilt.

2. Faith. It is not faith generally considered that is imputed to us for righteousness, but faith (trust) in an atonement offered by another in our behalf.

3. Imputation. The non-imputation of sin to a sinner is expressly called “the imputation of righteousness without works;” the imputation of righteousness is, then, the non-punishment or pardon of sin; and by imputing faith for righteousness, the apostle means precisely the same thing.

(c.) The objections to the doctrine of the imputation of faith for righteousness admit of easy answer.

1. The papists err in taking the term justification to signify the making men morally just.

2. A second objection is, that if believing is imputed for righteousness, then justification is by works, or by somewhat in ourselves. In this objection, the term works is used in an equivocal sense.

3. A third objection is, that this doctrine gives occasion to boasting. But

(1.) this objection lies with equal strength against the doctrine of imputed righteousness.

(2.) The faith itself is the gift of God.

(3.) The blessings which follow faith are given in respect to the death of Christ.

(4.) Paul says that boasting is excluded by the law of faith.

(IV.) The theologians who assert the extreme doctrine of imputation are ably answered by the closing words of an article on this subject in Chambers's Cyclopaedia, 5, 529: “To impute sin is to deal with a man as a sinner, not on account of his own act, or at least not primarily on this account, but on account of the act of another; and to impute righteousness is to deal with man as righteous, not because he is so, but on account of the righteousness of Christ reckoned as his, and received by faith alone. The act of another stands in both cases for our own act, and we are adjudged--in the one case condemned, in the other acquitted--lot for what we ourselves have done, but for what another has done for us.

“This is a fair illustration of the tyranny which technical phrases are apt to exercise in theology as in other things. When men coin an imperfect phrase to express a spiritual reality, the reality is apt to be forgotten in the phrase, and men play with the latter as a logical counter, having a force and meaning of its own. Imputation of sin and imputation of righteousness have in this way come to represent legal or pseudo-legal processes in theology, through the working out of the mere legal analogies suggested by the word. But the true spiritual reality which lies behind the phrases in both eases is simple enough. Imputation of sin is, and can be nothing else than, the expression of the spiritual unity of Adam and his race. Adam ‘being the root of all mankind,' the stock which has grown from this root must, share in its degeneracy. The law of spiritual life, of historical continuity, implies this, and it requires no arbitrary or legal process, therefore, to account for the sinfulness of mankind as derived from a sinful source. We are sinners because Adam fell. The fountain having become polluted, the stream is polluted. We are involved in his guilt, and could not help being so by the conditions of our historical existence; but, nevertheless, his sin is not our sin, and cannot, in the strict sense, be imputed to us, for sin is essentially voluntary in every case-an act of self- will, and not a mere quality of nature; and my sin, therefore, cannot be another's, nor another's mine. In the same manner, the highest meaning of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ lies in the spiritual unity of the believer with Christ, so that he is one with Christ, and Christ one with him, and in an true sense he becomes a partaker of the divine nature. The notion  of legal transference is an after-thought-the invention of polemical logic- and the fact itself is deeper and truer than the phrase that covers it. The race one with Adam, the believer one with Christ, are the ideas that are really true in the phrases imputation of sin and imputation of righteousness.”

See Watson, Institutes, 2, 215, 241; Knapp, Theology. § 76, 115; Whitby, De imputatione Peccati Adamitici; Taylor, Doctrine of Original Sin; Wesley, Sermons, 1, 171-4; Edwards, On original Sins; Walch, De Obedientia Christi Activa (Gottingen, 1754, 4to); Walch, ,Neueste Religionsgeschichte, 3, 311; Princeton Rev. April, 1860; Baird, The First and Second Adam (Philadelphia, 1860. 12mo); Princeton Repertory, 1830, p. 425; Whately, Difficulties of St. Paul, Essay 6; Stuart, On Romans, Excursus 5, 6. SEE OBEDIENCE OF CHRIST; SEE JUSTIFICATION.

## Imrah[[@Headword:Imrah]]

             (Heb. Yimrah', םיַמְרָהrefractoriness; Sept. Ι᾿εμρά), one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:36). B.C. post 1612. SEE HOTHAM.

## Imri[[@Headword:Imri]]

             (Heb. Inmri', אַמְרַי., eloquent), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. omits either this or the preced. name, giving only Α᾿μρί;.Vulg. Omrai). The son of Bani, and father of Omri of Judah (1Ch 9:4). B.C. much ante 536.

2. (Sept. Α᾿μαρί, Vulg. Amri). The “father” of Zaccur which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh 3:2). B.C. ante 446.

## In[[@Headword:In]]

             The Hinduwi comprehends many dialects, strictly local and provincial, which differ from each other chiefly in the different proportions of Sanscrit, Arabic, or Persian terms entering into their composition. At a very early period translations into these different dialects were executed by the Serampore missionaries, but these translations were not afterwards reprinted; some have been practically discontinued. See Bible of Every Land, page 103.

1. Braj, or Brij-bhasa. This dialect is spoken throughout the province of Agra. In 1811 the Reverend John Chamberlain, then stationed at Agra, commenced a translation of the New Test. in this dialect, and in 1813 he had finished the translation of the gospels. After much delay the New Test. was completed at press in the year 1832.

2. Bughelcundi. This dialect is spoken in a district between the province of Bundelcund and the sources of the Nerbudda River. A translation of the New Test. was commenced in 1814, and was published at Serampore in 1821.

3. Canaj, or Canyacubja. This dialect is spoken in the Doab of the Ganges and Jumuna. A version of the New Test. was commenced in 1815 at Serampore, and completed at press in 1822.

4. Kousulu, or Koshala. This dialect is spoken in the western part of Otude. In 1820 the gospel of Matthew was printed, arid nothing more since.

In addition to the Hinduwi dialects, strictly so called, there are several other Indian dialects, supposed to be corruptions of the general Hinduwi stock:

1. Bikaneera. This dialect is spoken in the province of Bikaneer, north of Marwar. The New Test. was printed at Serampore in 1823.

2. Buttaneer, or Virat. This is spoken in the province of Buttaneer, west of Delhi, and a New Test. printed in 1824 at Serampore is extant in that dialect.

3. Harroti. This dialect is spoken in Harroti, a province west of Bundelcund. A version of the New Test. was printed at Serampore in 1822.

4. Juyapoora. This is spoken in the province of Joipoor, east of Marwar and west of Agra. Only the gospel of Matthew was published at Serampore in 1815.

5. Madrwari. This dialect is spoken in the province of Joipoor, or Marwar, north of Mewar. this dialect the New Test. is extant since 1821.

6. Oodeypoora. This dialect is vernacular in the province of Mewar, or Oodeypoor. Only the gospel of Matthew has been published at Serampore in 1815.

7. Oojein, or Oujjuyuni. This dialect is vernacular in the province of Malwah of Central India. A version of the New Test. was published at Serampore in 1824. (B.P.)

## In Caena Domini[[@Headword:In Caena Domini]]

             (Lat. at the Lord's Supper, the opening words of the document) is the name of a celebrated papal bull. “It is not, as other bulls, the work of a single pope, but, with additions and modifications at various times, dates back from the Middle Ages; some writers tracing it to Martin V, others to Clement V, and some to Boniface VIII. Its present form, however, it received from the popes Julius II and Paul III, and, finally, from Urban VIII, in 1627, from that time it continued for a century and a half to be published annually on Holy Thursday,” whence its name; afterwards Easter Monday was substituted. The contents of this bull have been a fertile subject of controversy. It may be briefly described as a summary of ecclesiastical censures, especially against all heretical sects, which are cursed in it by their several designations, their excommunication renewed, and the same punishment threatened to all who should be guilty of schism, sacrilege, usurpation of the rights of the Church or of the pope, forcible and unlawful seizure of Church property, personal violence against ecclesiastics, unlawful interruption of the free intercourse of the faithful  with Rome, etc. The bull, however, although, as indicated, mainly dealing with offences against the Church, also denounces, under similar censures, the crimes of piracy, plunder of shipwrecked goods, forgery, etc.

This bill, being regarded by most of the crowned heads of Europe as an infringement of their rights, was in the 17th century opposed by nearly all the courts, even the most Roman Catholic; and at length, in 1770, according to some authorities (e.g. Hase, History of the Christian Church), Clement XIV discontinued its publication. Janus (Pope and Council, p. 387), however, says that it is still treated in the Roman tribunals as having legal force, and, according to the accounts of some eminent travelers who have visited Rome, it appears that the sentence of excommunication is still read, though in a more simple form. Eliza von der Recke (Tagebuch einer Reise durch einen Theil Dezutschlands u. d. Italien, Berlin, 1817, 4:95), under date of April 6, 1806, relates that after the pope had blessed the people from the balcony of the church of St. Peter, “he read out a paper, then tore it, and threw the fragments down among the people. A great tumult then arose, every one ‘striving to secure a piece of the paper, but I do not know for what purpose, for, as I was told, the paper contained nothing but the form of excommunication always pronounced on this occasion against all who are not Romanists. This concluded the festival.” This is confirmed by what chancellor. Gottling, of Jena, relates as having seen in his journey; in 828 (in Rohr, Kritische Predigerbibliothek, 11, 379 sq.). It thus seems proved that the bull itself, whose § 21 says: “Volentes prasentes nostros processus ac omnia et quaecunque his literis contenta, quousque alii huiusmodi processus a Nobis ant Romano-Pontifice pro tempore existente fiant aut publicentur, durare suosque effectus omnino sortiri,” is not completely abolished yet. No pope has so far substituted a new bull for the old, and its principles concerning the cases reserved for the pope are yet in full force. In the Historisch-politische Blutter of Phillips and Gorres (Munich, 1847, vol. 21) we find it stated that “In foro conscientice, the bull is only valid yet in so far as its stipulations have not in other acts been altered by the Church herself.” Its efficiency in foro externo, so much desired by Rome, is everywhere opposed in self-defense by the civil powers. For the special history of this bull, and proofs of its present validity in the Romish Church, see Biber, Bull in Comna Domini, transl. (Lond. 1848); Biber, Papal Diplomacy and the Bull in Ccena Dominsi (Lond. 1848); Lebret, Geschichte d. Bulle (Lpz. 1768, 4 vols.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8, 843; Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 530; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation, 3:266, 387; Janus, Pope and Council, p. 384 sq.; cardinal Erskine to Sir  J.C. Hippisley, in Rep. of Comm. of House of Commons on the Laws regarding-the Regulation of the Roman Cath. subjects (1816, p. 218). (J. H. W.)

## In antis[[@Headword:In antis]]

             a term for a temple which has upon the façade two columns, detached, standing between two antce that terminate the side walls of it. Specimens are the temples at Rhamnus and Sunium. — Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art, 2, 200.

## In partibus infidelium[[@Headword:In partibus infidelium]]

             (i.q. in heathen countries), EPISCOPUS, episcopus titularis, episcopus sufraganeus. All these expressions, sometimes used promiscuously, have, when closely examined, different significations. As bishops, on account of the great variety and number of duties devolving on them, are unable to perform them all in person, they are allowed the use of assistants, such as archdeacons, coadjutors, etc. For such functions, however, as can only be performed by a bishop, since there can be but one in a diocese (c. 8, Conc. Niccen. a. 325), the bishop unable to perform them was formerly obliged to call in the aid of a neighboring bishop. In after times, the bishops driven out of their dioceses were especially entrusted with these functions, being considered as still belonging dejure to their diocese. The Roman Church was thus led never to give up, in principle, any place where it had once obtained a footing, even when it did lose it in fact; and thus, when its bishops were driven from a place, their connection with their cathedra did not therefore cease. In the 9th century a number of bishops were driven out of Spain by the Arabs, and sought refuge at Oviedo (Africa), waiting to resume their sees; and when one of them died,' another was at once elected in his stead. While thus waiting they acted as assistants to the bishops of Oviedo, according to the express definition: “Ut episcopi, qui ditione carerent, Ovetensi praesuli vicariam operam exhiberent, cura in multos partita, ejusque reditibus alerentur” (see Thomassin, Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina de beneficiis, pt. 1, lib. 1, cap. 27, no. 8; Vinterim, Die vorzüglichsten Denkwürdigkeiten d. christkath. Kirche, vol. 1, pt. 2, p.  379, 380).

We next find instances of such vice-episcopi, vices gerentes in pontificalibus, vicarii in pontificalibus, in Germany, and they grew more numerous after the 12th century in consequence of the schism of the Eastern Church. It then became the practice to appoint for such dioceses as had formerly been Christian, but had now fallen into the hands of infidels (in partibus infidelium), bishops called episcopi titulares, who were used as assistants to other bishops in their strictly episcopal functions. The practice soon led to abuses, monks especially using every exertion to obtain such appointments. Clement V therefore decreed at Vienna in 1311 that no such bishops should thenceforth be appointed without the special authorization of the ‘pope, and that no monks could be raised to that office without the consent of their superiors (cap. 5, Clement. De electione).

Other restrictions were also enacted at Ravenna in 1311,1314, etc., but the practice was not abolished. Thus, at the Synod of Cologne in 1322, we find the bishop of Liege represented by a titular bishop (episcopus ecclesie Henner's) (Hartzheim, Concilia Gernmaniae, 4:284). We find also mention made in the synod of Salzburg, in 1420, of episcopi titulares (Hartzheim, 5, 179), and in that of Passan, in 1470 (Song of Solomon 7, 8), of surcaganei, whose functions were to consecrate priests and churches. They received the name of suffiaganei because they were to support the bishops by deed and word (suifagio). Leo X, in the fifth Lateran Council, 1514 (Sess. 9), granted also to the cardinals the privilege of having vicarii seu sufifaganei. The Council of Trent (Sess. 6:cap. 5, De re. form.; Sess. 14, cap. 2, 8:De reform.) sought to remedy the still existing abuses, for sometimes titular bishops endeavored to establish separate bishoprics for themselves in the dioceses of the bishops whom they were to assist. On this and subsequent decisions (see Benedict XIV, De synodo diocesana, lib. 2, cap. 7; lib. 13, cap. 14; Ferraris, Bibl. Canonica, s.v. Episcopus, art. 7. no. 21 sq.) is based the existing practice of creating bishops- of the title of dioceses which have passed from the rule of the Romish Church. Hence, in the bull De salute animarum of 1821 to Prussia, it is enacted that the confirmation of existing suffraganeatus, as also the restoration of those of Treves and Cologne, shall be performed in the usual manner (“servatis consuetis formis de episcopatu titulari in partibus ilfidelium”). This consecration differs from that of the other bishops only in making the recipient simply an adjunct of the regularly located bishops, without separate jurisdiction. When they confer orders without the consent of their bishops, or otherwise overstep their duties, they are punished by being suspended for one year. The episcopi in partibus, as simple titular bishops,  are revocable papal delegates. So also when they are missionary bishops. Suffragan bishops are in a more secure position, “cum assuetas congrume adsignatione provideatur,” as says the bull De salute. See A. H. Andreucci, De episcopo titulari seu in partibus infidelium (Romans 1732); Thomassin, Vetus ac nova ecclesice disciplina de beneficiis, pt. 1, lib. 1, cap. 27, 28; F. A. Dtirr, De suffiaganei seu vicariis in pontificalibus episcop. German. (Mogunt. 1782); J. H. Heister, Suffraganei Colonienses extraordinarii sive de sacrce Colon. ecclesiae pro episcopis, etc. (Mogunt. 1843). — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 4, 103.

## Ina[[@Headword:Ina]]

             king of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex from 689 to 729, celebrated as the principal legislator of the Anglo-Saxons, deserves mention here on account of his enactments in favor of religious observances. He was the first in that portion of England who made the laws of Christianity the basis of all civil and social relations. Particular regard was paid to the observance of the Sabbath day; the rite of baptism was ordered to be performed on infants within thirty days after their birth, etc. His relation with the see of  Rome was very intimate. He made several journeys to the Eternal City, and originated in his dominions the payment of the annual tribute of the “Peter's pence.” See Riddle. Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 310; Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 93 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Inability[[@Headword:Inability]]

             in theology, is generally used to denote want of power to do the will of God. It is natural inability when the hindrance is physical; moral inability when the hindrance lies in the will. This distinction has special prominence in American theology, and has been the subject of a great deal of controversy between New-school and Old school Calvinists, and also between Calvinists and Armenians. The New school contend that man is naturally able to obey God, but morally unable. The Old school deny both natural and moral ability. The Armenians deny natural and moral, but assert gracious ability on the part of man to accept Christ, and so to obey God.

The following paragraphs present well the Old school view of the subject. “It has long been a boast, in certain quarters, that it is the glory of American theology that it has enabled us to hold fast to the doctrine of inability, and yet so to explain it as to make the sinner inexcusable, and to prevent him from abusing it to purposes of carnal apathy and desperation. This happy result, which the Bible ascribes to the Holy Ghost, is supposed to be accomplished by showing men that they have full natural ability to fulfill God's requirements; that they have no inability, but simply a want of will, or purpose, or inclination, to obey the Gospel, which they have full power to remove, if they will. While this language is used by many in a sense which, as explained by themselves, at all events coheres with the doctrine that man has lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, it is used by others to express and vindicate the dogma that men are perfectly able to make themselves Christians at pleasure. This is Pelagialism, without even a decent disguise. Yet it is this very class who make the most of the distinction in question. They think it a convenient and safe shelter for their doctrines that man can make himself a new heart. This class claim that Edwards was the inventor of this distinction; that it is the distinguishing characteristic and special property of his followers; that therefore they are the true Edwardeans, because they are the patrons and inheritors of this his grand discovery in theology. It can easily be shown, however,  1. That whatever of truth is connected with this distinction was familiar to theologians not only before the time of Edwards, but from the time when the heresies of Pelagius first occasioned thorough discussion of the subject of sin and grace.

2. That Edwards did not regard himself as introducing any novel doctrines or discoveries on the subject.

A formerly distinguished champion of New school doctrines recently said in a public speech, with great truth, ‘that the common idea that the power of Edwards's system lies in the distinction of natural and moral ability is a fallacy.' This was well understood before his day. It lies in his views or spiritual light, which constitute the key to his whole treatise on the Religious Affections.' All who have read this treatise, or his sermons on the ‘Natural Blindness of Men in Religion,' and on The Reality of Spiritual Light,' must concede the justness of this statement. The great principle of his work on the Affections is that ‘they arise from divine illumination.' The amount of truth contained in the proposition that man is naturally able, but morally unable, to obey God's commands, may be thus stated:

1. Man is really unable to do things spiritually good without divine grace. But this inability is moral, because it pertains to our moral nature. It does not excuse, because it is our sin; and the greater it is, the greater is our sin.

2. This corruption and inability do not destroy any of the faculties of will, affection, or intelligence, which are essential to humanity, moral agency, or responsibility. They only vitiate the state and action of those faculties with reference to things moral and spiritual. All power remains which would be requisite to the fulfillment of God's commands if we were holy. Any hindrance, or want of power or opportunity, which would prevent us from fulfilling any command of God if we were morally good, excuses the non- performance of it, and this alone. So far, then, as the assertion that we have natural ability is intended to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth. So far as it is used, or is adapted to convey the idea that we have ability to remove our sinful corruption without the prevenient and efficacious grace of God, or that our inability, though moral, is such that we can resume it by the strength of our own will, or that it is not by nature, it contains a dangerous error. It is not only contrary to Scripture and all Christian experience, but it is inconceivable that any state or act of the unregenerate will of man should make him a holy being. The corrupt tree cannot bring forth such good fruit.  Nay, as all Christians find to their sorrow, they cannot, although partially sanctified, by any power of their wills, exclude all corruption from their souls. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that they cannot do the things that they would. When they would do good, evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the phrase ‘natural ability,' according to its natural import, fairly express, or, rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt natures, which is not adequate to produce the result. Man has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?” — Princeton Review, July, 1854, No. 10:p. 512 sq.

The Armenian doctrine is (1) that the unregenerate have complete ability, through the efficient grace of Christ, to comply with the conditions of justification as offered under the covenant of grace; (2) that the regenerate have ability, through the grace of Christ, to do the will of God, i.e. to avoid voluntary transgression thereof. The following criticism of the Armenian view, by an eminent New-England divine, with a comment on it, is taken from the Christian Advocate, Dec. 15, 1859. The parts in brackets are added by the commentator. “The Armenian theory of man's inability or want of power is the same [as the Calvinistic], excepting a vain attempt to conceal its revolting aspect by the still greater absurdity of what is called a gracious ability. The advocates of this theory plainly subvert and virtually deny the grace of God in their very attempt to magnify it; for if man has not ability or power to obey God without grace [divine operation, or ‘favor to sinners'], then he does not sin in not obeying, since a being who cannot act morally right cannot act morally wrong. Such a being cannot be truly said to receive or to be capable of receiving grace, for grace is favor to sinners. Besides, what does the supposed grace of God [here evidently in the sense of divine efficiency] do? Does it give man power to obey? then man has power to obey, as he must have before he obeys.' But even this is no security that he will obey. [What Armenian ever pretended that it is?] Adam sinned with this power. The grace [exercise of divine efficiency],  then, does not meet the exigency of the case. [Is invariable obedience essential, then, to a proper human ability? In that case, what would become of Dr. Taylor's own theory?] Is it said he has power to use the grace [what does the word mean here?] furnished? But what power is this? Until man has power to obey, it is absolutely inconceivable that he should obey, for I the act of obedience is his own act, done in the exercise of his own power to obey. Thus the grace of God [the Holy Ghost], according to this scheme, must, by a direct act of creation, impart some new essential mental faculty or power to the sound of man to qualify it to act morally right or wrong. Without the grace of God man has not a human soul, for he has not the true and essential nature of such a soul-the power requisite to moral action. [We have been wont to think of ‘power' as an attribute, not as a ‘nature.'] He cannot be a sinner, and of course grace to him cannot be grace to a sinner. Grace is no more grace” (Taylor, Lectures on the Moral Government of God, 2, 123).

The comment is as follows: “In the first place, Dr. Taylor falsely represents the Armenian as asserting the gracious ability of man, in general terms, to keep the divine law, whereas we only affirm this of the regenerate. In the second place, he continually shuffles in his use of the term grace, as will be seen by our bracketed insertions of equivalents, wherever the context fixes the sense. In the third place, we see no possible relevancy in his argument against a divinely imparted ‘power to obey,' from the fact that the possession of this power does not insure its invariable exercise any more than it did in Adam's case. If the professor had inferred the impossibility of our theory of ability from the conceded fact that the earth revolves upon its axis, we should not have been more at loss to perceive the. pertinency or logical force of the reasoning. Finally, he forgets that in the economy of redemption, ‘ability to use grace' is an ‘ability to obey.' God's prime requirement of a sinner is repentance and return to service; and in the arrangements of the remedial scheme under which we live, the sinner possesses a complete, though not a constitutional and independent ‘ability to obey' this ‘requirement.” For the New-England view, SEE NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY. SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE PELAGIANISM; SEE GRACE. For a full discussion of the New-school theory, see Hodgson, New Divinity Examined (N. Y. 12mo); Princeton Review, July, 1854. See also Amer. Presb. Rev. Jan. 1861; Bib. Sacra, 1863, p. 324 sq., 608 sq.; 1865, p. 503; Meth. Quart. Rev. 49, 263; 1868, p. 610; British Quart. Rev. July, 1867; New Englander, 1868, p. 486, 490, 496-9, 511, 553.

## Inauguratio[[@Headword:Inauguratio]]

             the ceremony by which the ancient Romans consecrated a person or thing to the gods. It was performed by the augurs (q.v.), who offered prayer to the gods, asking them to show by signs whether they accepted the consecrated object. If the signs appeared favorable, the consecration was regarded as complete. The kings of Rome were inducted by the augurs as the high priests of the people; but the inauguration of the flamens devolved upon the college of pontiffs.

## Incantation[[@Headword:Incantation]]

             (Lat. incantatio; incanto, to chant a magic formula, compound of in, intensive, and canto, to sing) denotes “one of the most powerful and awe- inspiring modes of magic (q.v.), viz., that resting on a belief in the mysterious power of words solemnly conceived and passionately uttered.” “There is in the human voice, especially in its more lofty tones, an actual power of a very wonderful kind to stir men's hearts. When to this we add that poetic utterance is a special and exceptional gift; that the language of primitive nations is crude and unmanageable, the words being as difficult to weld together as pieces of cast iron; that it is only when the poet's mind has risen to unusual heat that he can fuse them into those rhythmical sequences that please the ear and hang together in the memory; that, in short, his art is a mystery to himself-an inspiration-we need not wonder at the feeling with which everything in the form of verse or meter was viewed. The singing or saying of such compositions which could thus stir the blood of the hearers they knew not how, what other effects might it not produce?” To the power which the superstitious belief of the people, up to and even through the Middle Ages, gave to incantations, especially when accompanied, as they generally were, with the concocting of drugs and other magical rites, there is hardly any end. “They could heal or kill. If they could not raise from the dead, they could make the dead speak, or ‘call up spirits from the vast deep' in order to unveil the future. They could extinguish fire; darken the sun or moon; make fetters burst, a door or a mountain fly open; blunt a sword; make a limb powerless; destroy a crop, or charm it away into another's barn.” It is especially the heathenish nations that in their prayers, whether for blessings or for curses, partake largely of the nature of magical incantations. “They are not supposed to act as petitions addressed to a free agent, but by an inherent force which even the gods cannot resist.

This is very marked in Hinduism and Buddhism, but it actually pervades all superstitious worship, though sometimes quite disguised. They think they shall be heard for their much speaking.' For almost every occasion or operation of life there were appropriate formulas  to be repeated in order to secure success; and many of these, with that reverence for antiquity and conservative tendency which always characterize superstition, continue to live in popular memory, although often the words are so old as to be unintelligible. Thus, among the Romans, in the days of Cato, incantations were common for curing dislocations, full of words the meaning of which had been lost. A form of words used to this day in Shetland for healing a sprain call be traced back to the 10th century. In its earliest form, as found in an old German manuscript, it narrates how their native gods, Woden and Baldur, riding out to hunt, Baldur's horse dislocated its foot, and how Wolden, using charmed words, set bone to bone, etc., and so healed the foot. The repetition of this rhymed narration acted as a charm to heal other lamed horses. A modern version of this tradition, current in Norway even in our day, makes the accident happen to the horse of Jesus, and Jesus himself perform the cure-in Shetland, also, the Lord (Jesus) is substituted for Woden: and the formula is applied to the healing of persons' limbs as well as those of horses. The operation is thus described in R. Chambers's Popular Rhymes of Scotland: ‘When a person has received a sprain, it is customary to apply to an individual practiced in casting the “wresting- thread.” This is a thread spun from black wool, on which are cast nine knots, and tied round a sprained leg or arm. During the time the operator is putting the thread round the affected limb, he says, but in such a tone of voice as not to be heard by the bystanders, nor even by the person operated upon:

“‘Our Lord rade,

His foal's foot slade;

Down he lighted,

His foal's foot righted.

Bone to bone,

Sinew to sinew,

Blood to blood,

Flesh to flesh.

Heal, in name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. SEE MAGIC; SEE WITCHCRAFT.

## Incapacity[[@Headword:Incapacity]]

             in the ecclesiastical sense, is absolute unfitness for ordination. Thus women (Gen 3:16; 1Ti 2:12; 1Co 14:34-35) and  unbaptized persons are incapacitated from ordination. Baptism is essential to church membership, and therefore the basis of further advancement in the Church: “Cum baptismus sit fundamentum omnium sacramentorum ante susceptionem baptismi non suscipiatur aliud sacramentum” (c. 60, Song of Solomon 1 qu. 1, Capit. Theodori Canterb.); also c. 1, 10:De presbytero non baptizato (3, 43); c. 3, 10, eod. (Innocent III a. 1206); c. 2, De cognatione spirituali in 6 (4, 3) Bonifacii VIII. So the early Church declared that he who has not received in due form the baptism of water is not a member of the visible church, and cannot therefore be ordained. The Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, in c. 19 (c. 52, Song of Solomon 1, qu. 1), directs that the clergy of the Paulinists who did not perform baptism regularly) and of other sects were to be rebaptized and ordained on their return to the Catholic Church, and that such persons as had been previously ordained, but not baptized, should at once receive baptism, and then be reordained (c. 112, dist. 4, De consecr. [Leo a. 4581; c. 60, Song of Solomon 1, qu. 1; comp. Capit. lib. 6. c. 94, and other quoted passages), although, according to the decision of pope Innocent II (c. 2, 10:De presb. non bapt.; c. 34,151, dist. 4:De consecr.),the subordination of a baptized priest ordained by an unbaptized did not necessarily follow. SEE IRREGULARITY.

The incapacity of women for ordination was believed to be so fully authorized by the passages above cited from the Bible that it was never questioned by the Church. God had made woman subject to the rule of man; she could therefore not instruct a congregation likely to be composed also of men (Cone. Carthag. 4, a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29; dist. 23:c. 20; dist. 4, De consecr.). It is from this point of view that Tertullian regards this question when he says (De velandis virginibss, c. 8): “Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed non docere, nec tingere, nec offerre, nec allius virilis muneris nedum sacerdotalis officiis sortem ubi vindicare.” Ina like strain argue Augustine (c. 17, can. 33, qu. 5) and others. The early Church therefore declared that no woman should be ordained presbytera (vidua) (Conc. Laodic. a. 372, c. 11 in c. 19, dist. 32), nor diacona, or diaconissa (Concil. Arausicanum 1, a. 441, can. 26; Epaonense, a. 517, can. 21; Aurelianense 2, a. 533, can. 18 [ed. Brunc. 2, 126, 170, 187]; compare c. 23, can. 27, qu. 1, Novella Justiiniani 6:cap. 5); though educated and pious, they are not to teach in the congregations (Conc. Carthag. 4, a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29, dist. 23; c. 20, dist. 4:De consecr.). Abbesses were not to bless the nuns, to hear confessions, or to preach in public (c. 10, 10, Deponit. et remiss. [5, 38] Innocent III a. 1210).  The Evangelical Church teaches the necessity of baptism (Augsb. Conf. art. 9, etc.), and also that “the female sex was not ordained by God to rule, either in the Church, or in secular positions where a specially strong understanding and good counsel are requisite. But they are ordered to take care of their household, and to see after it diligently” (Luther, in Walch's Werke, 2, 1006). The ground which the Reformers took on this question was up to our day approved by the Protestant churches at large. Among the Friends, however, no such distinction has ever been recognized. Indeed, the tendency of the present age is to abolish the rule altogether, and females in several instances have actually been installed as pastors in this country, while in other cases their ability in the pulpit has been freely acknowledged even among evangelical denominations. Yet even this hardly satisfies the advocates of “women's rights” (q.v.). See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6:617. (J. H. W.)

## Incardinare[[@Headword:Incardinare]]

             in the language of the Church of the Middle Ages, is the appointment of any strange bishop, presbyter, deacon, or a person of some other class of the priesthood, to this or that church, in which he was to perform services in part or exclusively, or even the appointment to one particular church. The election of a cardinal was also called incardinare, Fuhrmann, Handworterbuch d. Kirchengesch, 2, 435.

## Incardinati clerici[[@Headword:Incardinati clerici]]

             fugitive or foreign priests appointed to a church, in contrast with the appointment of a native and regular priest. — Pierer, Universal Lexicon, 8, 840.

## Incarnation[[@Headword:Incarnation]]

             (Lat. in, and caro, flesh), the permanent assumption of a human form by a divine personage.

I. False or Pretended Incarnations of Heathen Religions. — The mythologies of most nations afford traces, although faint, of the idea of incarnation. If, as Vinet has suggested, there can be no religion without an incarnation, the pseudo-incarnations of false religions may be regarded as so many gropings for the truth, “if haply they might feel after him” who at some time should become incarnate. These incarnations express the  deepest need of our common nature. Sin has so isolated man from God that he feels there is no hope of his restoration except “the gods come down in the likeness of men.” This idea confronts us from all parts of the world, whether in the avatars of the Hindu, the election and worship of the Lama of Thibet, the metamorphoses of the Greek and Roman mythologies, or the wilder worship of the aborigines of America. The earlier Christian apologists attributed these caricatures of the true incarnation to Satan, and alleged that “he invented these fables by imitating the truth.” Neander makes the profound suggestion that “at the bottom of these myths is the earnest desire, inseparable from man's spirit, for participation in the divine nature as its true life its anxious longing to pass the gulf which separates the God-derived soul from its original-its wish, even though unconscious, to secure that union with God which alone can renew human nature, and which Christianity shows us as a living reality. Nor can we be astonished to find the facts of Christianity thus anticipated in poetic forms (embodying in imaginative creations the innate yet indistinct cravings of the spirit) in the mythical elements of the old religions, when we remember that human nature itself, and all the forms of its development, as well as the whole course of human history, were intended by God to find their full accomplishment in Christ” (Life of Christ, chap. 2, sec. 12).

The want that thus expresses itself in these fabled avatars lies at the foundation of idolatry. The unsatisfied nature of mall demands that his Deity should be near him-should dwell with him. It first leads him to represent the Deity by the work of his own hands, and then to worship it (see Tholuck, Predigten, 2, 148). Or we may look upon these avatars as so many faint and distant irradiations of the holy light that shone upon the Garden through the first promise given to man. On the contrary, Kitto denies “that there is in Eastern mythology any incarnation in any sense approaching that of the Christian, and that least of all is there any where it has been most insisted on” (Daily Bible Illus. on John 1, 14). Cocker, in his late work (Christianity and Greek Philosophy, N. Y. 1870, 8vo, p. 512), advances the theory that the idea. of “a pure spiritual essence without form and without emotion, pervading all and transcending all, is too vague and abstract to yield us comfort,” and that therefore the need of an incarnation “became consciously or unconsciously ‘the desire of nations' “by ‘‘the education of the race” and “by the dispensation of philosophy. The idea of an incarnation was not unfamiliar to human thought, it was no new or strange idea to the heathen mind. The numberless metamorphoses of Grecian mythology, the incarnations of Brahma, the avatars of Vishnu, and  the human form of Krishna, had naturalized the thought (Young, Christ of History, p. 248).” See Dorner, Lehre v. der Persons Christi, 1, 7 sq.; Biblioth. Sacra, 9:250; Weber, Indische Studien, 2, 411 sq.

Among the ancient Egyptians, Apis or Hapi, “the living bull,” was esteemed to be the emblem and image of the soul of Osiris, who, as Pliny and Cicero say, was deemed a god by the Egyptians. “Diodorus derives the worship of Apis from a belief that the soul of Osiris had migrated into this animal; and he was thus supposed to manifest himself to man through successive ages;” while Strabo calls “Apis the same as Osiris” (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgm. 1, 290, 291). “About the time when Cambyses arrived at Memphis, Apis appeared to the Egyptians.” Their great rejoicings led that prince to examine the officers who had charge of Memphis. These responded “that one of their gods had appeared to them-a god who, at long intervals of time, had been accustomed to show himself in Egypt” ‘Herod. 3:27). Mnevis, the sacred bull of Heliopolis, was also a representative of Osiris, and with Apis, the sacred bull of Memphis, was worshipped as a god throughout the whole of Egypt. Ammianus says that Mnevis was sacred to the sun, while Apis was sacred to the moon (see Rawlinson's Hersod. 2, 354, Engl. edition). Hardwick, however, adduces Wilkinson as regarding it “a merit of the old Egyptians that they (lid not humanize their gods; and yet he admits that their fault was rather the elevation of animals and emblems to the rank of deities;” Hardwick denies that the idea of incarnation is to be found in the old. Egyptian creed (Christ and other Masters, 2, 351). SEE APIS.

The mythology of the Hindis presents a vast variety of incarnations, the inferior avatars that have appeared in various ages being innumerable. The object of the avatar is declared by Vishnu himself, who, in the form of Krishna, thus addresses Arjuna: “Both I and thou have passed many births; mine are known to me, but thou knowest not thine. Although I am not in my nature subject to birth or decay, and am the lord of all created beings, yet, having command over my own nature, I am made evident by my own power; and as often as there is a decline of virtue, and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world, I make myself evident. Thus I appear from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of virtue” (Bhagavad-Gita, p. 40). With this declaration accord, for the most part, the objects of the ten more conspicuous avatars of this deity, although the details of them abound in puerilities and obscenity. In the Matsya, or Fish avatar, Vishnu took the  form of a human being issuing from the body of a fish, for the recovery of the sacred books which had been stolen from Brahma by the daemon Hayagriva. The Kurna, or Tortoise avatar, supported the earth sinking in the waters. The prayer of Brahma for assistance when the whole earth was covered with water called forth a third avatar of Vishnu, that of the Vardaha, or Boar, of which Maurice says, “Using the practical instinct of that animal, he began to smell around that he might discover the place where the earth was submerged. At length, having divided the water and arriving at the bottom, he saw the earth lying a mighty and barren stratum; then he took up the ponderous globe (freed from the water), and raised it high on his tusk-one would say it was a beautiful lotus blossoming on the tip of his tusk” (Hist. of Hindostan, 1, 575 sq.).

There can be but little doubt that these three avatars are perversions of the Hindu traditions of the Deluge. The next incarnation burst forth from a pillar as a man-lion for the purpose of destroying a blaspheming monarch. The Vamana, or Dwarf, in the next avatar, rebuked the pride of Maha Bali, the great Bali. In human form the divine Parasurama, in twenty pitched battles, extirpated the Kettri tribe to prepare for the Brahmin the way to empire. The seventh was very like that of the preceding, and for similar objects. Rama Chandra, however, was a great reformer and legislator. The eighth, that of Krishna, represents the Deity in human form trampling on the head of a serpent, while the serpent is biting his heel-a corruption of the promise to Eve. One object of the ninth incarnation, that of Buddha, is generally admitted to have been the abolition of sanguinary sacrifices. Whatever be the cause, “Buddhism stands conspicuous in the midst of heathendom as a religion without sacrificial cultus.” Upon the tenth, the Kalki avatar, which is yet to take place, the destruction of the universe will ensue (see Maurice, History of Hindostan, passim; Hardwick, 1, 278; New Englander, 3:183-185). For the astounding events connected with the birth and infancy of Gotama (q.v.), SEE BUDDHA. See also Hardy's Annual of Buddhism, p. 140 sq. SEE AVATAR; SEE HINDUISIM.

Lamaisn presents many features in common with Buddhism, so much so that it may be considered one of its outgrowths. It “differs fundamentally from Chinese Buddhism in the doctrine of hereditary incarnations. The great thought of some intelligence issuing from the Buddha world assuming the conditions of our frail humanity, and for a time presiding over some one favored group of Buddhist monasteries, had long been familiar to the natives of Tibet.” In the latter half of the 15th century arose the idea of  perpetual incarnations. “Then it was that one chief abbot, the ‘perfect Lama.' instead of passing, as he was entitled to do, to his ultimate condition, determined for the benefit of mankind to sojourn longer on the earth, and be continuously new-born. As soon as he was carried to his grave in 1473, a search was instituted for the personage who had been destined to succeed him. This was found to be an infant who established its title to the honor by appearing to remember various articles which had been the property of the lama just deceased, or, rather, were the infant's own property in earlier stages of existence. So fascinating was the theory of perpetual incarnations that a fresh succession of rival lamas (also of the yellow order) afterwards took its rise in Teshu-lambu while the Dalai lamas were enthroned in Lhassa; and at present every convent of importance, not in Tibet only, but in distant parts of Tartary, is claiming for itself a like prerogative. .. The religion of Tibet is from day to day assuming all the characteristics of man-worship” (Hardwick, 2, 93 sq.). For the election of the successor of the lama, see also Huc's Travels in Tartary, 2, ch. 6:p. 197 sq.

The notion that prevailed in Egypt was similar, “save only that the symbolical bull was substituted for the literal man, and as Buddha is still held to be successively born in each infant lama, so the god Osiris was equally thought to be successively born in each consecrated Mnevis. Nor was the doctrine of a huntln incarnation by any means lost in that country. Diodorus gives a curious account of an infant in whose person Osiris was thought to have been born into the world in order that he might thus exhibit himself to mortals; and what Herodotus says of the Egyptian Perseus, who was the same divinity with Osiris, necessarily requires us to suppose that at certain intervals a man was brought forward by the priests as an incarnation of their god” (Diod. Sic. lib. 1, p. 20; Herod. Hist. 2, ch. 91; G. S. Faber, Eight Dissertations, 1, 61 sq.; see Wilkinson's note ad loc. cit. in Rawlinson's Herodotus). On the general subject, see also Faber's Origin of Pagan Idolatry, 6:ch. vi; Eight Dissertations, 1, 67 sq.

Under the head of classical metamorphoses it will be sufficient to refer to Baur in Baumgarten (on Acts, 1, 446, transl.); to Ovid, Metanorphoses, Baucis et Philemon; and the name that Jupiter bore of Ζεὺς καταβάτης (Biscoe, On the Acts, p. 205).

“Passing over to the American continent, whether by way of Iceland to Labrador, or eastward from Asia, we find the wilderness, from the frozen  shores of the Arctic Ocean to the Mexican Gulf, resounding with the deeds of a hero-god corresponding in character, history, and name with the Wodin and Buddha of the eastern continent..... His grandmother descended from the moon, which, in the symbolic language of the early traditions, always represents the Noachian ark. The only daughter of this Nokomis, in the bloom of her maidenhood, without the concurrence of mortal agency, and in a miraculous manner, gave birth to a son, who became conscious, as he advanced to manhood, that he was endowed with supernatural powers for the redemption of the world from evil. Al his stupendous exploits were directed to that end. His name in the Indian dialects was Bosho, Bozho, etc. (Meth. Quart. Re. 1859, p. 596; compare Schoolcraft's Alic Res. 1, 135; and Kingsborough's Lex. Antiq. 6:175). The remarkable story of the birth of Huitzilopochtli from a virgin mother is given by Squier, American Archaeological Res. p. 196. For the reputed incarnations of the highest god, Tezcatlipoca, thought by Mr. Squier to be analogous to Buddha, Zoroaster, Osiris, Taut in Phoenicia, Odin in Scandinavia, etc., see Hardwick, 2, 152, with his remarks. — Brinton (Daniel G.), Myths of the New World (N Y. 1868), 12mo), chap. 2 and 4.

II. Definition of “Incarnation” in the Christian Scheme. — In the evangelical sense, incarnation is that act of grace whereby Jesus Christ, the Son of God, took upon himself the nature of man. “By taking only the nature of man, he still continueth one person, and changeth but the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in the habit of our flesh” (Hooker, Ecc. Pol. 5, § 52). In the assumption of our nature he became subject to the consequences of sin, except that he was without the accident of sin (see Ebrard, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. Jesus Christ). “-That Christ should have taken man's nature shows that corruption was not inherent in its existence in such wise that to assume the nature was to assume the sin” (Wilberforce, Doctrine of the Incarnation, p. 74). The essential features of the incarnation are peculiar to Christianity, and when we speak of the incarnation, that of Christianity is at once understood; for the incarnation of Vishnu as found in Krishna, which is admitted to be the most perfect of all heathen incarnations, and the only one to be compared with that of Christ according to Hardwick (Christ and other Masters, 1, 291), “when purged from all the lewd and Bacchanalian adjuncts which disfigure and debase it, comes indefinitely short of Christianity.” “Nothing can be more absurd than to compare the incarnations of this Indian deity with that of Christ. They  are by their multiplicity alone tinctured with the pantheistic idea. The human personality is destitute of reality, since it is taken- up and laid down as a veil or mask with which the divinity invested himself for a moment. Moreover, the degradation of the god is carried too far-he descended to evil; and participated in human corruption” (Pressense, Rel. before Christ, p. 61). Although, therefore, the idea of the union of the divine and human natures was not foreign to heathenism, yet that the divine Logos should become flesh belonged to Christianity alone. False religions teach an apotheosis of man rather than a proper incarnation of the Deity. Judaism itself had never risen to the conception of an incarnate God. The antagonism between the Creator and the creature was too sharply defined to admit such an interpretation of the first promise as the incarnation has given. See Martensen, Christ. Doym. § 128; Neander, Church Hist. (Clark), 2, 200 sq.; Kitto, Daily Bible Illus. 29th week, evening. The use of the term incarnation (later Latin) maybe traced back to Irenaeus, A.D. 180, as in the expression “Incarnatio pro nostra salute” (Contra Haer. 1, 10).

III. Theory. — The doctrine of the incarnation is fundamental to Christianity, and is the basis upon which the entire fabric of revealed religion rests. It is presented to our faith from the plane of the miraculous, and is to be considered as the one all-comprehensive miracle of Christianity. It contains within itself essentially the entire series of miracles as taught in the Gospels. These miracles are the fruit, after its kind, which this divine tree brings forth. Faith sees in the fallen estate of so noble a being as man, and his restoration to purity, immortality, and God, objects commensurate with the sacrifice and humiliation — that are implied in the incarnation, and accepts the doctrine as corresponding to the wants and necessities of human nature; but a divine revelation elevates our vision, and meets all objections founded upon the comparative insignificance of our race by indicating that in some mysterious manner the influences of the atonement may beneficially affect the entire universe. See Garbett; Christ as Prophet, 1, 12; Kurtz, Astron. and the Bible, transl. p. 95 sq.; Calvin on Col. 1, 20; Olshausen, Stier, and Harless on Eph 2:20.

The blending together of two natures implied in an incarnation presupposes some element of nature common to both. As far as we can see, “things absolutely dissimilar in their nature cannot mingle: water cannot coalesce with fire; water cannot mix with oil” (F. W. Robertson on Matthew 5, 48). “Forasmuch as there is no union of God with man without that mean  between both which is both” (Hooker), we see in the incarnation, reflected as in a mirror, the true nobility of man's nature, and the secret of the fact that the incarnation took place in the seed of Abraham rather than in angels. “For verily he taketh not hold of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold” (Heb 2:16, marginal rend.). “The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the Logos assumed our fallen humanity. — But by this, we are told, is not to be understood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became a man, but that he assumed generic humanity so that he became the man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself outwardly as a body, and inwardly as a soul.

The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Olshausen, in his comment on Joh 1:14, says, ‘It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redeemer was a man by the side of other men, whereas, being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personality.' To the same effect he says, in his remarks on Rom 5:15, ‘If Christ were a man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential influence on mankind: he could then only operate as an example; but he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature; as the man, i.e. as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally.' To this point archdeacon Wilberforce devotes the third chapter of his book on The Incarnation, and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied, he says, ‘the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology.' In fine, Dr. Nevin, of America, in his Mystical Presence, p. 210, says, The Word became flesh; not a single man only, as one among many, but flesh, or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such?” (Eadie). This fine distinction, however, savors too much of transcendentalism to be capable of clear apprehension or general reception. It is sufficient to say that the divine Logos actually assumed a human body and soul, not precisely such as fallen men have, but like that of the newly-created Adam, or rather became himself the archetypal man after whom, as a pattern originally in the mind of Deity, the human race was primevally fashioned. SEE IMAGE OF GOD.  The question whether there would or could have been an incarnation without the fall of man has especially engaged the speculative minds of German divines, most of whom maintain the affirmative. “If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and to humanity-if his person has not merely a historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance, sin alone cannot have been the ground of his revelation; for there was no metaphysical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer if it had been eternally involved in the idea that he should be our Mediator.

Are we to suppose that what is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? that there would have been no room in the human race for the glory of the only-begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God, with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God, must we not necessarily ask, even if we for the moment suppose sin to have no existence, Where in this kingdom is the perfect Godman? No one of the individuals by himself expresses more than a relative union of the divine and human natures. No one participates more than partially in the “fullness of him that filleth all” (Eph 1:23). All, therefore, point beyond themselves to a union of God and man, which is not partial and relative (Χε λειποᾷ, 1Co 12:27), but perfect and complete” (Martensen, Christian Dogmatics. § 131). See also Muller, Deutsche Zeitschrift, 1853, No. 43; Philippi, Kirchliche Glaubenslehre, Eifileitung; Ebrard, Dogmnlinik, 2, 95; British and Foreign Ev. Rev. in Theol. Eclec. 3. 267.

IV. Objections to the Bible doctrine of the incarnation worthy of consideration are more easily resolved, perhaps, than those against any other doctrine of Scripture, for they are mostly, if not altogether, to be comprehended under the head of its deep mysteriousness. Many writers, however, have adduced as parallel the mystery of creation, which is in itself the embodiment of thought in matter, and the existence of such a composite being as man, not to speak of mysteries with which our entire economy is crowded. Apriori, it is not more difficult to conceive of the union of the divine with the human, or the taking up of the human into the divine, than to comprehend the incarnation of an immaterial essence such as that of the mind in a material form like that of the body. “If even in our time the idea of the incarnation of God still appears so difficult, the principal reason is, that the fact itself is too much isolated. It is always the impulse of spirit to embody itself, for corporeity is the end of the work of  God; in every phenomenon an idea descends from the world of spirit and embodies itself here below. It may therefore be said that all the nobler among men are rays of that sun which in Christ rose on the firmament of humanity. In Abraham, Moses, and others, we already discover the coming Christ” (Olshausen on Joh 1:14).

The strictures of archbishop Whately with respect to the substance of Deity, etc., may hold good of dogmatism upon the incarnation: “But as to the substance of the supreme Being and of the human soul, many men were (and still are) confident in their opinions, and dogmatical in maintaining them: the more, inasmuch as in these subjects they could not be refuted by an appeal to experiment. .. Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate are confessedly and by their own account beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly revealed in Scripture; but it is a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own,” etc. (Cyclop. Brit. 1, 517, 8th ed.). On objections, consult Liddon, Basmpton Lecture, lect. 5; Sadler, Emmanuel, chaps. 2, 5; Frayssinous, Def. of Christianity, 2, ch. 25; Thos. Adams, Meditations on. Creed, in Works, 3, 235; Martensen, Christ. Dogmat. § 132.

V. History of Views. — The true theory of the nature of Christ was of gradual development in the history of the Church. Not unlike the best and most enduring growths of nature, it sprang up and matured amid the conflicts of doubt and the tempests of faction. (See § VIII, below.) The efforts to harmonize the divine and human natures of Christ gave rise to a series of fluctuations of doubt, which illustrate in a signal manner the tendencies of the human mind to recoil from one extreme to another. The close of the 4th century (A.D. 381) witnessed the maturing of correct views as to the twofold nature in the one person of Christ, and their embodiment in the creed, which, subjected to the test of centuries, is still the expression and symbol of the faith of the Church. SEE CREED, NICENE and SEE CONSTANTINOPOLITAN, vol. 2, p. 562.

“If we would correctly apprehend the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take ΘᾷιμΧ in the abstract sense in which it was used. The divine nature consists in this, that Christ is God, the predicate ‘God' belongs to him; the human nature is this that the predicate ‘man' is assigned to it. His divine nature is the divine essence which subsists in the  Logos from eternity, and which in his becoming man he still retained. His human nature is the man's nature or mode of being and constitution, which for itself does not subsist, but which, as a universal attribute, exists in all other men, and, since his incarnation, also in him-the natura hominum. To have human feeling, will, and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature. We must, however, never think of human nature as a concretum, a subsistens, a son of Mary, with which the Son of God united himself, or mixed himself up” (Ebrard, in Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, s.v. Jesus Christ).

With the explanation thus given, we proceed to remark that the earliest controversies of the Church revolved around the physical nature of Christ. The result of those contests established the essential oneness of Christ's body with ours. The pungency of the arguments employed may be illustrated in the words of Irenaeus (quoted by Hooker, Eccl. Polity, 5, sec. 53): “If Christ had not taken flesh from the very earth, he would not have coveted those earthly nourishments wherewith bodies taken from thence are fed. This was the nature which felt hunger after long fasting, was desirous of rest after travel, testified compassion and love by tears, groaned in heaviness, and with extremity of grief melted away itself into bloody sweats.” The earliest fathers, with the exception of Justin Martyr, held the opinion that Christ assumed only a human body, or, if he had a soul, it was animal, or, which was more common, they quite ignored the question of his human soul. The views of Justin, however, were colored by the Platonic philosophy, which led him to attribute to Christ body, soul, and spirit, but in such a mode of union with the Logos as to furnish the germs of the future error of Apollinaris the younger. Tertullian, about the end of the 2nd century, first ascribed to Christ a proper human soul, and thus met and disposed of the difficulties which had arisen from the teaching that connected the Logos immediately with the body of Christ. The doctrine of the human soul of Christ was more fully developed and illustrated by Origen. But, in comparing the connection between the Logos and the human nature in Christ to the union of believers with Christ, he drew upon himself the objection that he made Christ a mere man. (See further, Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, sec. 102, note by the translator.) Ambrose (De Incarnatione, p. 76) may more properly serve as the connecting link between Tertullian and the Athanasian Creed, the latter setting forth the doctrine to which the Church was slowly attaining in the following words: “Perfectus Dels, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et  ‘humana carne subsistens.” Thus Ambrose reasons: “Do we also infer division when we affirm that he took on him a reasonable sound, and one endowed with intellectual capacity?

For God himself, the Word, was not to the flesh as the reasonable intellectual soul; but God the Word, taking upon him a reasonable intellectual soul, human, and of the same substance with our souls, the flesh also like our own, and of the same substance with that of which our flesh is formed, was also perfect man, but without any taint of sin. ... Wherefore his flesh and his soul were of the same substance with our souls and our flesh.” Questions in connection with the nature of the human soul of Christ came into greater prominence towards the close of the 4th century than ever before in the history of the Church. Apollinaris the younger revived the opinion which extensively prevailed in the primitive Church, that Christ connected himself only with a human body and an animal soul (Hase, Ch. Hist. sec. 104). “Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole. Out of the union of the perfect human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed; and, more particularly, the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form one person” (Neander, 4:119, Clarke's edition). From an early part of the 9th century, when the Adoption tenets sank into oblivion, the Church enjoyed comparative rest. But, as might have been presumed, the era of scholastic theology, which was inaugurated at about the commencement of the 12th century, and continued into the 15th, although the attention of the schoolmen was more directed to other subjects, did not pass by one that so readily admitted the exercise of dialectic subtlety.

The nominalism of Roscelinus, “which regarded the appellation God, that is common to the three persons, as a mere name, i.e. as the abstract idea of a genus” (Hagenbach), had perverted the true idea of Father, Son, and Spirit into that of three individuals or things, in contradistinction to one thing (una res), In response, Anselm argued that, as every universal is a mere abstraction, and particulars alone have reality, so “if only the essence of God in the Trinity was called una res, and the three persons not tres res, the latter could not be considered as anything real. Only the one God would be the real; all besides would become a mere nominal distinction, to which nothing real corresponded; and so, therefore, along with the Son, the Father and the Holy Ghost would also have become man (Neander, 8:92). “The daring assertions of Roscelinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while those of Abelard exposed him to that of Sabellianism. The distinction which Gilbert of Poitiers drew between the quo est and the  quod est gave to his doctrine the semblance of Tetratheism” (see Hagenbach, History of Doct. 1, sec. 170). Though his starting-point was Realism, he arrived at the same goal as the Nominalist Roscelinus. “The Scholastics had much to say of the relation of number to the divine unity. Since Boethius had put forth the canon, ‘Vere unum esse, in quo nullus sit numerus,' Peter the Lombard sought to avoid the difficulty by saying that number, in its application to God and divine things, had only a negative meaning; ‘these are rather said to exclude what is not in God than to assert what is'” (Theol. Lect. by Dr. Twesten, transl. in Bib. Sac. 3, 770). “Considered as an act, according to Thomas Aquinas, the incarnation is the work of the whole Trinity; but in respect to its terminus, that is, the personal union of the divine and human nature, it belongs only to the Son; since, according to the doctrine of the Church, it is first and properly not the nature, but a person, and that the second person, which has assumed humanity.” (For the accordance of this with the confession of faith of the. eleventh Council at Toledo, A.D. 675, see Bib. Sac. 4:50, note.) “Duns Scotus ascribed to the human nature of Christ's proper if not an independent existence. This fundamental view of the Middle Ages Luther also adopted, and designated the divinity and humanity as two parts;' and upon this he built his theory of the importation of the divine attribute to the human” (Herzog).

The age of the Reformation contributed nothing or but little new on the subject of the incarnation. The most that it did was to repeat some of the more pestilent errors of the past, and in the mean time, through the conflicts of mind, bring into bolder relief the lineaments of truth. “Thus Caspar Schwenkfield revived the docetico-monophysitic doctrine concerning the ‘glorified and deified flesh' of Christ. Menno Simonis, as well as other Anabaptists, supposed (like the Valentinians in the first period) that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom. Michael Servetus maintained that Christ was a mere man, filled with the divine nature, and rejected all further distinctions between his two natures as unscriptural, and founded upon scholastic definitions alone. Faustus Socinus went so far as to return to the view entertained by the Ebionites and Nazarenes” (Hagenbach, History of Doct. sec. 265). According to Dorner, “Servetus, resting on a pantheistic basis, could say that the flesh of Christ was consubstantial with God, but the same would hold true in reference to all flesh.” Nevertheless, he did not say it in reference to all flesh. “In his opinion, Christ alone is the Son of God; nor is that name to be given to any  one else' (Hagenbach, sec. 265). The controversies between Calvin and Servetus, in which were comprehended the erroneous views of the latter on the subject of the incarnation, at last culminated in his death at the stake. Much, however, as Calvin was blamed for calling the Son, considered in his essence, αὐτόθεος, still he was right, and is supported by Lutheran theologians. In another point of view, that is, considered in his personal subsistence, the Son cannot be called αὐτόθεος, but only the Father, since he alone is αγέννητος; but the ἀγεννησία of the person is not to be confounded with the absoluteness of the essence.” (See further, Twesten, in the Bib. Sac. 4, 39. For the differences, as respects the incarnation, between Luther and Zwingle, in which each failed to comprehend the standpoint of the other, see Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, art. Jesus Christ.)

VI. Theophanies. — It might have been expected, from a consideration of an event of such moment to our race as the incarnation, that. delayed so long in the history of the world,-it would not have been without its adumbrations, like types in nature, mute prophecies of archetypal existence. The first prophecy of the incarnation was coeval with the fall. In terms succinct and yet clear, the announcement was made that from the seed of the woman should rise the hope of man. In analogy with nature the typical form was thus given, from which the grand archetypal idea should be elaborated, until in the fullness of time that idea should be permanently embodied, and God become manifest in the flesh. “No sooner had the first Adam appeared and fallen than a new school of prophecy began, in which type and symbol were mingled with what had now its first existence on the. earth-verbal enunciations; and all pointed to the second Adam, ‘the Lord from heaven.' In him creation and the Creator meet in reality and not- in semblance. On the very apex of the finished pyramid of being sits the adorable Monarch of all-as the Son of Mary, of David, of the first Adam, the created of God; as God and the Son of God, the eternal Creator of the universe; and these-the two Adams-form the main theme of all prophecy, natural and revealed. That type and symbol should have been employed with reference not only to the second, but, as held by men like Agassiz and Owen, to the first Adam also, exemplifies, we are disposed to think, the unity of the style of Deity, and serves to show that it was he who created the worlds that dictated the Scriptures” (Hugh Miller, in Fairbairn's Typology, vol. 1, append. 1). See also Hugh Miller, Test. of Rocks, Lect. 5; M'Cosh, Typical Forms; Agassiz, Princ. of Zoology, pt. 1.

During the course of the preparatory dispensations, the divine Being disclosed himself to the more pious and favored of our race in the form of man, and with the title of “the Angel of Jehovah”-- מִלְאִךְ יְהוָֹהThe first of these appearances was to Hagar in her distress. The angel addressed her in the person of God, and she, in return, attributed to him the name of “Thou, God, seest me.” The foremost of the three angels with whom Abraham conversed with respect to the cities of the plain (Genesis 18) is called not fewer than eight times “Jehovah,” and six times “Lord” (אֲדֹנָי). (See Hengstenberg, Christol. 1, 112, transl.) In the destruction of the cities of the plain an unmistakable distinction is made between two persons, each of whom bears the same divine name: “Then the Lord rained upon Sodom and upon Gomorrah brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven” (Gen 19:24). The full nature of the theophany to Jacob (Gen 32:24-30) is made manifest in Hos 12:3-5. The scene opens with the view of a man wrestling with Jacob, and closes with Jacob's calling the name of the place “Peniel, for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.” “The prophet Hosea puts it beyond a doubt that this was a divine person by styling him not only an angel and God (אלֵַֹהים), but Jehovah, God of hosts, Jehovah is his memorial. Whilst, therefore, he was a man and an angel, or the angel of the covenant, he was also the supreme Jehovah. These titles and attributes belong to none other than the second person of the blessed Trinity, Christ the Savior” (Davidson, Sacred Hermeneutics, p. 281). The “Angel of Jehovah” appears to Moses in a flame of fire from the bush, and still takes to himself the names of Deity, Elohim, and Jehovah (Exo 3:2-7); manifests himself to Manoah as man, and yet is recognized and worshipped as God, while he declares his name to be “Wonderful,” the same as in Isa 9:6; and at the close of the Old-Testament canon (Mal 3:1): he is announced as the angel or messenger who should suddenly come to his Temple. (See also Exo 14:19; Exo 18:20; Exo 23:23; Num 20:16; comp. Exo 23:21; Exo 33:2-3; Exo 33:14; Jos 6:2; Jos 5:13-15; Jdg 6:11-22; Jdg 13:6-22; Isa 63:9.)

As to the nature of this mysterious personage, there have been those who have held, with Augustine, that the theophanies were “not direct appearances of a person in the Godhead, but self-manifestations of God through a created being” (see Liddon, Bampton Lect. 2. 87, note), among the latest defenders of which view are Hoffman (in his Weissagung und Erfüllung) and Delitzsch (on Genesis). On the other hand, the fathers of  the Church prior to the Nicene Council were almost unanimous in the opinion that the “angel of Jehovah” is identical with Jehovah himself, not denoting an existence apart from himself, but only the mode of manifestation of the divine Logos, who subsequently became incarnate; and in this view the Church has generally acquiesced. (On the subject of theophanies, see Justin Martyr, Apology; Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. 1, ch. 2; Kurtz, Old Cov. 1, 181-201, transl.; an able article in the Stud. u. Krit. of 1840 by Nitzsch; E. H. Stahl, Die Erscheinungen Jehovas u. Seiner Engel im A. T., in Eichhorn's Bib. Rep. 7:156 sq.; Hnilein, Ueber Theo. u. Christophanien, in the N. Theol. Journ. 2, 1 sq., 93 sq., 277 sq.) SEE THEOPHANY.

VII. The Logos. — In the description of the incarnation given by the evangelist John there appears the term “Logos” in a sense new to the Scriptures, and among New-Testament writers peculiar to him. Mulch has been written on the origin of this word. The Targums, the best of which are generally attributed to the 1st century, may be regarded as embodying the sentiments of that age (Etheridge, leb. Lit. p. 191). In these, for the name of Deity, “Jehovah,” there is employed the paraphrase “Word of the Lord.” “On this circumstance much argument has been built. Some have maintained that it supplies an indubitable ascription of personal existence to the Word, in some sense distinct from the personal existence of the supreme Father; that this Word is the Logos of the New Testament; and, consequently, that the phrase is a proof of a belief among the ancient Jews in the pre-existence, the personal operations, and the deity of the Messiah, ‘the Word who became flesh, and fixed his tabernacle among us' “(J. Pye Smith. Messiah, bk. 2, sec. 11; compare Bertholdt, Christol. Jud. p. 130 sq.). Others have referred the origin of the word to Philo; but, as has been abundantly shown, the Logos of Philo has but little in common with that of the Gospel (Tholuck, Comm. ad loc. p. 61), and is but a nucleus of divine ideas, which lacks the essential element of personality. “Blinding as the resemblance between many of his ideas and modes of expression and those of Christianity may be to the superficial reader, yet the essential principle is ‘to its very foundation diverse. ‘Even that which sounds like the expressions of John has in its entire connection a meaning altogether diverse. His system stalks by the cradle of Christianity only as a spectral counterpart. It appears like the floating, dissolving fata Morgana on the horizon, where Christianity is about to arise” (Dorner, Lehre v. der Person Christi, 2, 198, 342. Comp. Burton, Bampton Lect. note 93; Ritter, Hist.  of Philos. transl. 4, 407-478; Liddon, Bampton Lecture, p. 93-108; Dollinger, Heid. u. Judenthum, 10:3; Bib. Sacra, 6:173; 7:13, 696-732; Meth. Quart. Rev. 1851, p. 377; 1858, p. 110-129). SEE LOGOS.

VIII. Heresies. — The false theories that have gathered around the doctrine of the incarnation are manifold, and deny (1) that Christ was truly God, (2) that he was truly man, or (3) that he is God-man in one undivided and indivisible person. (See Wangemann, Christliche Glaubenslehre, p. 203; Ffoulkes, Christendom's Divisions, 2 vols. 8vo.) SEE CHRISTOLOGY, III.

1. Ebionism. — This, the first heresy of importance, took its rise during the lifetime of the apostles, and received its designation, according to Origen, from םאֵַבייֹןpoor, thus signifying, perhaps, the meagerness of their religious system, or, more properly, the poverty of its followers. They denied the divinity of Christ, but ascribed to him a superior legal piety and the elevated wisdom of a prophet. Eusebius says (Hist. Eccles. 3 7), “The common Ebionites themselves suppose that a higher power had united itself with the man Jesus at his baptism.” The Ebionites, whose views are represented by the Clementine Homilies, differed from the former by asserting that Jesus had from the beginning been pervaded with the same power; in their opinion he ranks with Adam, Enoch, and Moses (Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 1, 180). This error, which has been called, not improperly, the Socinianism of the age, revived and embodied the sentiments concerning the Messiah current among the Jews during his life. The views of the Nazarenes, who are generally regarded as a species of Ebionites, while they more nearly approached the orthodox faith, agreed with them in regarding Christ as only a superior man.

2. Gnosticism. — The Ebionitish heresy that rose within the infant Church, from its necessary association with Judaism, was paralleled by another (Gnosticism), which sprang from a similar contact with the pagan philosophy of the age. The assumption of a superior capacity. for knowledge implied in the name the Gnostics bore (γνῶσις, 1Co 8:1; 1Ti 6:20; Col 2:8), probably self- assumed, indicated the transcendental speculations which they engrafted on the tender plant of Christianity. With respect to- the nature of Christ; they held that the Deity had existed from all eternity in a state of absolute quiescence, but finally he begat certain beings or eons after his own likeness, of whom Christ was one; and that he was allied to the lower  angels and the Δημιουργός, Demiurge, to whom this lower world was subject. Moreover, he had never in reality assumed a material body, but became united with the man Jesus at his baptism, and abode with him until the time of his death. (See Mosheim, Commentaries on the first three Centuries, sec. 62.) The tenets of Gnosticism can be traced even to the apostolical age. Simon Magus appears to have represented himself as an incarnation of the demiurgic power (Act 8:10). The ancient fathers regarded him as the father of the Gnostics (Ireieus, adv' Hor. 1, 23). On the other hand, Tittmann (Do vestigiis Gnosticorum, etc.) holds that nothing was known of the Gnostics until the 2nd century. However the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel seems to be directed against Gnostical perversions of the doctrine of the incarnation, which is not impossible if we admit the well-known tradition that Cerinthus disputed with that evangelist. (See Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, 3, ch. 28.)

3. Docetism. — This was one of the forms of Gnosticism denying the reality of Christ's human nature, and representing whatever appertained to his human appearance to be a mere phantasm-δόκησις. Jerome tells us that while the apostles were still living there were those who taught that his body was no more than a phantom. This particular form of Gnostical error was censured by Ignatius in his Epistles, and therefore unquestionably arose early in the Church. (See Lardner, 3:441.) ‘If the Son of God (said the Docetist) has been crucified for me merely in appearance, then am I bound down by the chains of sin in- appearance; but those who speak are themselves a mere show.” For modern Docetism, as illustrated in the mythical treatment of the doctrines of sacred history by Schelling, and the Rationalists generally, see Martensen, Dogmnatics, p. 244.

4. Monarchianism, (about A.D. 170), μοναρχία, so called either from its regard to the doctrine of the divine unity, or from a regard to Christ's dignity. (See Hase, sec. 90.) According to its teachings, Christ was a mere man, but born of the Virgin by the power of the Holy Spirit, and exalted to be the Lord of the whole Church. A certain efflux from the divine essence dwelt in Christ, and this constituted his personality, while this personality originated in the hypothesis of a divine power. (See Neander, 2, 349, Clark's ed.)

5. Sabellianism (about 258) taught that the Father Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same-so many different manifestations of the same being- three denominations in one substance. (See Hagenbach, 1, 263.) Thus the  personality of the Son was denied. His personality in the flesh did not exist prior to the incarnation, nor does it exist now, as the divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ has returned to its source In the words of Burton, “If we seek for a difference between the theory of Sabellius and those of his predecessors, we are perhaps to say that Noetus supposed the whole divinity of the Father to be inherent in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part, which was put forth like an emanation, and was again absorbed in the Deity. Noetus acknowledged only one divine Person; Sabellius divided this one dignity into three; but he supposed the Son and the Holy Ghost to have no distinct personal existence, except when they were put forth for a time by the Father.” The views of Sabellius reappear in the dogmas of Schleiermacher (who regarded the eternal and absolute Monas as unrevealed; the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as God revealed), and in a modified form in the Discourses on the Incarnation and Atonement by Dr. Bushnell.

6. Manichaeism (circa A.D. 274). — Mani or Manes, who was probably educated in the religion of Zoroaster, upon' his adoption of the Christian faith, transferred to his Christ the Oriental views of incarnation. In this system the dualistic principle was more fully developed than in Gnosticism. He brought together as in a kaleidoscope the fantasies of Parseeism, Buddhism, and Chaldeeism, bits of philosophy alike brilliant and alike worthless. “From Gnosticism, or, rather, from universal Orientalism, he drew the inseparable admixture of moral and physical notions, the eternal hostility between mind and matter, the rejection of Judaism. and the identification of the God of the Old Testament with the evil spirit, the distinction between Jesus and the Christ with the Docetism or unreal death of the incorporeal Christ.” For a further admirable summary of his views, see Milman's Latin Christ. 2, 322 sq. The followers of Manes formed themselves into a Church A.D. 274, which possessed a hierarchical form of government, and consisted of two great classes, the perfect (electi) and catechumens (auditores). (See Hase, sec. 82.)

7. Arianism (about 318). — The 4th century witnessed the rise of the most formidable and persistent of all the forms of error as to the person of Christ. The teachings of Alexander, bishop of Alexandria, that the Son was of the same essence with the Father, developed the latent doubts of one of his presbyters, Arius, who rushed to the other extreme. Charging his bishop with Sabellianism, he maintained that the Son was not the same in substance (ὁμοούσιος), but similar (ὁμοιούσιος). He did not hesitate to  accept the logical consequences of his dogma-that Christ, though the noblest of creatures, must, like all others, have been created from nothing. This deduction contains, as in a nut-shell, the entire heresy.

8. Apollinarianisms (about A.D. 378). — Apollinaris the younger rejected the proper humanity of Christ. He adopted many of the sentiments of Noetus the Monarchian. From the postulate that as the person of Christ was one, therefore his nature must be one, he reasoned that there could be no human intellect or will, but that the functions of soul and- body must be discharged by the Logos, which so commingled with the uncreated body of Christ that the two distinct natures formed one heterogeneous substance entirely sui generis. (See Harvey, On the Creeds, 2, 645.) “Both Noetus and Apollinaris denied that the Word was made man of the Virgin by the Holy Ghost; the earlier heretic teaching that there was no real hypostatic distinction in the Deity, the latter supposing that the flesh, as an eternally uncreated body, came down from heaven., Both denied, for the same reason, the ‘inseparable union of two perfect natures in one person; both denied that Christ was perfect man; the Patripassian, no less than the Apollinarian, having considered that the divine nature supplied the place of a human soul” (Harvey, Creeds, 2, 649).

9. Nestorianism (about 428) furnished the knotted root from which sprang ultimately the antagonist heresies of the Monophysites and Monothelites. To the phrase θεοτόκος, mother of God, applied to the Virgin, Nestorius took exception, maintaining that Mary had given birth to Christ, and not to God. Thus arose the long-protracted controversy respecting the two natures of Christ (Socrates, Eccl. Hist. 7, ch. 32). Nestorius maintained that a divine and human nature dwelt in Christ as separate entities, but in closest connection — συναφεία; to use the figure of Wangemann, “as boards are glued together.” His own admission, “Divide naturas sed conjungo reverentiam,” justified the allegation brought against his doctrines that Christ is really a double being. The humanity of Christ was the temple for the indwelling (ἐνοίκησις) of Deity upon the separate basis of personality in his human nature.

10. Monophysitism (about 446). — The doctrine of Nestorius, that there must be two natures if there be two persons in Christ, led Eutyches, by the law of contrarieties, to an exact counterpart, that there is but one person in Christ, and this one person admits of but one nature. The logic was the same in both heresies. Liddon has properly said, “The Monophysite  formula practically made Christ an unincarnate God;” for, according to Monophysitism, the human nature of Christ had been absorbed in the divine. “We get, as it were, a Christ with two heads: an image which produces the impression not merely of the superhuman, but of the monstrous, and which is incapable of producing any moral effect” (Martensen, Christian Dogmatics. sec. 136). Soon after the condemnation of this error by the fourth General Council at Chalcedon, it branched out into ten leading sects, whence it has been called “the ten-horned.”

11. Monothelitism (about 625). — The controversy over the heresy of Monophysitism was prolonged for centuries. In the midst of the contest, the idle curiosity of the emperor Heraclius led him to propound the question to his bishops “Whether Christ, of one person but two natures, was actuated by a single or double will” (Waddington, Ch. History, 1, 355). The question met with a ready response, but it was the response of error. It was said in reply that a multiplicity of wills must of necessity imply a multiplicity of willers. This is the postulate of Monothelitism. In maintenance of the unity of Christ's nature, they held that in him was only one will or energy, and that this was a divinely human will (ἐνεργεία θεανδρική). (For a statement of the orthodox view of the divine and human will of Christ, see Liddon's Bampton Lect. 5, 392.) The sixth General Council at Constantinople, A.D. 680, decided in favor of the Dyothelitic doctrine, while it anathematized the Monothelites and their views.

12. Adoptianism (about 787). — The incessant and fierce strife of the early Church with respect to the nature of Christ finally culminated in the Adoptian controversy. According to the views of this sect, in his divine nature, Christ is the true Son of God; but as respects his human nature, he is the Son of God only by adoption — ‘his divinity according to the former was proper, but according to the latter nature nominal and titular” (Herzog, Encyklop.).

13. Socinianism, Unitarianism, and Rationalism present no new phase of heresy. They are simply resurrected forms of error that had again and again been refuted It may be questioned whether the inventive mind of German Neology has presented upon the incarnation any feature of error essentially new. The subtle minds of Arius, Sabellius, and other kindred philosophers of the early Church have explored every avenue of doubt, and left no now openings into which heretical error can possibly thrust itself. The most that  modern speculations have done has been to revivify dead theories of the past, and clothe them with “the empty abstractions of impersonal idea.” SEE CHRISTOLOGY, vol. 2, p. 282. As a fair illustration of the mystical speculations with which the metaphysical theology of modern Germany has overlaid the doctrine of the incarnation, we quote from Hegel (religions philosophie, 2, 261): “That which first existed was the idea in its simple universality, the Father; the second is the particular, the idea in its manifestation, the Son--to wit, the idea in its external existence, so that the external manifestation is changed into the first, and known as the divine idea, the identity of the divine with the human. The third is this consciousness, God as the Holy Spirit and this spirit in his existence is the Church.” According to Lessing, “This doctrine (of the Trinity) will lead human reason to acknowledge that God cannot possibly be understood to be one by that reason to which all finite things are one; that his unity must also be a transcendental unity which does not exclude a kind of plurality.” To Schelling “it is clear that the idea of Trinity is absurd, unless it be considered on speculative grounds.... The incarnation of God is an eternal incarnation;” and by Fichte the Son is regarded as God attaining to a consciousness of himself in man. See, farther, Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, 2, 384-420. Marheineke, who in theological obscurities was an apt disciple of his master Hegel, thus discourses of the incarnation (Grundlehren d. Christlichen Dogmatik, § 325, 326): “As spirit, by renouncing individuality, man is in truth elevated above himself, without having abandoned the human nature; as spirit renouncing absoluteness, God has lowered himself to human nature, without having abandoned his existence as divine Spirit. The unity of the divine and human nature is but the unity in that Spirit whose existence is the knowledge of the truth with which the doing of good is identical. This spirit, as God in the human nature, and man in the divine nature, is the God-man. The man wise in divine holiness, and holy in divine wisdom, is the God-man. As a historical fact, this union of God with man is manifest and real in the person of Jesus Christ; in him the divine manifestation has become perfectly human. The conception of the Godman, in the historical person of Jesus Christ, contains in itself two phases in one: First, that God is manifest only through man, and in this relation Christ is as yet placed on an equality with all other men; he is the Son of Man, and therein at first represents only the possibility of God becoming man; secondly, that in this man. Jesus Christ, God is manifest as in none other; this manifest man is the manifest God; but the manifest God is the Son of God, and in this relation Christ is God's  Son; and this is the actual fulfillment of the possibility or promise; it is the reality of God becoming man.” For farther quotations from German Rationalists, see Mansel, Limits of Religious Thought, p. 154-163, 378- 383.

While, as respects the question of antecedency, the propriety of introducing Swedenborg in the company of Rationalists might be questioned, we regard his views on the incarnation as entitling him to consideration in this connection. “He taught that, instead of a trinity of persons (set forth in the symbols of the Church), we must hold a trinity of the person, by which he understood that that t which is divine in the nature of Christ is the Father, that the divine which is united to the human is the Son, and the divine which proceeds from him is the Holy Spirit,” etc. (Hagenbach, Hist of Doct. 2, 419). For the literature of Rationalism and its polemics, consult Hagenbach, Encyclop. der Theologischen Wissenciehften, p. 90-93. We cannot but suggest that all speculations upon the incarnation, which on the one hand rob Christ of his divinity as the true God, or on the other of his humanity as truly man, subject themselves to the severe strictures of Coleridge (Works, Am. edit. 5. 552; comp. also 5, 447): “That Socinianism is not a religion, but a theory, and that, too, a very pernictous theory, or a very unsatisfactory theory-pernicious, for it excludes all our deep and awful ideas of the perfect holiness of God, his justice, and his mercy, and thereby makes the voice of conscience a delusion, as having no correspondent in the character of the legislator; unsatisfactory, for it promises forgiveness without any solution of the difficulty of the compatibility of this with the justice of God; in no way explains the fallen condition of man, nor offers any means for his regeneration. ‘If you will be good, you will be happy,' it says. That may be, but my will is weak; I sink in the struggle.”‘We may even adduce the trenchant sarcasm of Hume, “To be a philosophical skeptic is the first step towards becoming a sound believing Christian,” which, interpreted in plainer phrase, is, “He who comes to Christ must first believe he is NOT.” (Consult Martensen, Dogmatics, § 137.)

IX. Additional Texts illustrative of the Subject. —

1. Prophecies of Christ incarnate. — Gen 3:15, The seed of the woman Gen 48:16, The angel; Gen 49:10, Shiloh: Deu 18:18-19, The prophet like unto Moses; Job 19:23-27, The Redeemer that liveth; Job 33:23, The Angel intercessor; Psa 2:6-7, The Sonship declared; Psa 16:10-11, The Holy One free from corruption; Psalms 22 The sufferings of the Messiah; Psa 24:7-10, Jehovah of glory, with 1Co 2:8; 1 Corinthians 14, The perpetuity and glory of his kingdom; 72, Psa 40:6-10, A body prepared for the Messiah; ex, Messiah the Lord, Priest, Conqueror; 110:1, with Mat 22:42-45; Pro 8:9 :חָכְמָה, Wisdom personified; Isa 6:1-3, As Lord of hosts, Joh 12:41; Isa 7:14; Isa 8:10, The Virgin's child, named Immanuel; Isa 9:5-6. Attributes of Deity ascribed to the child to be born; Isa 11:1-10, Messiah from the root of Jesse; Isa 32:1-5, The blessings of Christ's kingdom; Isa 40:3, As Jehovah, with Mat 3:3; Psa 42:1-5, The office of Christ; Isa 44:6, As Jehovah the first and the last, with Rev 1:17; Rev 3:13-15, The sufferings, death, and burial of Christ; Jer 23:5-6; Jer 33:15-16, The Lord our righteousness, with 1Co 1:30; Eze 1:26, The appearance of a man upon the throne; Dan 7:13-14, The glory of the Son of Man; Joe 2:28-32, Christ the Savior, with Act 2:17; Act 2:21; Mic 5:2-4, The birthplace of Christ foretold; Hag 2:6-9, The desire of all nations; Zec 3:8; Zec 6:12-13, The Branch; Zec 12:10; Zec 13:1, The opening of a fountain for sin; Zec 13:7, The shepherd to be smitten; Mal 3:1, The Lord to come to his Temple, with Luk 2:27, etc.; Mat 1:18-25; Luk 1:30-38; Luke 2. Circumstances of Christ's birth; Luk 22:43, David-calling Christ Lord; Luk 24:19; Luk 24:44, Christ interpreting prophecy concerning himself.

2. The divinity of Christ in the New Test. — John 1; Joh 3:13; Joh 3:31; Joh 5:17; Joh 5:27; Joh 5:31; Joh 5:36; Joh 6:33-63; Joh 8:5-6; Joh 8:58; Joh 10:24-38; Joh 12:41; Joh 14:1; Joh 14:6-14; Joh 14:20; Joh 17:3; Joh 19:36; Joh 20:28; Act 2:34; Act 7:59-60; Act 10:36; Act 20:28; Act 13:33; Rom 1:4; Rom 9:5; Rom 11:36; Rom 14:10-12; 1Co 2:8; 1Co 8:6; 1Co 15:47; 2Co 4:4; Gal 4:4-5; Eph 1:10; Eph 1:23; Eph 4:24; Php 2:6-11; Php 3:21; Col 1:3; Col 1:15-19; Col 2:9-10; Col 3:10-11; 1Ti 3:16; Tit 2:13, with Hos 1:7; Heb 1:2-12; Heb 2:14-18; Heb 3:1-5; Heb 4:16; Heb 5:7-9; Heb 9:11; Heb 10:20; Heb 13:8; Jam 2:7; 1Pe 3:18; 2Pe 1:1; 1Jn 1:1-3; 1Jn 3:8; 1Jn 4:2; 1Jn 4:9; 1Jn 4:14; 1Jn 5:19-20; Jud 1:4; Rev 1:4-17; Rev 2:8; Rev 7:17; Rev 22:1; etc

3. The humanity of Christ. — Mat 1:18; Mat 2:2; Mat 4:2; Mat 8:20; Mat 8:24; Mat 16:13; Mat 22:42; Mat 26:67; Mat 27:26; Mat 27:59-60; Mar 4:38; Mar 10:47; Mar 15:46; Luk 1:31; Luk 2:7; Luk 2:11; Luk 2:21; Luk 2:52; Luk 3:23; Luk 22:64; Luk 23:11; Joh 1:14; Joh 4:2; Joh 4:6-7; Joh 7:27; Joh 11:33; Joh 11:35; Joh 12:27; Joh 19:1; Joh 19:28; Joh 19:30; Joh 20:27; Act 2:22; Act 2:31; Act 3:15; Act 3:22; Act 13:23; Rom 1:3; Gal 3:16; Gal 4:4; Php 2:7-8; 2Ti 2:8; Heb 2:14; Heb 2:17; Heb 7:26; Heb 7:28; 1Jn 1:1; 1Jn 3:5; 1Jn 4:3; 2Jn 1:7, etc.  X. Literature. — Athanasius, De Incarnatione Dei Verbi et contra Arianos, in Opp. (ed. Patavii, 1777), 1, 695 sq.; Tertullian, Opera (1695, fol.), p. 307 sq.; Cyrill. Hierosol. De Christo Incarnato, in Opera (1763, fol.), p. 162 sq.; Cyrill. Alexandrinus, De Incarnatione Uniqeniti, in Opera (1638, fol.), 5, 1; Hilary, De Trinitate (Paris, 1631), bk. 2, p. 17 sq.; Chrysostom, Homilia (“In principio erat Verbum”), in Opera, 12, 571; Zanchius, De Incarnatione Filii Dei, in Opera (1619, folio), 8, 1; Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio in naticitaten Christi (transl. by H. S. Boyd, in The Fathers-not Papists, 1834); G. F. Baur, Die Chr. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit 1. Menschwerdung Gottes (Tübingen, 1841); Johann Aug. Ernesti, De Dignitate et Veritate Incarnationis Filii Dei, in his Opuscula Theologica (1792); Gass, Geschichte der Prot. Dogm. 1, 111 sq.; A. Hahn, Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens (1828), p. 448 sq.; Duguet, Principes de la Foi Chretienne, and responses to Renan's Vie de Jesu, by his countrymen Freppel, Bp. Plantier, and Poujoulat; J. A. Dorner, Entwicklungsgesehichte ders Lehrefir die Person Christi, 1, passim; 2, 51 sq., 432-442, 591 sq. (transl. also in Clark's Lib.); Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk (Erlangen, 1857); J. P. Lange, Leben Jesu, 2, 66 sq.; Karl Werner, Geschichte der Apologetischen und Polemischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie (1861), 1, 387 sq., 566 sq.; 2, 175 sq.; M. F. Sadler, Emmanuel, or the Incarnation of the Son of God the Foundation of immutable Truth (1867); John Owen, Χριστολογία, or a Declaration of the glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ God and Man (Lond. 1826), 12:1-343; Pearson, On the Creed; Burnet, On the 39 Articles, Art. 2; Archbishop Usher, Immanuel, or the Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God (Lond. 1648, fol.),; Thos. Goodwin, Christ the Mediator, in Works (1681, fol.), 3:1-427; R. J.Wilberforce, Doct. of the Incarn. of our Lord Jesus Christ in its Relation to Mankind and the Church; Edward Irving, The Doctrine of the Incarnation opened (in Sermons); Robt. Turnbull, Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ Jesus; John Farrer, Bamnpton Lecture (1803), p. 59 sq.; Robert Fleming, The Loganthropos, or a Discourse concerning Christ as the Logos (Lond. 1705), vol. 2 of Christology; Thomas Bradbury, Mystery of Godliness cosnsidered in 61 Sermons (Edinb. 1795); Wm. Sherlock, Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God (Lond. 1691); Marcus Dods, On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, with rec. notice by Dr. Thomas Chalmers (2nd ed. 1849); Bib. Rep.  1832, p. 1; 1849, p. 636 sq.; Brownson's Quart. Rev. sec. series, 4:136; 5, 137 sq.; 6:287 sq.; Church Rev. 4:428 sq.; Biblioth. Sacra, 11, 729; 12, 52; 24, 41 sq. (an able art. on the theory of Incarnation, April, 1854); Methodist Quart. Rev. 1851, p. 114; 1866, p. 290; Kitto's Journal of Sacred Literature, first series, 3:107-113; Theological Eclectic, 2, 184; Massillon, “Les caracteres de la grandeur de Jesus Christ,” in AEuvres Completes, 6:107; on 1Co 2:8; 1Co 7:39; Bp. Stillingfleet, Sermons (1690), 3:336; Bossuet, three Sermons, AEuvres, 7:1; Bp. Atterbury, Sermons, 4, 61; Joseph Benson, Sermons, 2, 604; Archbp. Tillotson, (fol. ed.), 1, 431; Bp. Beveridge, Works, 2, 564; Bp. Horne, Disc. 1, 193; Bp. Van Mildert, Works, 5, 359; J. H. Newman, Sermons, 2, 29; C. Simeon, Works, 19:170; Richard Duke, The Divinity and Humanity of Jesus Christ (1730), p. 29; Thomas Arnold, Sermons on 1Ti 3:16, at Rugby (1833) p. 111; W. A. Butler, The Mystery of the Holy Incarnation (Amer. ed.), 1, 58; George Rawlinson, Sermons on John 1, 11, p. 1; Riggenbach, Sermon on the Person of Jesus Christ, transl. in Foundations of our Faith. p. 100. For other sermons on the incarnation, see Darling's Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, col. 1059, 1063, 1064, 1546,1547,1595-1597; also Malcolm's Theol. Index, p. 234. Compare Stanley, East. Ch. p. 279, 352; Baptist Quart. 1870 (July); Amer. Ch.. Rev. 1870, p. 82; An. Presb. Rev. 1869, p. 324; Bib. Sac. 1870, p. 1; Mercersb. Rev. 1858, p. 419; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1861 (Jan., art. iv); 1866 (Jan.); 1868 (July) Theol. Elect. 3:167; Bullet. Theol. 1867- (Jan.), p. 23 sq. See also references to the subject, more or less extensive, in Lives of Christ, by Sepp, Kuhn, Baumgarten, Ewald, Van Osterzee, Neander, Jeremy Taylor, Ellicott, Pressense, Young, Andrews; Lichtenstein's Jesus Christus, Abriss seines Lebens, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. vol. 6; also Bibliography of Life of Jesus in Hase's Leben Jesu (Lpz. 1854); also Literature under SEE CHRISTOLOGY, vol, 2, p. 834 (J. K. B.)

## Incartulti[[@Headword:Incartulti]]

             a term for the certificates of liberation given to serfs or slaves of churches and monasteries who were liberated. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 841.

## Incastratura[[@Headword:Incastratura]]

             (sepulcrun) is a name in the Roman Catholic Church for a small place in the altar-stones set apart for the storage of saints' relics. — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 8, 841.

## Incensarium[[@Headword:Incensarium]]

             (or INCENSORIUM) is the name of the vessel used in the Romish and some of the Oriental churches for containing the incense to be burned. SEE INCENSE.

## Incensation[[@Headword:Incensation]]

             is the lighting and burning of the incense. SEE INCENSE.

## Incense[[@Headword:Incense]]

             (ק2ַ2ְטוֹרָה, ketorah', Deu 33:10; usually קְטֹרֶת, keto'reth, which is once applied likewise to the fat of rams, being the part always burned in sacrifice; once קַטֵּי, kitter'. Jer 44:21; all forms of the verb קָטִּי, prop. to smoke, hence to cause an odor by burning, often itself applied to the act of burning incense; Greek, θυμίαμα and cognate terms; sometimes לְבוֹנָה:, lebonah', Isa 43:23; Isa 60:6; Isa 66:3; Jer 6:20; Jer 17:26; Jer 41:5, frankincense, as elsewhere rendered), a perfume which gives forth its fragrance by burning, and in particular, that perfume which was burned upon the Jewish altar of incense. (See Weimar, De sufftu aromatum, Jen. 1678.) SEE ALTAR.

Indeed, the burning of incense seems to have been considered among the Hebrews so much of an act of worship or sacred offering that we read not of any other use of incense than this among them. Nor among the Egyptians do we discover any trace of burned perfume except in sacerdotal use; but in Persian sculptures we see incense burned before the king. The offering of ‘incense has formed a part of the religious ceremonies of most ancient nations. The Egyptians burned resin in honor of the sun at its rising, myrrh when at its meridian, and a mixture called kuphi at its setting (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 5, 315). Plutarch (De Is. et Os. c. 52, 80) describes kuphi as a mixture of sixteen ingredients. “In the temple of Siva incense is offered to the Lingam six times in twenty-four hours” (Roberts, Oriental Illust. p. 368). It was also an element in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (Jer 11:12; Jer 11:17; Jer 48:35; 2Ch 34:25).

1. The incense employed in the service of the tabernacle was distinguished as קְטֹרֶת הִסִּמַּים(ketdoeth has-sammim; Exo 25:6, incense of the aromnas; Sept. ἡ σύνθεσις τοῦ θυμιάματος; Vulg. thymiamata boni odores; A.V. “sweet incense”). The ingredients of the sacred incense are enumerated with great precision in Exo 30:34-35 : “Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte (נָטָ, nataph), and onycha (שְׁחֵלֶת, shecheleth), and galbanum (חֶלְבְּנָה. chelbenah); these sweet spices with pure frankincense (לְבֹנָה, lebonah): of each shall there be a like weight. And thou shalt make of it a perfume, a confection after the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy.” See each of these ingredients in its alphabetical place. All incense which was not made of these ingredients was called קְטוֹרָה זָרָה(ketorah zarah), “strange incense,” Exo 30:9, and was forbidden to be offered. According to Rashi on Exo 30:34, the above-mentioned perfumes were mixed in equal proportions, seventy manehs being taken of each. They were compounded by the skill of the apothecary, to whose use, according to Rabbinical tradition, was devoted a portion of the Temple, called, from the name of the family whose especial duty it was to prepare the incense, “the house of Abtines.” So in the large temples of India “is retained a man whose chief business it is to distil sweet waters from flowers, and to extract oil from wood, flowers, and other substances” (Roberts, Oriental Illust. p. 82). The priest or Levite to whose care the incense was intrusted was one of the fifteen ממונים(memunnim), or prefects of the Temple. Constant watch was kept in the house of Abtines that the incense might always be in readiness (Buxtorf, Lexicon Talmud. s.v. אבטינם). In addition to the four ingredients already mentioned, Jarchi enumerates seven others, thus making eleven, which the Jewish doctors affirm were communicated to Moses on Mount Sinai. Josephus (War, 5, 5, 5) mentions thirteen. The proportions of the additional spices are given by Maimonides (Cele hammnikddsh, 2, 2, § 3) as follows: of myrrh, cassia, spikenard, and saffron, sixteen manehs each; of costus, twelve manehs; cinnamon, nine manehs; sweet bark, three manehs. The weight of the whole confection was 368 manehs. To these was added the fourth part of a cab of salt of Sodom, with amber of Jordan, and an herb called ‘the smoke-raiser” (מעלה עשׁן, maaleh aishan), known only to the cunning in such matters, to whom the secret descended by tradition. In the ordinary daily service one maneh was used, half in the morning and half in the evening. Allowing, then, one maneh of incense for  each day of the solar year, the three manehs which remained were again pounded, and used by the high priest on the day of atonement (Lev 16:12).

A store of it was constantly kept in the Temple (Joseph. War, 6, 8, 3). The further directions are that this precious compound should be made or broken up into minute particles, and that it should be deposited, as a very holy thing, in the tabernacle “before the testimony” (or ark). As the ingredients are so minutely specified, there was nothing to prevent wealthy persons from having a similar perfume for private use: this, therefore, was forbidden under pain of excommunication: “Ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people” (v. Exo 30:37-38). So in some part of India, according to Michaelis (Mosaische Recht, art. 249), it was considered high treason for any person to make use of the best sort of calcambak, which was for the service of the king alone. The word which describes the various ingredients as being “tempered together” literally means salted (מְמֻלָּה, memulnlach). — The Chaldee and Greek versions, however, have set the example of rendering it by mixed or tempered, as if their idea was that the different ingredients were to be mixed together. just as salt is mixed with any substance over which it is sprinkled. Ainsworth contends for the literal meaning, inasmuch as the law (Lev 2:13) expressly says, “With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt.” In support of this he cites Maimonides, who affirms that there was not anything offered on the altar without salt, except the wine of the drink offering, and the blood, and the wood; and of the incense he says, still more expressly, that “they added to it a cab of salt.” In accordance with this, it is supposed, our Savior says. “Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt” (Mar 9:49). Ainsworth further remarks: “If our speech is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt, as the apostle teaches (Col 4:6), how much more should our incense, our prayers unto God, be therewith seasoned!” It is difficult, however, to see how so anomalous a substance as salt could well be combined in the preparation; and if it was used, as we incline to think that it was, it was probably added in the act of offering. SEE SALT.

The expression בִּד בְּבִד(bad bebad), Exo 30:34, is interpreted by the Chaldee “weight by weight,” that is, an equal weight of each (comp. Jarchi, ad loc.); and this rendering is adopted by our version. Others, however, and among them Aben-Ezra and Maimonides, consider it as signifying that each of the spices was separately prepared, and that all were afterwards mixed.

2. Aaron, as high-priest, was originally appointed to offer incense, but in the daily service of the second Temple the office devolved upon the inferior priests, from among whom one was chosen by lot (Mishna, oma, 2, 4; Luk 1:9) each morning and evening (Abarbanel, On Lev 10:1). A peculiar blessing was supposed to be attached to this service, and in order that all might share in it, the lot was cast among those who were “new to the incense,” if any remained (Mishna, Yoma, 1. c.; Bartenora, On Tamid, 5, 2). Uzziah was punished for his presumption in attempting to infringe the prerogatives of the descendants of Aaron, who were consecrated to burn incense (2Ch 26:16-21; Joseph. Ant. 9, 10, 4). The officiating priest appointed another, whose office it was to take the fire from the brazen altar. According to Maimonides (Tamid Unus, 1', 8; 3:5), this fire was taken from the second pile, which was over against the S.E. corner of the altar of burnt offering, and was of fig-tree wood. A silver shovel ( מִחְתָּהmachtah) was first filled with the live coals, and afterwards emptied into a golden one, smaller than the former, so that some of the coals were spilled (Mishna, Tamid, 5, 5; Yoma; 4, 4; comp. Rev 8:5). Another priest cleared the golden altar from the cinders which had been left at the previous offering of incense (Mishna, Tamid, 3, 6, 9; 6:1).

The times of offering incense were specified in the instructions first given to Moses (Exo 30:7-8). The morning incense was offered when the lamps were trimmed in the holy place, and before the sacrifice, when the watchman set for the purpose announced the break of day (Mishna, Yoma, 3:1, 5). When the lamps were lighted “between the evenings,” after the evening sacrifice and before the drink-offerings were offered, incense was again burnt on the golden altar which “belonged to the oracle” (1Ki 6:22), and stood before the veil which separated the holy place from the Holy of Holies, the throne of God (Rev 8:4; Philo, De Anim. ison. §3).

When the priest entered the holy place with the incense, all the people were removed from the Temple, and from between the porch and the altar (Maimonides, Tamid Ulmus, 3, 3; compare Luk 1:10. The incense was then brought from the house of' Atines in a large vessel of gold called כִּ(caph), in which was a phial (בזי,ִ bazik, properly “a salver”) containing the incense (Mishna, Tamid, 5, 4). The assistant priests who attended to the lamps, “he clearing of the golden altar from the cinders, and the fetching fire from the altar of burnt-offering, performed their offices singly,  bowed towards the ark of the covenant, and left the holy place before the priest, whose lot it was to offer incense, entered. Profound silence was observed among the congregation who were praying without (comp. Rev 8:1), and at a signal from the prefect the priest cast the incense on the fire (Mishna, Tamid, 6, 3), and, bowing reverently towards the Holy of Holies, retired slowly backwards, not prolonging his prayer that he might not alarm the congregation, or cause them to fear that he had been struck dead for offering unworthily (Lev 16:13; Luk 1:21; Mishna, Yoma, 5, 1). When he came out he pronounced the blessing in Num 6:24-26, the “magrephah” sounded, and the Levites burst forth into song, accompanied by the full swell of the Temple music, the sound of which, say the Rabbins, could be heard as far as Jericho (Mishna, Tamid, 3:8). It is possible that this may be alluded to in Rev 8:5. The priest then emptied the censer in a clean place, and hung it on one of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering. SEE CENSER.

On the day of atonement the service was different. The high-priest, after sacrificing the bullock as a sin-offering for himself and his family, took incense in his left hand, and a golden shovel filled with live coals from the west side of the brazen altar (Jarchi, On Lev 16:12) in his right, and went into the Holy of Holies. He then placed the shovel upon the ark between the two bars. In the second Temple, where there was no ark, a stone was substituted. Then, sprinkling the incense upon the coals, he stayed till the house was filled with smoke, and, walking slowly backwards, came without the veil, where he prayed for a short time (Maimonides, Yom hakkippur, quoted by Ainsworth, On Leviticus 16; Outram, De Sacrificiis, 1, 8, § 11). SEE ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

3. With regard to the symbolical meaning of incense, opinions have been many and widely different. While Maimonides regarded it merely as a perfume designed to counteract the effluvia arising from the beasts which were slaughtered for the daily sacrifice, other interpreters have allowed their imaginations to run riot, and vied with the wildest speculations of the Midrashim. Phile (Quis rer. div. haer. sit. § 41, p. 501) conceives the stacte and onycha to be symbolical of water and earth; galbanum and frankincense of air and fire. Josephus, following the traditions of his time, believed that the ingredients of the incense were chosen from the products of the. sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the earth, to indicate that all things are of God and for God (War, 5, 5, 5). As the Temple or tabernacle was the palace of Jehovah, the theocratic king of Israel, and the  ark of the, covenant his throne, so the incense, in the opinion of. some, corresponded to the perfumes in which the luxurious monarchs of the East delighted. It may mean all this, but it must mean much more. Grotius, on Exo 30:1, says the mystical signification is “sursum habenda corda.” Cornelius a Lapide, on Exo 30:34, considers it as an apt emblem of propitiation, and finds a symbolical meaning in the several ingredients. Fairbairn (Typology of Scripture, 2, 320), with many others, looks upon prayer as the reality of which incense is the symbol, founding his conclusion upon Psa 141:2; Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3-4.

Bahr (Sym. d. Mos. Cult. vol. 1, c. 6:§ 4) opposes this view of the subject of the ground that the chief thing in offering incense is not the producing of the smoke, which presses like prayer towards: heaven, but the spreading of the fragrance. His own exposition may be summed up as fallows. Prayer, among all Oriental nations, signifies calling upon the name of God. The oldest prayers consisted in the mere enumeration of the several titles of God. The Scripture places incense in close relationship to prayer, so that offering incense is synonymous with worship. Hence incense itself is a symbol of the name of God. The ingredients of the incense correspond severally to the perfections of God, though it is impossible to decide to which of the four names of God each belongs. Perhaps stacte corresponds to יְהֹוָה (Jehovah), onycha to אֵֹלהַים (Elohimn), galbanum to חִי (chai), and frankincense to קָדוֹש ׁ(kadosh). Such is Bahr's exposition of the symbolism of incense, rather ingenious than logical. Looking upon incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritual, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ. In Rev 8:3-4, the incense is spoken of as something distinct from, though offered with, the prayers of all the saints (comp. Luk 1:10); and in Rev 5:3 it is the golden vials, and not the odors or incense, which are said to be the prayers of saints. Psa 141:2, at first sight, appears to militate against this conclusion; but if it be argued from this passage that incense is an emblem of prayer, it must also be allowed that the evening sacrifice has the same symbolical meaning. SEE PERFUME.

## Incense, Christian[[@Headword:Incense, Christian]]

             The use of incense in worship was not carried over from the Jewish to the Christian Church; yet it is still employed, with other superstitious usages, in the Romish Church, and in some of the Oriental churches. The incense  used is either the resinous gum olibanum, brought from Arabia or the East Indies. or an imitation of it manufactured by the chemists. The latter is most common now.

1. It is certain that incense was not used in the-first three ages of the Christian Church. Indeed the use of it was a mark of paganism, as is fully evinced by the enactments of the Christian emperors against its use. “The very places or houses where it could be proved to have been done were, by a law of Theodosius, confiscated by the government” (comp. Gothof, De Statu Pagan. sub. Christ. Imper. leg. 12). A few grains of incense thrown by a devotee upon a pagan altar constituted an act of worship. The apologists for Christianity, Arnobius (Contra Gent. 2), Tertullian (Apol. 30), and Lactantius (1, 20), make distinct and separate statements that “Christians do not burn incense” like pagans. It appears likely that the use of incense was first begun in order to purify the air of the unwholesome chambers, caverns, etc., in which Christians were compelled to worship, just as candles were employed necessarily, even by day, in subterranean places. Even Romanist writers (e.g. Claude de Vert) assert this. Cardinal Bona, indeed (Res Liturgic. 1, 25), seeks to derive the use of incense in worship from apostolical times, but his argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Revelation 5, 8 : “Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints;” as if anything could be argued, for practical worship, from the highly symbolical language of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that period it became common, in the Latin Church. Its mystical representation is, according to Roman Catholic authorities,

(1) contrition (Ecclesiastes 14);

(2) the preaching of the Gospel (2Co 2:14);

(3) the prayers of the faithful (Psa 141:2; Rev 5:8-14);

(4) the virtue of saints (Son 3:6).

See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also, minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in  its use. Thus the Cistercians used incense only on festivals, while the Benedictines and Clugniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The censer (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When longer, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass. the incense is thrown over the altar and over the ‘sacrificing priests” by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the homage, typified by the incense, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to “incensing” the pope is, that “when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel.” No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this odd rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff's nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed the censer is thrown in the direction of the other priests present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as “human vanity creeps in everywhere” (Bergier, s.v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before ‘he mass of the people. See Bergier, Dict. de Theologie. 2, 423; Migne, Dict. de Liturgie, p. 535 sq.; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book 8:ch. 6:§ 21; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, 21:12; Walcott. Sacred Archaeology, p. 325 sq.; Adolphus, Compendium Theologicum, p.74; Broughton, Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra, 1, 527; Middleton, Letter from Rome, p. 15; Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 599 sq.; Siegel, Handb. der Christl. — Kirchl. Alterthümer, 2, 441 sq. SEE CENSER.

## Incense-Boat[[@Headword:Incense-Boat]]

             a vessel for containing incense, often formed like a boat: hence its name. Examples of these are numerous in old inventories of church furniture. SEE NAVICULA.

## Incest[[@Headword:Incest]]

             (Lat. in, not; castus, chaste), the crime of sexual commerce with a person within the degrees forbidden by the (Levitical) law (see Trier, De legibus Mo; saicis de incestu, Frcft. a. Oder, 1726). SEE AFFINITY CONSANGUINITY. “An instinct almost innate and universal,” says Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 4, 351), “appears to prohibit the incestuous commerce of parents and children in the infinite series of ascending and descending generations. Concerning the oblique and collateral branches, nature is indifferent, reason mute, and custom various  and arbitrary. In Egypt, the marriage of brothers and sisters was admitted without scruple or exception; a Spartan might espouse the daughter of his father, an Athenian that of his mother; and the nuptials of an uncle with his niece were applauded at Athens as a happy union of the dearest relations. The profane lawgivers of Rome were never tempted by interest or superstition to multiply the forbidden degrees; but they inflexibly condemned the marriage of sisters and brothers, hesitated whether first cousins should be touched by the same interdict, revered the parental character of aunts and uncles, and treated affinity and adoption as a just imitation of the ties of blood. According to the proud maxims of the republic, a legal marriage could only be contracted by free citizens; an honorable, at least an ingenuous birth, was required for the spouse of a senator; but the blood of kings could never mingle in legitimate nuptials with the blood of a Roman; and the name of ‘stranger' degraded Cleopatra and Berenice to live the concubines of Mark Antony and Titus.” Vortigern, king of South Britain, equaled, or, rather, excelled the Egyptians and Persians in wickedness by marrying his own daughter. The queen of Portugal was married to her uncle and the prince of Brazil, the son of that incestuous marriage, wedded his aunt.

But they had dispensations for these unnatural marriages from his holiness. “In order,” says Paley, “to preserve chastity in families, and between persons of different sexes brought up and living together in a state of unreserved intimacy, it is necessary, by every method possible, to inculcate an abhorrence of incestuous conjunctions; which abhorrence can only be upheld by the absolute reprobation of all commerce of the sexes between near relations. Upon this principle the marriage, as well as other cohabitation of brothers and sisters of lineal kindred, and of all who usually live in the same family, may be said to be forbidden by the law of nature. Restrictions which extend to remoter degrees of kindred than what this reason makes it necessary to prohibit from intermarriage are founded in the authority of the positive law which ordains them, and can only be justified by their tendency to diffuse wealth, to connect families, or to promote some political advantage.” The Roman law calls incestuous connection Incestus juris gentiun, while it designates as Incestus juris civilis the intercourse between other members of the families which it considers within the forbidden degrees. The principal law against incest, however, is the Lex Julia de adulteriis coercendis of Augustus. Children born of incest (liberi incestuosi) are by it bastardized. The canon law extended the forbidden degrees very far thus giving a more extended signification to the appellation of incest. By it a distinction was  made between the Incestusjuris diviini, relating to such degrees of relationship as were already condemned by the Mosaic law, and the Incestus juris hunmani, relating only to such degrees within which marriage is forbidden by ecclesiastical laws. But as in the latter case dispensations can, in the Romish Church, always be obtained, this form of incest is merely considered an offense against the laws of the Church. The penal statute of Charles V concerning incest is based on the Roman law, but includes also cohabitation with a daughter-in-law, a stepdaughter, and a mother-in-law. Consequently incest, properly so called, can only take place between ascendants and descendants, brothers and sisters, parents-in- law and children-in-law, stepparents and step-children. Prosecution for incest, however, is legal only in cases where persons have had sexual intercourse without marriage; it is inapplicable where marriage has been contracted in good faith, and only afterwards the contractors become aware of their connection being incestuous. Modern law, which in the main is based on the Levitical, and from which the rule of the Roman law differs very little, prohibits marriage between relations within three degrees of kindred; computing the generations not from, but through the common ancestor, and accounting affinity the same as consanguinity. The issue, however, of such marriages are not bastardized unless the parents be divorced during their lifetime. Penalties are enacted for incest and unchastity varying from simple imprisonment to hard labor for a term of five or six years. Sexual intercourse between parties in different degrees of the collateral lines is in many cases considered only as punishable by the police regulations. The ascendants are generally punished more severely than the descendants. The modern Jews permit the marriage of cousins, and even of the uncle by a niece. See Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 8, 841; Paley, Moral Philosophy, 1, 316 sq.; Buck, Theological Dictionary, s.v.

## Incest, Spiritual[[@Headword:Incest, Spiritual]]

             an ideal crime committed between two persons who have a spiritual alliance, by means of baptism or confirmation. This ridiculous fancy was made use of as an instrument of great tyranny in times when the power of the pope was unlimited, even queens being sometimes divorced upon this pretence. Incest spiritual is also understood of a vicar or other beneficiary who holds two benefices, one whereof depends upon the collation of the other. Such spiritual incest renders both the one and the other of these benefices vacant. — Henderson's Buck.

## Inchantment[[@Headword:Inchantment]]

             SEE ENCHANTMENT.

## Inchofer, Melchior[[@Headword:Inchofer, Melchior]]

             a German Jesuit, was born at Vienna or at GCim (Hungary) in 1584. He entered the Society of Jesus in 1607, and studied philosophy, mathematics, and theology at Messina, where he afterwards instructed. In 1636 he went to Rome, and became a member of the Congregation of the Index and of the Holy Office, but was called from thence to the college at Macerata in 1646. He died in 1648 at Milan. His principal works are Epistolce B. Marice ad Messanenses veritas vizdicata (1629): — Historia sacrce Latiziitatis (1636): — Annales ecclesiastici regni Hungarice (1644) (incomplete). Under the pseudonyme of Eugenius Lavande Ninevensis he defended his order and its educational system against the attacks of Scioppius (Schopp), in refutation of whom he wrote several pamphlets (16381641). He was also believed to be the author of the Monarchia Solipsorumn (Venice, 1652; French translation, Amst. 1722, 12mo); but Oudin proved, in an edition of Niceron, that this work is the production of count Scotti of Piacema, who entered the order in 1616, but became discontented, and retired from it in 1645. See Niceron, Mem pour servir, etc., 35, 322-346; 39, 165-280; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 648; Bayle, Hist. Dict. 3:563 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. 1, 405.

## Incineratio[[@Headword:Incineratio]]

             is a name in the Romish Church for the consecration of a certain quantity of ashes, and the sprinkling of them over the heads of the officiating clergy and the worshipping congregation, with the following admonition, pronounced by the officiating priest: ‘Memento quod cinis es, et in cinerem reverteris” (Remember that dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return). The custom is believed to have originated with Gregory the Great (towards the close of the 6th century), but it was not fully established till towards the end of the 12th century, when it received the sanction of pope Celestine III. Gregory the Great is in all probability also the founder of Ash- Wednesday, which is supposed to derive its name from the above ceremonial service generally performed on that day. See Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 667; Siegel, Handb. d. Christ. Kirchl. Alterth. 1, 141; Eadie, Eccles. Dict. p. 324. SEE ASHES; SEE ASH-WEDNESDAY.

## Incipientes[[@Headword:Incipientes]]

             (beginners) is one of the names by which the catechumens of the early Christian Church were called. SEE CATECHUMENS.

## Inclination[[@Headword:Inclination]]

             is the propensity of the mind to any particular object or action; a kind of bias by which it is carried towards certain actions previous to the exercise of thought and reasoning about the nature and consequences of them. Inclinations are of two kinds, natural or acquired.

1. Natural are such as we often see in children, who from their earliest years differ in their tempers and dispositions. Of one we may say he is naturally revengeful; of another, that he is patient and forgiving.

2. Acquired inclinations are such as are super induced by custom, which are called habits, and these are either good or evil. SEE HABIT; SEE WILL.

## Incluse[[@Headword:Incluse]]

             SEE ANACHORETS.

## Incommunicableness of God[[@Headword:Incommunicableness of God]]

             The divine attributes have been variously divided. One of the divisions sets the attributes of God forth as communicable and incommunicable. As the former are regarded such attributes as can be imparted from the Creator to the creature. e.g. goodness, holiness, wisdom, etc., and as the latter such are counted as cannot be imparted, as independence, immutability, immensity, and eternity. See Dorner, Person of Christ, div. 2, 1, 183 sq.; 2, 193 sq. See also the article GOD SEE GOD (Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of), vol. 3, p. 907 sq.

## Incomprehensibility of God[[@Headword:Incomprehensibility of God]]

             This is a relative term, and indicates a relation between an object and a faculty; between God and a created understanding: so that the meaning of it is this, that no created understanding can comprehend God; that is, have a perfect and exact knowledge of him, such a knowledge as is adequate to the perfection of the object (Job 11:7; Isaiah 4 o).

God is incomprehensible,

1. As to the nature of His essence;

2. The excellency of his attributes;

3. The depth of his counsels;

4. The works of his providence;

5. The dispensation of his grace (Eph 3:8; Job 37:25; Romans 11). The incomprehensibility of God follows,

1. From his being a spirit endued with perfections greatly superior to our own.

2. There may be (for anything we certainly know) attributes and perfections in God of which we have not the least idea.

3. In those perfections of the divine nature of which we have some idea, there are many things to us inexplicable, and with which, the more  deeply and attentively we think of them, the more we find our thoughts swallowed up, such as his self-existence, eternity, omnipresence, etc.

This should teach us, therefore,

1. To admire and reverence the divine Being (Zec 9:17; Neh 9:5);

2. To be humble and modest (Psa 8:1; Psa 8:4; Ecc 5:2-3; Job 37:19);

3. To be serious in our addresses, and sincere in our behavior towards him. (Caryl, On Job 27:25; Tillotson, Sermons, sermon 156; Abernethy, Sermons, vol. 2. nos. 6. 7: Doddridge, Lectures on Divinity, lecture 59; Martensen, Dogmatics, p. 89; Buck, Theolog. Dictionary, s.v.) SEE GOD.

## Incomprehensible[[@Headword:Incomprehensible]]

             This word, as occurring in the English Prayer-book, is understood, at the present day, in a sense quite different from what was designed when it was first introduced into the formularies. Thus when, in the Athanasian Creed, it is said, “The Father incomprehensible,” etc., the meaning is, “the Father is (imensus. i.e.) infinite,” etc.: a Being not to be comprised (comprehendendus) within the limits of space.

## Inconvertibility[[@Headword:Inconvertibility]]

             the quality of both natures in Christ, which does not admit of a change of either into the other.

## Incorpolitus[[@Headword:Incorpolitus]]

             a title in monasteries of the priest who has the administration of the convent estates, the collection of interest and other moneys due the monastery, etc.

## Incorporation[[@Headword:Incorporation]]

             The incorporation of a church benefice consists in its being joined quoad spiritualia et temporalia with a spiritual corporation, such, for ‘instance, as a convent or a monastery. We find many instances of such incorporations in the 9th century, and they were most generally the result of efforts to  increase the revenues of the corporations. The modus operandi was to abolish the separate office connected with a benefice, and to give the temporal advantages to the corporation, which also added the spiritual offices connected therewith to its other duties, supplying them with ministerial services. For instance, a regular pastor (parochus principalis) was appointed, who committed the care of souls to a vicar appointed by himself, under sanction of the bishop. This vicar then filled the office of cura animarunm ctualis, whilst the convent or monastery had but a cura habitualis. The canon laws in such cases soon prescribed the appointment of permanent vicars (vicarii peypetui), although in many instances, especially in Germany, many convents appointed only temporary vicars, and even entrusted the care of souls to members of their order who did not reside in the parish. Essentially different from these “pleno jure” or “utroque jure” incorporations were exclusively temporal unions of the revenues of livings with spiritual corporations, which were also often designated as incorporationes quoad temporalia. In these cases the income only of the livings went to the convents, together with all the revenues accruing there from, they in exchange undertaking to give to the incumbent minister an adequate support (portio cosngryua). The spiritual office, spiritualia, remained unaffected by this arrangement, and was filled by the bishop, according to the wishes of the convent. The numerous abuses which were introduced in both these kinds of incorporations were denounced by the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, c. 7, De reform.). The council also forbade the union of parish churches with convents, monasteries, hospitals, etc. (Sess. 24, c. 13; Sess. 7, De reform,. c. 6). In consequence of the secularization of convents and monasteries, the whole organization has mostly fallen into disuse; the parish administrators are about the only remains of the incorporation system. See Neller, De juribus parochi primitivi (in Schmid, Thesaur. jurs. eccl. 6, 441 sq.); Herzog, Real- Encyklopadie, 6:649.

## Incorporeality of God[[@Headword:Incorporeality of God]]

             is his being without a body. That God is incorporeal is evident; for,

1. Materiality is incompatible with self-existence, and God, being self- existent, must be incorporeal.

2. If God were corporeal, he could not be present in any part of the world where body is; yet his presence is necessary for the support and motion of body.

3. A body cannot. be in two places at the same time; yet he is everywhere, and fills heaven and earth.

4. A body is to be seen and felt, but God is invisible and impalpable (John 1, 185. See Charnock, Works, 1, 117; Gill, Body of Divinity, 1, 45, 8vo; Diudiridge, Lectures on Divinity, lect. 47. SEE GOD).

## Incorruptibiles[[@Headword:Incorruptibiles]]

             an extreme sect of Eutycllians (q.v.), who held that the body of Christ was incorruptible, i.e. “that from the time that his body was formed it was not susceptible of any change or alteration; that he was not even subject to innocent passions or appetites, such as hunger or thirst, but that he ate without any occasion both before his death and after his resurrection.” SEE APHTHARTODOCETE; SEE MOXOPHYSITES.

## Incorrupticolae[[@Headword:Incorrupticolae]]

             SEE INCORRUPTIBILES.

## Incredulity[[@Headword:Incredulity]]

             SEE INFIDELITY; SEE UNBELIEF.

## Incumbent[[@Headword:Incumbent]]

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

## Indagine, Johann De[[@Headword:Indagine, Johann De]]

             a Carthusian monk of Germany, who died at Eisenach in 1475, is the author of Commentarius in Quattuor Libros Regum: — De Visione Danielis cap. 7: — De Quattuor Sensibus Scripturae: — De Potestate Ecclesiastica et de Auctoritate Papae in Conciliis: — Contra Flagellatores: — Contra Errores Bohemorum: — De Cognitione Futurorum. See Hoffmann, Lexicon Universale; Tritheumius, De  Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexicon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Indefectibility of the Church[[@Headword:Indefectibility of the Church]]

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

I. Perpetuity of the Church. — “Plain promises of this are made in Isa 61:8-9; Dan 2:44; Mat 16:18; Mat 28:20; Joh 14:16-17. There are also arguments to be drawn for it from the consideration of God's counsel and purpose. The consummation of all things is delayed only till God's servants are sealed (1Co 15:28; Rev 6:9-11). When faith fails in the earth, the end will be (Luk 18:8). This is as regards God, in whose work we cannot suppose an interruption. So, too, as regards man. God will have all men to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth. The Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, could not fail without a failure of God's mercy. So long as there are men capable of salvation (and all men are capable of salvation, since Christ died for all), so long will the Church be  preserved, that to it may be added both οί σωζόμενοι and οί σωθησόμενοι. The promises of God are given to the Church as a whole. Each branch of the Church is on its probation, as is each individual member. And the law of probation, the law of their participation in the promise, is the same: ‘He that hath, to him shall be given.' To argue that because each particular church may fail, therefore the whole may fail, is not only a fallacy in logic, but a denial of Christ's power to impart to the whole that which he does not impart to each particular member.”

II. Inerrancy and Infallibility of the Church. — “The foregoing promises and arguments show that the Church will not fail either by dying out or by apostasy. As the work of the Spirit will not fail in bringing sons to God, so it will never fail in providing that there shall always be a body persevering in the faith according to the election of grace. This is to be considered more particularly as regards truth of doctrine. For this, also, there are promises, e.g. Joh 16:13; 1Jn 2:27. The spirit which dwells in the Church is likewise declared to be the spirit of knowledge and understanding (Col 1:9; Col 2:3; Col 3:10). Less cannot be implied in these words than that the Church shall always have a tenure of the truth sufficient for salvation. They show, further, that any doctrine which can be said to be the deliberately ascertained voice of the Church must be from God, whose Spirit is in the Church. But they cannot be pressed so far as to prove that the Church may not for a time hold such an error as does not directly deny the foundation of faith, or does not directly deny Christ. Even an error, which by logical consequence denies the foundation of faith, is not to be taken as such a denial. The consequence may not be perceived, and if perceived the premises would be at once rejected. The case is doubtless of great improbability, but its possibility must be conceded. When, then, can we say that the voice of the Church is sufficiently ascertained? This leads us on from the inerrancy, or passive infallibility, to the active infallibility, or declaration of the faith. No actual limits of time can be set for which, if a doctrine has been held, it must be considered as the ascertained decision of the Church. The circumstances of the Church may not be such as to lead to investigation. Ten y ears in one period may cause more sifting of the truth than a hundred years of another period. It is the condition of the Church militant to be always under trial, sometimes by persecution from the world, sometimes by blasts of contrary doctrine within itself. In different degrees these are blended, and with very different degrees of speed will the truth emerge. The degree of holiness also, and  above all, will regulate the discovery and reception of truth. For knowledge and understanding in spiritual things are the flower and fruit; the plant itself is holiness springing from the root of faith. The certainty, then, of a doctrine enunciated by the Church is a growing certainty, varying in amount with the time the doctrine has been held, the degree of investigation to which it has been subjected, and the degree of holiness in the Church. Thus the decrees of a council which we may believe to be ecumenical can only be known to be the genuine voice of the Church by their acceptance. We may agree to the abstract proposition that a truly ecumenical council cannot err; but the proposition is of little practical value at the time of holding a council, for none can prove that the council has not in some respects failed of ecumenicity. The authority of its decisions rests on their acceptance. For the Spirit of God is given to the whole body of the Church; and that can only be known to be the true voice of the Church which is expressed by sufficient deliberation of generation after generation. In this sense the infallibility of the Church is a reasonable doctrine, and one, in fact, which it would be unreasonable for any Christian to disbelieve.”

## Indefectible Grace[[@Headword:Indefectible Grace]]

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

## Indelible Character[[@Headword:Indelible Character]]

             SEE CHARACTER, INDELIBLE.

## Indemnity[[@Headword:Indemnity]]

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

## Independence of Churches[[@Headword:Independence of Churches]]

             “It is an admitted fact, as clearly settled as anything can be by human authority, that the primitive Christians, in the organization of their  assemblies, formed them after the model of the Jewish synagogue .. They disowned the hereditary aristocracy of the Levitical priesthood, and adopted the popular government of the synagogue… Their government was voluntary, elective, free, and administered by rulers or elders elected by the people. The ruler of the synagogue was the moderator of the college of elders, but only primus inter paries, holding no official rank above them. The people, as Vitringa (De Synagoga, lib. 3:pt. 1, c. 15, p. 828-863) has shown, appointed their own officers to rule over them. They exercised the natural right of freemen to enact and execute their own laws, to admit proselytes, and to exclude at pleasure unworthy members from their communion. Theirs was ‘a democratic form of government,' and is so described by one of the most able expounders of the constitution of the primitive churches (se Rothe, Anfange d. Christl. Kirche, p. 14). Like their prototype, therefore, the primitive churches also embodied the principle of a popular government and of enlightened religious liberty” (Coleman, Apostol. and Prisnit. Ch. p. 43 sq.).

The reason, however, why the primitive Christians had this peculiar organization, reintroduced in the modern Church by the Congregationalists, and in part also by the Presbyterians, is, that the members of the early Christian Church mostly came from the Jewish Church, and naturally adopted methods of worship, government, etc., to which they were accustomed. But this by no means goes to prove that it was the intention of the early Christians to perpetuate their mode of government, but rather that, engaged as Christ and his disciples had been in founding a Church, needing no other bond than his own person, the mode of government to which they had been accustomed was chosen for the time being, “the disciples not having yet attained to a clear understanding of that call which Christ had already given them by so many intimations to form a Church entirely separated from the existing Jewish economy. We are disposed to believe that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the Church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons” (Neander, Apostol. Kirche, 3rd edit. p. 31, 33; comp. p. 179,195; also Rothe, Anfange, p. 146 sq.; Act 6:1; Act 11:30).

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

## Independency of God[[@Headword:Independency of God]]

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

1. He is independent as to his knowledge. He doth not receive ideas from any object out of himself, as intelligent creatures do. This is elegantly described by the prophet, Isa 40:13-14.

2. He is independent in power. As he receives strength from no one, so he doth not act dependently on the will of the creature (Job 36:23);

3. He is independent as to his holiness, being sin necessarily, and not barely depending on some reasons out of himself inducing him thereto; for it is essential to the divine nature to be infinitely opposite to sin, and therefore to be independently holy.  4. He is independent as to his bounty and goodness.

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

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

2. If God be infinitely above the highest creatures, he cannot depend on any of them, for dependence argues inferiority (Isa 40:15; Isa 40:17).

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

From God's being independent, we infer,

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

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

## Independent Baptists[[@Headword:Independent Baptists]]

             SEE BAPTISTS.

## Independents[[@Headword:Independents]]

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

I. History. — After the reformation of religion in England, the greater body of Protestants adopted the Episcopal form of Church polity, aid this was finally, established as the religion of the nation. But the smaller body of Protestants opposed episcopacy on the ground that it too nearly resembled the Roman Catholic form of Church polity, and these so-called Nonconformists (q.v.) came to be stigmatized by the derisive name of Puritans, which the followers of Novatian had borne in the third century. To this class (i. c. Nonconformists) belong the Independents, who claim that their system is substantially the same as that of the apostolic churches, which had been corrupted by the tendencies that culminated in papacy, and that traces of dissent from the episcopal power may be found in every age back to the 4th century (see Punchard, History of Congregationalism). They are supposed to have originated in England about the year 1581, under the leadership of Robert Brown, bearing thence the name of Brownists (q.v.); but Richard Fitz is generally named as the first pastor of the first Independent church in England (compare Skeats, History of the Free Churches, p. 23). The persecution which they were obliged to endure from the Established Church soon necessitated the emigration of these first Independents, and they removed to the Netherlands. Deserted by Brown, who conformed, and became an adherent of the Church of England, they chose as their leader John Robinson, to whom belong the chief merit of a better organization of them. Brown, who, by the persecutions which, as a Nonconformist, he had to endure, had become greatly embittered, had, with hardly less bigotry than his persecutors, declared all other forms of Church government not only as inconsistent. but denounced them in the severest terms, even branding them as antichristian. Robinson, however,  while holding his own to be the most apostolical form, counseled recognition of all other forms and Christian fellowship, looking upon charity as the end of the commandments. The names also which they had hitherto borne were now exchanged for that of Independents. Robinson, in his Apology, having affirmed “Coetum quemlibet particularem, esse totam, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex suis partibus constantem immediate et independentem [quoad alias eccl.] sub ipso Christo.” In 1616, a friend and co-laborer of Robinson, Henry Jacob, returned to the mother country, and organized an Independent Church at London, which has oftentimes, though incorrectly, been termed “the first Independent Church in England” (compare vol. 2, p. 476). “From this, as a nucleus, Independency gradually spread through England, and, in spite of the harsh measures of Laud and the court, came, in the middle of the 17th century, to occupy a dominant place among the powers by which the destinies of England were swayed.”

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

Ministers and delegates of more than a hundred congregations thereupon convened, Sept. 29, 1658, and on Oct. 12 (a few weeks before Oliver Cromwell's death) they adopted and issued a confession of faith and discipline, which was named a “Declaration.” Of this declaration the following were fundamental propositions: “A particular Church consists of officers and members: the Lord Christ having given to his called ones-united in Church order liberty and power to choose persons fitted by the Holy Ghost to be over them in the Lord. The officers appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church are pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person unto the office of pastor, teacher, or elder in a church is that he be chosen thereunto by the common suffrage of the Church itself, and solemnly set apart by fasting and prayer, with the imposition of hands of the eldership of that Church, if there be any before constituted therein; and of a deacon, that he be chosen by the like suffrage, and set apart by prayer, and the like imposition; and those who are so chosen, though not set apart after that manner, are rightly constituted ministers of Jesus. The work of preaching is not so peculiarly confined to pastors and teachers but that others also, gifted and fitted by the Holy Ghost, and approved by the people, may publicly, ordinarily, and constantly perform it.

Ordination alone, without election or consent of the Church, doth not constitute any person a church officer. A church furnished with officers, according to the mind of Christ, hath full power to administer all his ordinances; and where there is want of any one or more officers, those that are in the Church may administer all the ordinances proper to those officers whom they do not possess; but where there are no teaching officers at all, none may administer the seals, nor can the Church authorize any so to do. Whereas the Lord Jesus Christ hath appointed and instituted, as a means of edification, that those who walk not according to the rules and laws appointed by him be censured in his name and authority, every Church hath power in itself to exercise and execute all those censures appointed by him. The censures appointed by Christ are admonition and excommunication; and whereas some offences may be known only to some, those to whom they are so known must first admonish the offender in private; in public offences, and in case of non-amendment upon private admonition, the offence being related to the Church, the offender is to be duly admonished, in the name of Christ, by the whole Church through the elders; and if this censure prevail not for his repentance, then he is to be cast out by excommunication, with the consent of the members.” These  particulars respecting a declaration of faith but little known indicate the opinions entertained by the Independents, not only at the time of the Restoration, but, with some modification, afterwards; and here it may be added that if, in the theory of Presbyterianism, the ministry, as to the order of existence, precedes the Church, in the theory of Congregationalism, the Church, in that same order, precedes the minister; and in this significant fact may be found a key to some important differences between the two systems. Besides those rules which had reference to the internal order of the churches, there were these three relative to their dimensions, their co- operation, and the catholicity of their fellowship. “For the avoiding of differences, for the greater solemnity in the celebration of ordinances, and for the larger usefulness of the gifts and graces of the Holy Ghost, saints, living within such distances that they can conveniently assemble for divine worship, ought rather to join in one Church for their mutual strengthening and edification than to set up many distinct societies. In cases of difficulties or differences, it is according to the mind of Christ that many churches holding communion together do, by their managers, meet in a synod or council to consider and give advice; howbeit, these synods are not entrusted with ‘any Church power, properly so called, or with any jurisdiction over the churches. Such reforming churches as consist of persons sound in the faith, and of conversation becoming the Gospel, ought not to refuse the communion of each other, so far as may consist with their own principles respectively, though they walk not in all things according to the same rules of Church order.”

The conclusions at the Savoy meeting were not ecclesiastical canons, but simply united opinions. They had no binding force. They aspired to no higher character than that of counsel and advice. Lest this declaration should endanger their principles. the assembly took the precaution not to invest it with binding symbolical authority; and, to guard against the possibility of hierarchical schemes, they further enacted that no one should be ordained without having a call to some particular congregation. Similar precautions were also taken by them against all possible civil interference in ecclesiastical affairs, except cases in which Christian societies had laid themselves open to investigation by the civil authorities for the encouragement of civil disturbances (comp. art. SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS, vol. 2, p. 480, II, 2). After the restoration of Charles II in 1660, and the re-establishment of episcopacy, the Independents, like all other nonconforming “sects,” suffered from illiberal  enactments, especially from the “Act of Uniformity,” which was passed in 1662. “Independents retired into obscurity for a while after the Restoration. The doors of buildings where they had been wont to assemble were nailed up, the pastors were driven out, flocks were scattered, the administration of ordinances could not take place, and meetings could not be held, and communities which had been prosperous under the Commonwealth diminished in number” (Stoughton, Eccles. History of England [Church of the Restoration], 2, 164). The Act of Uniformity, however, was the most severe of all enactments against dissenters. Some 2000 of the ablest and best of England's clergy were forced to leave the Church. “They included Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and not a few whom it would be difficult to reduce entirely under any of those denominations; both Calvinists and Arminians, with other divines scarcely belonging to either of those schools. In point of learning, eloquence, reasoning, and imagination the men varied; but under all their peculiarities lay a common faith of no ordinary character, a faith of that rare kind which makes the confessor. They believed in God, in Christ, in truth, in heaven; and in the controversy which they carried on they regarded themselves as fighting for a divine cause… They believed that they were acting in the defense of the Gospel. A strong evangelical faith upheld their ecclesiastical opinions like the everlasting rocks which form the ribs and backbone of this grand old world. The Church of England suffered no small loss when she lost such men” (Stoughton). Yet, in spite of these persecutions, the Independents still continued to subsist until, in 1688, the Revolution, mad in 1689 the “Act of Toleration,” finally restored to them the enjoyment of liberty of worship.

Shortly after the publication of the Act of Toleration, efforts were made to bring about a union between the Presbyterians and the Independents (who by this time generally styled themselves Congregationalists), and in 1691 heads of agreement were drawn up (compare Mosheim, Eccl. list. 5, 361- 363). But “within a year from the formation of the union two discussions on points of doctrine and order arose. The first of these was excited by a Congregational minister holding high Calvinistic or rather Antinomian opinions, believing and preaching that repentance is not necessary to salvation, that the elect are always without sin and always without “spot before God.” The controversy which this course provoked “threw eleven counties into disorder, and before a year had passed away the Congregationalists had begun to be weaned from the union” (Skeats;  comp. also our article on SEE HOWE, JOHN ). From the position which the Independents assumed, it is curious to notice “that the Presbyterians, at this time, were more moderate Calvinists than the Congregationalists, and that the epithet of ‘Baxterians' was not inappropriately applied to them; but as Baxterianism included the articles of the Church of England, and the confessions of Dort and Savoy, their moderation was certainly limited. What they did not believe was the doctrine of absolute reprobation, held in the sense that persons were condemned irrespective of their character and faith. They did not believe that sinners were pardoned without repentance. They did not believe that the Savior so stood in the sinner's place that God ever looked upon him as a sinner. The last point was the point most vehemently debated in this controversy. The question was, Is there a change of persons, or only of person, in the redemption; and according as this was answered, and the sense in which the answer was understood, the controversialist was classed as an Arminian, or even Unitarian, on the one side, or as an Antinomian on the other. Mather went so far as to state that believers were as righteous as Christ himself, and the Congregational body supported Mather.”

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

present have under their control in England eleven training colleges, with a staff of twenty-six professors. These are,

Western CollegeDate of FormationNo. of Students Plymouth1752Rotherhalm College175616Brecon College176024Cheshunt College176832Airedale College,178439Bradford179635Hackney College180635Lancashire College183832Spring Hill, Birmingham185032New College, London186035Cavendish Theological22College, Manchester1861Cong. Institute, Nottingham50II. Doctrines. — '” In support of their scheme of Congregational churches, the Independents observe that the word ἐκκλησία, which we translate ‘church,' is always used in Scripture to signify either a single congregation, or the place where a single congregation meets. Thus that unlawful assembly at Ephesus, brought together against Paul by the craftsmen, is called ἐκκλησία, a church (Act 19:32; Act 19:39; Act 19:41). The word, however, is generally applied to a more sacred use, but still it signifies either the body assembling, or the place in which it assembles. The whole body of the disciples at Corinth is called the Church, and spoken of as coming together into one place (1Co 14:23). The place into which they came together we find likewise called a church: ‘When ye come together in the church-when ye come together into one place' (1Co 11:18; 1Co 11:20). Wherever there were more congregations than one, there were likewise more churches than one. Thus, ‘Let your women keep silence in the churches, ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (1Co 14:34).. The whole nation of Israel is indeed called a church, but it was no more than a single congregation, for it had but one place of public worship, namely, first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple.

The catholic Church of Christ, his holy nation and kingdom, is likewise a single congregation, having one place of worship, that is, heaven, where all the members assemble by faith and hold communion; and in which, when they shall all be fully gathered together, they will in fact be one glorious assembly.. Accordingly we find it called ‘the general assembly and church  of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.' Besides these, the Independent can find no other description of a church in the New Testament; not a trace of a diocese or presbytery consisting of several congregations, all subject to one jurisdiction. The number of disciples in Jerusalem was certainly great before they were dispersed by the persecution in which Paul bore so active a part. Yet they are never mentioned as forming distinct assemblies, but as one assembly, meeting with its elders in one place — sometimes in the Temple, sometimes in Solomon's porch, and sometimes in an upper room. After the dispension, the disciples who fled from Jerusalem, as they could no longer assemble in one place, are never called a Church by themselves,-or one church, but the churches of Judaea, Samaria, and Galilee (Act 9:31; Gal 1:22).

Hence the Independent concludes that in Jerusalem the words church and congregation were of the same import; and if such was the case there, where the Gospel was first preached, he thinks we may reasonably expect to find it so in other places. Thus, when Paul, on his journey, calls the elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, he speaks to them as the joint overseers of a single congregation: Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers' (Act 20:28). Had the Church at Ephesus consisted of different congregations, united under such a jurisdiction as that of a modern presbytery, it would have been natural to say, Take heed to yourselves, and to the flocks over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers;' but this is a way of speaking of which the Independent finds no in-stance in the whole of the New Testament. The sacred writers, when speaking of all the Christians in a nation or province, never call them the Church of such a nation or province, but ‘the churches of Galatia' (Gal 1:2), ‘the churches of Macedonia' (2Co 8:1), ‘the churches of Asia' (1Co 16:19). On the other hand, when speaking of the disciples in a city or town who might ordinarily assemble in one place, they uniformly call them a Church; as, ‘the Church of Antioch,' ‘the Church at Corinth,' ‘the Church of Ephesus,' and the like. “In each of these churches or congregations there were bishops, sometimes called ‘elders,' and deacons; and in every church there seems to have been more than one elder, and in some a great many, ‘who all labored in word and doctrine.'

Thus we read (Act 14:23) of Paul and Barnabas ordaining elders (to be bishops and deacons) in every church; and (Act 20:17) of a company of elders in the Church of Ephesus, who were exhorted to ‘feed the flock, and to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which  the Holy Ghost had made them overseers.' But of such elders as are found in modern Presbyterian churches, who neither teach nor are fit to teach, the Independent finds no vestige in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest uninspired writers of the Christian Church. The rule or government of this presbytery or eldership in a church is not their own, but Christ's. They are not lords over God's heritage, nor can they pretend to more power over the disciples than the apostles possessed. But when the administration of the apostles in the Church of Jerusalem and other churches where they acted as elders, is inquired into by an Independent, it does not appear to him that they did anything of common concern to the Church without the consent of the multitude; nay, it seems they thought it necessary to judge and determine in discipline, in presence of the whole Church (Act 6:1-6; Act 15:22; 1Co 5:3-5).

Excommunication and absolution were in the power of the Church at Corinth and not of the elders as distinguished from the congregation (1 Corinthians 5; 2 Corinthians 11). The apostle, indeed, speaks of his delivering some unto Satan (1Ti 1:20); but it is by no means clear that he did it by himself, and not after the manner pointed out in 1Co 5:4-5; even as it does not appear, from his saying, in one epistle, ‘that the gift was given unto Timothy by-putting on of his hands,' that this was not done in the presbytery of a Church, as in the other epistle we find it actually was the trying and judging of false apostles was a matter of the first importance but it was done by the elders with the flock at Ephesus (Rev 2:2; Act 20:28); and that whole flock did, in the days of Ignatius, all partake of the Lord's Supper, and pray together in one place. Even the power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Savior conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the Church. ‘If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between thee and him alone. If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother; but if he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established. And if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the Church; but if he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven,' etc. (Mat 18:15-35). It is not said, if he shall neglect to hear the one or two, tell it to the elders of the Church; far less can it be meant that the offended person shall tell the cause of his offence to all the disciples of a presbytery or diocese consisting of many congregations. But he is required to tell it to that particular Church or congregation to which they both  belong; and the sentence of that assembly, pronounced by its elders, is in a very solemn manner declared to be final, from which there lies no appeal to any jurisdiction on earth.

“With respect to the constituting of elders in any Church or congregation, the Independent reasons in the following manner: The officers of Christ's appointment were either ordinary and permanent in the Church, or they were extraordinary, and peculiar to the planting of Christianity. The extraordinary were those who were employed in laying the plan of the Gospel churches, and in publishing the New-Testament revelation. Such were the apostles, the chosen witnesses of our Savior's resurrection; such were the prophets, inspired by the Holy Ghost for explaining infallibly the Old Testament by the things written in the New; and such were the evangelists, the apostles' ministers. These can be succeeded by none in what was peculiar to them, because their work was completed by themselves. But they are succeeded in all that was not peculiar to them by bishops and deacons, the only two ordinary and permanent orders of ministers in the Church. We have already seen that it belongs to the office of a bishop to feed the flock of Christ. The only question to be settled, then, is, How men are ordinarily called to that office? for about the office of the deacon there is little or no dispute.

No man can now pretend to be so called of God to the ministry of the Word as were the apostles and other inspired elders, whom he chose to be the publishers of his revealed truth, and to whose mission he bore witness in an extraordinary manner. But what the apostles were to those who had the divine oracles from their mouths, that their writings are to us; and therefore, as no man can lawfully pretend to a call from God to make any addition to those writings, so neither can any man pretend to be lawfully called to the ministry of the Word already written, but in the manner which that word directs. Now there is nothing of which the New Testament speaks more clearly than of the characters of those who should exercise the office of bishop in the Church, and of the actual exercise of that office. The former are graphically drawn in the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and the latter is minutely described in Paul's discourse to the Ephesian elders, in Peter's exhortation to elders, and our Lord's commission to those ministers with whom he promised to be always present, even unto the end of the world. It is not competent for any man or body of men to add to or take from the description of a Gospel minister given in these places, so as to insist upon the necessity of any qualification which is not there mentioned, or to  dispense with any qualification as needless which is there required.

Neither has Jesus Christ, the only legislator to the Church, given to any ministers or people any power or right whatever to call, send, elect, or ordain to that office any person who is not qualified according to the description given in his law; nor has he given any power or right to reject the least of them who are so qualified, and who desire the office of a bishop or elder. Let a man have hands laid upon him by such as could prove an uninterrupted descent by imposition of hands from the apostles, let him be set apart to that office by a company of ministers themselves the most conformable to the Scripture character, and let him be chosen by the most holy people on earth, yet, if he answer not the New Testament description of a minister, he is not called of God to that office, and is no minister of Christ, but is indeed running unsent. No form of ordination can pretend to such clear foundation in the New Testament as the description of the persons who should be elders of the Church; and the laying on of hands is of small importance in the mission of a minister of Christ; for now, when the power of miracles has ceased, it is obvious that such a rite, by whomsoever performed, can convey no powers, whether ordinary or extraordinary.

Indeed, it appears to have been sometimes used, even in the apostolic age, without any such intention. When Paul and Barnabas were separated to the particular employment of going out to the Gentiles, the prophets and teachers at Antioch ‘prayed, and laid their hands on them.' But did this ceremony confer upon the apostles any new power or authority to act as ministers of Christ? Did the imposition of hands make those shining lights of the Gospel one whit better qualified than they were before to convert and baptize the nations, to feed the flock of God, to teach, rebuke, or exhort, with all longsuffering and patience? It cannot be pretended that there was any special virtue in this ceremony. Paul and Barnabas had undoubtedly received the Holy Ghost before they came to Antioch; and, as they were apostles, they were of course authorized to discharge all the functions of the inferiors and ordinary ministers of the Gospel. As in this instance, however, the imposition of hands appears to have been a mark of recognition of the parties as qualified for the work to which they were appointed, so Independents usually impose the hands of the bishops with the same intent. In a word, whoever in his life and conversation is conformable to the character which the inspired writers give of a bishop, and is likewise qualified by his ‘mightiness in the Scripture' to discharge the duties of that office, is fully authorized to administer the sacraments of baptism and the. Lord's Supper, to teach, and exhort, and rebuke, with all  long-suffering, and doctrine, and has all the call and mission which the Lord now gives to any man; while he who wants the qualifications mentioned has not God's call, whatever he may have, nor any authority to preach the Gospel of Christ, or to dispense the ordinances of his religion. From this view of the Independent principles, which is faithfully taken from their own writers, it appears that, according to them, even the election of a congregation confers upon the individual whom they may choose for their pastor no new powers, but only creates a new relation between him and a particular flock, giving him an exclusive right, either — by himself or in conjunction with other pastors constituted in the same manner, to exercise among them that authority which he derives immediately from Christ, and which, in a greater or less degree, is possessed by every sincere Christian according to his gifts and abilities” (Encyclop. Britannica, 12, 370-372).

III. Scottish, or New Independents. — In Scotland Independency originated with John Glas (q.v.). The Baptists there, as elsewhere, are Independents. The regular Congregationalists are also numerous. SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS.

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

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

“As to Church government, they believe that the apostolical churches, according to the model of which it is their great and professed object to conform, were entirely independent, none of them being subject to any foreign jurisdiction, but each one governed by its own rulers, and by no other laws than those written in the Word of God. They say that a true Church of Christ is a society formed for the same purpose as the churches planted by the apostles, and whose constitution is the same as theirs. A deviation in these particulars renders it unworthy of the name. According to them, when the word Church in Scripture, in its religious sense, does not denote a single congregation of saints, it always refers to the whole body or kingdom of Christ, part of which is in heaven and part on earth; which body does not constitute two churches, a visible and an invisible, but one church or family, consisting of different parts. They admit that all churches,  that is, congregations, are connected together as being Christ's subjects, but they insist that they are dependent only on their King, in whose hands the supreme authority rests. While they teach that independent churches have no authority over each other, they allow that they may receive the advantage of each other's opinion on any matter of importance. They conceive that bishop and elder were, in apostolic times, synonymous terms; that the stated officers in all the churches then were elders and deacons, and, of course, that they are the only offices essential to a Church of Christ, and that there is no difference, in any respect, between elder and deacon, except in the offices to which they are appointed. They insist that ordination is not represented in Scripture as conveying an office, or giving any person a right to discharge that office; it is only the manner of setting him apart to discharge the duties of his office. It gives him no jurisdiction in any church except in that which appointed him; and as soon as he lays down, or is removed from his office in that church, his ordination is at an end. They contend that there is a distinction of departments in the pastoral office, and that teaching and ruling arc different branches of that office. Both elders and deacons are ordained by imposition of hands; and though ordination is part of the elder's province, yet, when churches are newly formed or in other cases of necessity, they allow that the members, who have always the right of election, may ordain church officers for themselves, or, at least, set them apart to their respective offices.

“In worship, the New Independents do not differ much from other non- liturgical churches. They read a large but indefinite portion of the Scriptures at each meeting; in many of their chapels they use Dr. Watts's version of the Psalms; and in most of them they stand while singing. They adopt weekly communions; and, as they make no real distinction between clergy and laity, the want or absence of elders and deacons, on any occasion, in any of their chapels, is not thought a sufficient reason for preventing the administration of the Holy Communion on the first day of the week. They contend that, by the approved practice of apostolic churches, it is demonstrated to be the appointment of Christ that his churches must observe the Lord's Supper every first day of the week. A division has taken place among these Independents, chiefly in consequence of the adoption of Baptist principles, and the introduction of Church discipline, and of mutual exhortation and prayer by the brethren, into the public service on Sunday mornings.” The New Independents increased rapidly, and possessed, as early as the opening of our century, some 86  churches. There are at present some 114 churches in connection with the New Independents. See Haldane, View of Social Worship; Adams, Religious World, 3:260 sq.; Robinson, Theological Dictionary, s. V.; Kinniburgh, Historical Survey of Congregationalism in Scotland; and the articles SEE HALDANE; SEE CONGREGATIONALISTS. Some of the Scotch Independents have embraced the Morisonian doctrine. SEE MORISONIANS. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Fletcher, History of Independency (Lond. 1847, 4 vols. 12mo); Vaughan, Hist. of English Nonconformity (Lond. 1862); Neal, Hist. of the Puritans (see Index); Milner, Ch. Hist. 1, 444; Burnet, Hist. of his own Times (see Index); Punchard, History of Congregationalism, vol. 1, 2; Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, 1, 171 sq.; 2, 251, 546; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 653 sq.; Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Cyclopaedia Britannica, s.v.

## Index[[@Headword:Index]]

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

1. INDEX LIBRORUM PROHIBITORUM. —

1. Before the Reformation. — Prohibitions of heretical or dangerous books are as old as the attempts of the popes to usurp universal supremacy. In fact, such prohibitions flow naturally from the theory that “out of the Church there is no salvation.” It was Cyprian (q.v.) who first fully stated this theory; and even in his hands it logically led to the conclusion that all heretical opinions (i.e. such as differ from those announced by the Church authorities) must be punished and suppressed, if possible. As the claims of the hierarchy grew in magnitude, It became necessary to put down all doctrines that might diminish the power of the priesthood. To do this was a proof of zeal. This zeal was at first directed against heathen and Jewish writings, as it was feared that the reading of such might even endanger Christianity. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 400) forbade in Can. 16 the reading of heathen books.

The Church, however, did not remain satisfied with forbidding heretical books, it commanded them to be burned. This  was first attempted in connection with the writings of Arius, and became afterwards one of the practices of the Church. As heretical books, however, were sometimes published under ecclesiastical titles, such proceeding was in the 5th and 6th centuries declared by the Apostolic Canons (Can. 60) to be punishable by suppression of the work. The Synod of Elvira (813) decided in the same sense that all who circulated forbidden books should be anathema (libelli famosi). It even came to be held that any one who had read a forbidden book was guilty of all the heresies therein contained, and incapacitated for readmission into the Church until the performance of such penance as the Church enjoined. Especially did the hierarchy consider the reading of translations of the Bible as dangerous for the laity. Thus Gregory VII (1080) denounced the practice of reading the Bible in the vernacular in his letter to the King Wratislaw of Bohemia (in Mansi SS. Conciliorum nova et ampliss. Collectio, 20, 296). Innocent III it is true, said (see his Epistolarum libri 19, in lib. 1, ep. 141, p. 1199) that the searching of the Scripture is to be commended not forbidden; but added: “Tanta est divinge Scripturas profunditas ut non solum simplices et illiterati, sed etiam prudentes et docti non plene sufficiant ad ipsius intelligentiam indagandam. Unde recte fuit olim in lege divina statutum, ut bestia, qume montem tetigerit, lapidetur; ne videlicet simplex aliquis et indoctus proesumat ad sublimitatem Scripturse sacrse pertingere vel etiam aliis praedicare.” But the opposition to the papacy and to the Romish Church which immediately followed a more general reading of the Bible, soon led to placing the latter among the forbidden books, on a level with those condemned as heretical. The Concil. Tolosanum (1229) forbade the laity (c. 14) to even possess the O.T. or N.T. (see Hegelmaier, Gesch. des Bibelverbots, Ulm, 1783).

When the Inquisition became established and prosperous, the enforcing of the rules relating to forbidden books was entrusted to it, and in the Cone. Biterrense (1246) we find (c. 36) a number of theological works mentioned which both the laity and clergy are forbidden to read. But the more the Church strove to render its position secure by such means, the more did influences quite to the contrary exert themselves to secure its overthrow, particularly the precursors of the Reformation, whose doctrines and writings struck at the most vital parts of the Romish organization. A Synod of London (1408) forbade the reading of Wycliffe's works when not previously approved, while the works of Huss were condemned as thoroughly heretical. The discovery of the art of printing gave a new impulse to the publication of dangerous books, and Alexander VI complained in his Decretum de libris non sine censure:  imprimendis (Raynald, Annal. ad a. 1501, no. 36) that heretical dogmas were extensively promulgated, especially in the provinces of Mayence, Cologne, Trieste, and Magdeburg. He recommended the bishops and vicars to carefully watch the appearance of any heretical works, and to enforce the fines and excommunications against the authors. As to the printers, he says: “Debentipsi merito compesci opportunis remediis, ut ab eorum impressione desistant, que fidei catholicae contraria fore noscuntur vel adversa, ant in mentibus fidelium possunt verisimiliter scandalum generare.” Pope Leo X, in the tenth session of the Lateran Council (May 4, 1515), stated in the decree Inter sollicitudines that no book should be published without the authorization of either the bishop, his legate, or the Inquisition, under penalty of excommunication. Any book issued in contravention of this regulation was to be sequestered and burnt. ‘

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

1, those of whom all the works were absolutely condemned;

2, those among whose works some only were condemned;

3,. the authors of anonymous works, such as had appeared since 1519. At the end was appended a list of sixty-two printers of heretical works. The reading of books named in the Index was punishable by excommunication and by degrading penances.

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

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

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

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

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

(V.) Books of which heretics are the editors, but which contain little or nothing of their own, being mere compilations from others, as lexicons,  concordances (collections of), apothegms, or similes, indexes, and others of a similar kind, may be allowed by the bishops and inquisitors, after having made, with the advice of divines, such corrections and emendations as may be deemed requisite.

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

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

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

(IX.) All books and writings of geomancy, hydromancy, airomancy, pyromancy, onomancy, chiromancy, and necromancy, or which treat of sorceries, poisons, auguri auspices, or magical incantations, are utterly rejected. The bishops shall also diligently guard against any persons reading or keeping any books, treatises, or indexes which treat of judicial astrology, or contain presumptuous predictions of the events of  future contingencies and fortuitous occurrences, or of those actions which depend upon the will of man. But they shall permit such opinions and observations of natural things as are written in aid of navigation, agriculture, and medicine.

(X.) In the printing of books and other writings, the rules shall be observed which were ordained in the tenth session of the Council of Lateran, under Leo X. Therefore, if any book is to be printed in the city of Rome, it shall first be examined by the pope's vicar and the master of the sacred palace, or other persons chosen by our most holy father for that purpose. In other places, the examination of any book or manuscript intended to be printed shall be referred to the bishop, or some skilful person whom he shall nominate, and the inquisitor of the city or diocese in which the impression is executed, who shall gratuitously, and without delay, affix their approbation to the work, in their own handwriting subject, nevertheless, to the pains and censures contained in the said decree; this law and condition being added, that an authentic copy of the book to be printed, signed by the author himself, shall remain in the hands of the examiner: and it is the judgment of the fathers of the present deputation, that those persons who publish works in manuscript, before they have been examined and approved, should be subject to the same penalties as those who print them; and that those who read or possess them should be considered as the authors, if the real authors of such writings do not avow themselves.

The approbation given in writing shall be placed at the head of the books, whether printed or in manuscript, that they may appear to be duly authorized; and this examination and approbation, etc., shall be granted gratuitously. Moreover, in every city and diocese, the house or place where the art of printing is exercised, and also the shops of booksellers, shall be frequently visited by persons deputed by the bishop or his vicar, conjointly with the inquisitor, so that nothing that is prohibited may be printed, kept, or sold. Booksellers of every description shall keep a catalogue of the books which they have on sale, signed by the said deputies;. nor shall they keep, or sell, nor in any way dispose of any other books without permission from the deputies, under pain of forfeiting the books, and being liable to such other penalties as shall be judged proper by the bishop or inquisitor, who shall also punish the buyers, readers, or printers of such works.

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

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

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

The Congregation of the Index was originally established by pope Pius V. It holds its sittings at Rome, and has the right of examining generally all books which concern faith, morals, ecclesiastical discipline, or civil society; on which it passes judgment, for suppressing them absolutely, or directing them to be corrected, or allowing them to be read with precaution, and by certain persons. Persons specially deputed by it may give permission to Romanists throughout the world to read prohibited books; and the penalty denounced against those who read or keep any books suspected of heresy or false doctrine is the greater excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on any other account, besides the mortal sin committed, are to be severely punished at the will of the bishops. It is remarkable, however, that the Index is hardly in force at the present day, even in the most Romish-inclined countries. In Austria even, the faithful daughter of Rome, Maria Theresa forbade the publication, and it is not to be expected that either her liberal successors or the princes of other Roman Catholic countries, forced by the liberal spirit of the people to disobedient acts towards Rome, should permit the publication in their dominions. It can, therefore, hardly be said to be any longer virtually in force, though in some countries its publication is permitted by special grant from the government. Baudri, in an article on this subject in Aschbach (Kirchen-Lex. 3:444, a Roman Catholic work), concedes this, and says that even the countries bound by a concordat to an enforcement of the decisions of the Congregation of the Index fail to do their duty, and that books are  constantly published without regard and consideration of the agreement entered into with Rome (comp. Eckardt, Modern Russia, p.246 sq.). See Mendham, Literary Policy of the Church of Rome (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Cramp, Text-book of Popery (London, 1851, 8vo), p. 419-428; Elliott, Delineation of Popery, bk. i; Gibbings, Index Vaticanus, an exact Reprint of the Roman Index Expurgatorius (London, 1837, 8vo); Peignot, Dictionnaire critique litteraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condamnes aufeu, supprimes ou censures (Paris, 1806); Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6:651; Eadie, Ecclesiastical Encyclopedia, s.v.; Buckley, Canons and Decrees of Trent, p. 284. SEE BIBLE, USE OF; SEE CENSORSHIP OF BOOKS.

## India[[@Headword:India]]

             (Heb. Hoddu', הֹדּוּ, for הֹנְדּוּ, i.e. Hindu, of Sanscrit origin; see Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p. 366; Sept. Ι᾿νδική, Vulg. India), occurs in the Bible only in Est 1:1; Est 8:9, where the Persian king is described as reigning “from India unto Ethiopia, over a hundred and seven and twenty provinces;” the names of the two countries are similarly connected by Herodotus (Est 7:9). It is found again, however, in the Apocrypha (compare Esther 13:1), where India is mentioned among the countries which the Romans took from Antiochus and gave to Eumenes (1Ma 8:8). It is also with some reason conceived that in the list of foreign Jews present at the Pentecost (Act 2:9) we should read Ι᾿νδίαν, India, and not Ι᾿ουδαίαν, Judaea; but the still more probable reading is Ι᾿δουμαίαν, Idumaea, if indeed the common reading ought to be changed at all (see Kuinol, Conmment. ad loc.). The Hebrew form “Hoddu” is an abbreviation of Honadu, which is identical with the indigenous names of the river Indus, “Hindu,” or “Sindhu,” and again with the ancient name of the country as it appears in the Vendidad, “Hapta Hendu.” The native form “Sindus” is noticed by Pliny (vi, 23). The India of the book of Esther is not the peninsula of Hindostan, but the country surrounding the Indus--the Punjab, and perhaps Scinde — the India which Herodotus describes (3, 98) as forming part of the Persian empire under Darius, and the India which at a later period was conquered by Alexander the Great. The name occurs in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Nakhsh-Rustam, but not in those of Behistufn (Rawlinson, Herod. 2, 485). In 1Ma 8:8, it is clear that India proper cannot be understood, inasmuch as this never belonged either to Antiochus or Eumenes. At the same time, none of the explanations offered by commentators are  satisfactory: the Eneti of Paphlagonia have been suggested, but these people had disappeared long before (Strabo, 12:534): the India of Xenophon (Cyrop. 1, 5, 3; 3:2, 25), which may have been above the Carian stream named Indus (Pliny, 5, 29; probably the Calbis), is more likely; but the emendation “Mysia and Ionia” for ilfedia and India offers the best solution of the difficulty. SEE IONIA. A more authentic notice of the country occurs in 1Ma 6:37; where Indians are noticed as the drivers of the war-elephants introduced into the army of the Syrian king (see also 1Es 3:2; Esther 16:1). SEE ELEPHANT.

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

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

## India, Modern[[@Headword:India, Modern]]

             The name is sometimes used of the two peninsulas west and east of the Ganges combined, to which even occasionally the Indian Archipelago is added; but, more commonly, it is applied either to the peninsula west of the Ganges (East Indies), or to the aggregate possessions of the British crown (the Viceroyalty of India, or the Indian Empire). The present form of government of the Indian Empire is established by the Acts 21, 22 Victoria, cap. 106, called an Act for the better Government of India, sanctioned Aug. 2, 1858. By the terms of this act, all the territories heretofore under the government of the East India Company are vested in the queen; and all its powers are exercised in her name; all territorial and other revenues, and all tributes and other payments, are likewise received in her name, and disposed of for the purposes of the government of India  alone, subject to the provisions of this act. One of the queens principal secretaries of state, called the Secretary of State for India, is invested with all the powers hitherto exercised by the company or by the Board of Control. The executive authority in India is vested in a governor general or viceroy, appointed by the crown, and acting under the orders of the Secretary of State for India. The governor general has power to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, foreigners or others, within the Indian territories under the dominion of the queen, and for all servants of the government of India within the dominions of princes and states in alliance with the queen. The Secretary of State for India is aided in the administration by a council of fifteen members, of whom seven are elected by the Court of Directors from their own body, and eight are nominated by the crown. The duties of the council of state are, under the direction of the secretary of state, to conduct the business transacted in the United Kingdom in relation to the government of and the correspondence with India.

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

Presidencies and Provinces under the Administration ofPopulationArea in Sq. MilesGovernor-General of India:Ajmeer316,0322,661Berar2,231,56517,500Mysore5,055,41227,077Coorg168,3122,000Governor ofMadras31,672,613138,856Bombay13,835,073123,142Lieutenant-Governor ofBengal62,231,470156,200North-west Provinces42,001,436105,395Punjab17,611,4981044,975Chief commissioner ofCentral Provinces8,201,51984,048British Burmah2,747,14888,556Assam4,132,01955,384Total190,2044,097905,794

Feudatory States underPopulationArea in Sq. MilesGovernor-General of India28,748,403308,677Governor of Madras3,289,3929,815Governor of Bombay9,298,61267,370Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal2,212,90938,217Lieut.-Gov. of the N.W. Provinces907,0135,445Lieutenant Governor of Punjab5,410,389114,739Chief Comm. Of Central Provinces1,049,71029,749Total50,916,428574,012Total for British India241,120,5251,479,806There has never been a regular census of the whole of India under British administration, but enumerations, more or less trustworthy, were made in the north-western and in the central provinces in the years 1865 and 1866. The census of the north-west provinces, taken Jan. 10,1865, showed that this division of India had increased in prosperity within the decennial period 18561865, as reckoned by the number of houses and extension of cultivation. There were found to be 4.71 persons to a house or hut, and 7.06 to an enclosure, or family dwelling. The census further showed that there were 41 millions of Mussulmans in the north-west provinces, or about one seventh of the total population, the other six sevenths being Hindus of the four chief castes; namely, Brahmins, 70 subdivisions; Kshatryas, 175 subdivisions; Vaisyas, 65 subdivisions; Stidras, 230 subdivisions. The Sudras were found to form the great bulk of the Hindus, being 18,304,309 in number; the Vaisyas numbered 1,091,250; the Kshatryas, 2,827,768; and the Brahmins, 3,451,692. The census of the central provinces, taken in 1866, showed that their population consisted of 6,864,770 Hindus, 1,995,663 Gonds and aboriginal tribes, 237,962 Mussulmans, 6026 Europeans and Eurasians, and 90 Parsees. The number of Mussulmans was much lower than had been expected. All the enumerations showed a high proportion of children to adults. Thus, while the percentage of children under 12 years of age was 29 in England, it was in many parts of India as high as 55. Among the reasons to account for such a result are mentioned the custom of polygamy, and, in particular, the desire of the Hindus to have male issue, which induces them to marry as  many wives as they can afford to keep until a son is born. The religious statistics of the four largest cities were, according to the enumeration of 1881: Calcutta, total population, exclusive of Howrah, 684,658; of whom 62 percent were Hindus, 32.2 Mohammedans, 4.4 Christians. About 20,000 were Europeans, and 20,000 Eurasians. In Madras the population was 405,848. Bombay had a population of 773,196, of whom less than 13,000 were British born. Lichnow had a population of 284,779. There is also a considerable admixture of Parsees and Indo Europeans, or, as they are now usually styled, Eurasians, i.e. of mixed blood. Leaving out of account the native states, the following is given as the relative proportion of creeds and races in India: Hindus, 110,000,000; Mussulmans, 25,000,000; aborigines or non-Aryans, 12,000,000; Buddhists, 3,000,000; Asiatic Christians, 1,100,000. The English population amounted, according to the census of 1861, to 125,945 persons.

Christianity became known in India at an early period. There is an old tradition that one of the twelve apostles, St. Thomas, preached the Gospel to the people of India, but the tradition is not supported by any proofs. Cosmas Indicopleustes, who visited the country in the 6th century, found a large number of Christian congregations, with a bishop who was ordained in Persia. In consequence of this connection with Persia, the Christians of India, who, after the reputed founder of the Indian Church, were called Christians of St. Thomas, were drawn into the Nestorian movement, and subsequently received their bishop from the head of the Nestorian Church. Their territory extended from the southern point of the peninsula of Malabar as far as a few miles south of Calicut, and from the defiles of the Ghats as far as the sea. An Armenian or Syrian merchant, Thomas Canna, rearranged in the 9th century the ecclesiastical and political affairs of these Christians. Through his efforts they obtained from the kings of Malabar important privileges; in particular, an exempt jurisdiction in all except criminal cases. Their rank was equal to that of the nobility of Malabar, and they were in great demand for the armies of the Hindu princes. This finally induced them to attempt the establishment of a kingdom of their own, which was, however, of but short duration. After that their position was less favorable, and the Portuguese, who in 1498 landed, under Vasco de Gama, in the port of Calicut, were consequently regarded by them as their liberators. The first Portuguese missionaries were Franciscan monks, who were introduced in 1500 by Cabral. Dominican monks landed in 1503 with the two Albuquerques, but they confined themselves to a few convents,  while the Franciscans were for about forty years the only Christian missionaries. It was, in particular, P. Antonio de Porto who in 1535 established on the island of Salsette a number of colleges, churches, and convents. In 1534 the first Roman Catholic bishopric for India was established at Goa; the first bishop, Albuquerque, was a Franciscan monk. But, although the convents of the Franciscans were so numerous that they constituted two provinces of the order, they soon ceased to make notable efforts for the propagation of Christianity, leaving the missionary field wholly to the new order of the Jesuits, who made their first appearance in India in 1542.

Their number increased very rapidly, and soon they had in all the Portuguese colonies of India houses and colleges, which were divided into the two provinces of Goa and Cochin. Their success at first was very slow, but when the Portuguese viceroy Constantine de Bragama banished some of the most prominent Brahmans, the Jesuits in 1560 succeeded in baptizing nearly 13,000 persons in that city. In 1579 several Jesuits were called to the court of the great mogul, Akbar, who for a time showed an inclination to accept Christianity. Subsequently, however, he conceived the plan of founding a new religion himself, and the Jesuit mission, which at first promised grand results, was confined to the establishment of a few congregations in the empire of the great mogul. The Jesuits were more successful in their endeavors to unite the Christians of St. Thomas with the Roman Catholic Church. This union was accomplished in 1599, at the Synod of Dramper, by the archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menezes. The bishopric of Goa had in 1557 been made an archbishopric, with two suffragan sees at Cochin and Malacca, to which, in 1606, Meliapur was added. The Christians of St. Thomas received, in 1601, an episcopal see at Angamala, which in 1601 was raised to the archbishopric of Cranganor. The right of patronage over the ecclesiastical benefices was left to the king of Portugal, as he had to defray most of the expenses for the support of the churches and missionaries. A new impulse was given to the missions when, in 1606, the Jesuit P. Robert de Nobili, at Madura, conceived the novel plan of introducing Christianity by accommodating his mode of life entirely to the Indian customs.

He called himself a Roman sannyasi (i.e. one who resigns everything), lived after the manner of the Brahmans, clothed his preaching of the Gospel in Indian figures of speech, and even retained among the new converts the difference of caste, allowing the converts to wear certain badges indicative of their caste. But he encountered a strong opposition, even among the members of his order, and a violent controversy began, which, after thirteen years, was decided by pope  Gregory XV in favor of P. de Nobili, and the converts were permitted to wear the badges. After this the Roman Catholic Church made numerous converts. According to statements of the Indian Christians, P. de Nobili is said to have baptized about 100,000 persons belonging to all castes. The separation was carried through even with regard to churches and missionaries; the missionaries of the Brahmans being called Sannyasi, those of the Pariahs, Pandarams. The successors of Nobili, who were supported by the French missionaries of Pondicherv, enlarged the missions and developed the system, but became consequently involved in new controversies, especially with the Capuchins (controversy of accommodation), which in 1704, by cardinal Tournon, who had been commissioned to examine the subject, and again by pope Benedict XIV in 1744, by the bull “Onnium sollicitudinum,” was decided against the Jesuits. These decisions not only put an end to the conversions, but the majority of the Indians who had been gained by the accommodation theories of the Jesuits again returned to their native religion. The suppression of the order of the Jesuits still more injured the Roman Catholic missions, which, moreover, suffered severely from the wars of Tippf Sahib. Long before this time the Jesuits had lost their missions among the Christians of St. Thomas, who in 1653 left the communion of Rome, and those in the vicinity of Cochin, as the Dutch from 1660 to 1663 had conquered nearly all the Portuguese possessions on the coast of Malabar.

The Christians of St. Thomas were, however, a second time prevailed upon to unite with Rome by Italian Carmelites; and in 1698, through the mediation of the emperor Leopold I, one bishop and twelve missionaries of this order received permission to settle on the coast of Malabar. But this protection afforded to the Italian missionaries led to a serious quarrel between the Portuguese government, bishop, and missionaries and the Italians, as Portugal declined to forego its right of patronage, although it was neither able nor willing to exercise it. In 1838, Gregory XVI, by the bull “Mallta praeclare,” abolished the former papal constitutions for the Church of India, and assigned to the several vicars apostolic their dioceses. The sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Meliapur (St. Thomas) were suppressed. The diocese of Meliapur was transferred to the vicariate apostolic of Madras; the territory of the two other bishoprics to the vicariate of Malabar, which had been erected in 1659 for the Incalceate Carmelites, and the see of which is now at Verapoly. To it were also assigned the United Christians of St. Thomas, a population of about 200,000, with 330 priests and 160 ministers. The Portuguese of Goa now  tried to make a schism. The archbishop of Goa, Jose da Silva y Torres, who had been consecrated in 1843, ordained, immediately after his arrival in Goa in 1844, no less than 800 priests, chiefly men without any education, and sent them into the territories of the vicars apostolic. They succeeded in obtaining control of a majority of the churches, and jurisdiction over a population of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect. In i848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishop from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicars apostolic, denounced the latter, defied the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 536 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained of the attitude of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio was on the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846 namely, Mysore, Coimbatfr, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1836 had reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizigapatam was established in 1848 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.

Protestant missions began at the commencement of the 18th century, when the Lutheran missionary Ziegenbaly was sent to the Danish coast of Tranquebar. Amidst the greatest difficulties which the foreign languages and the officers of the colony placed in his why, he founded schools, translated the Bible and the Catechism into the Tamil language, collected a congregation which rapidly increased, and laid the foundation of the Evangelical Church of India. A large portion of the councils either belonged to the lowest castes or were pariahs. In the course of the 18th century, the missionary work was carried on by the Missionary Society of Halle; at first with great zeal, which, however, gradually slackened under the influence of Rationalism. The last great missionary who was sent out from Halle was the apostolical Fr. Schwarz (q.v.), the results of whose  work can still be traced. Gradually the Halle Society leaned on the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which at last took entire charge of these missions. With regard to the differences of castes, the first missionaries had been earnestly opposed to their continuance in the Christian churches; but this policy was subsequently changed, and the differences permitted to remain, on the ground that they were merely of a social character. In 1841 the Lutheran Missionary Society of Dresden began to gather up again the scattered remnants of the old missionary societies in Tranquebar, but in the prosecution of the work became involved in many difficulties with the other missionary societies which had taken charge of the Halle missions.

This society is the only one among the missionary societies now laboring in India which undertakes to vindicate the social, though not the religious standing, of the caste. The recent mission in India begins with the arrival of the Baptist missionary, W. Carey, at Calcutta (Nov. 1793). He encountered from the start the formidable and entirely unexpected opposition of the East India Company, which hoped for larger commercial profits if it spared the religious belief and practice of the Hindus and Mohammedans, and therefore not only discouraged the establishment of Christian missions, but supported and defended the religious institutions of the native religions. The few chaplains who were sent out to attend the spiritual needs of the English in India were like the European residents in general, drunkards, servants of the mammon, and worldlings; when, therefore, the Rev. Henry Martyn, one of the most zealous missionaries of that time, arrived in 1806 in Calcutta, and endeavored to kindle a missionary spirit, he provoked thereby such a storm of indignation that he had to confine himself for some time to the reading of the homilies of the Church of England. When Carey landed in India, permission was refused to him to stay within the territory of the British dominions, and he was compelled to seek refuge in the small Danish possession of Serampoor (a few miles from Calcutta).

Here he was hospitably received by the governor, who himself was a pupil of Schwarz, and under his auspices he began the Baptist mission, which has become of so great importance for all India. Carey, who himself had mastered more than thirty Oriental languages, and the missionaries Marshman and Ward, caused the translation of the Bible into more than twenty languages of India, the compilation of grammars, dictionaries, school-books, and many learned works on the history, religions, and customs of India, new editions of the chief works of the native literatures, and thus, even where they did not succeed in forming new congregations, they smoothed the way for  subsequent missionary labors. In 1803, the indefatigable Carey, who in 1800 had been appointed professor of Sanskrit and other Oriental languages at Fort William (Calcutta), was allowed to begin a mission in Calcutta, which was at first intended only for English, Portuguese, and Armenian Christians, but was soon joined by several converted Hindus and Mohammedans. Soon a converted Hindu, Krishna, appeared in public as a preacher, and by his impressive sermons organized the first native congregation in Bengal. This success of the Baptist mission encouraged a number of the chaplains of the government to labor for the removal of the obstacles which the East India Company placed in the way of Christianity. David Brown, Henry Martyn, Thomas Thomason, Daniel Corrie, and Claudius Buchanan, and many others, distinguished themselves by establishing schools and seminaries, by literary labors, by appointing native preachers and teachers, and, in general, by their great zeal on the missionary field.

The translation of the Bible by H. Martyn, and the labors of the Mohammedan Abdul Messih, who was converted by him, were especially productive of great results. But more than all his predecessors, it was the Rev. CL. Buchanan who succeeded in overcoming those hindrances which had prevented the free propagation of Christianity throughout India. After having traveled through a large portion of the country, and acquired a minute knowledge of the people, he returned in 1807 to England, and by a number of works endeavored to gain public opinion for a radical change in the administration of India. His writings produced a great effect, and when, in 1813, the charter of the East India Company was renewed, the English Parliament passed resolutions which granted to all British subjects the right to establish schools and minions in India, and compelled the company to provide itself schools and seminaries for the instruction of the natives. This was followed by a number of other reforms, as the prohibition of burning of widows (1829), and of a further payment of temple and pilgrim taxes (1833 and 1840), and the admission of native Christians to the lower offices of administration. Full liberty for missionary operations was finally given in 1833, when a resolution of the British Parliament allowed all foreigners to settle in British India. and thus opened the field to all non-British missionary societies of the world.

The first bishopric of the English Church in India was established at Calcutta in 1814. The first bishop, Dr. Middleton, a rigid High-Churchman, was more noted for his quarrels with the ministers of other denominations than for missionary zeal. His successor, Heber (q.v.), on the contrary,  though likewise a High-Churchman, was indefatigable in his devotion to the missionary cause, and sternly opposed the toleration of caste differences among the converts. His work was continued in the same way by his successor, Wilson (died 1858). In 1835 other bishoprics were established at Bombay and Madras, and the bishop of Calcutta received the title of Metropolitan of India.

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

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

The Church Missionary Society has in Madras large Tamil congregations, served by native pastors. It has also a mission to the Mohammedan population of that city. In 1820 Tinnevelly was entered by the society, and now there are more than 1000 villages in which there are Christians. Successful work is done in Travancore, Cochin, and among the Pelegus. There are 88,000 Christians in all of South India.. North India is also a field  of the society. Divinity colleges are supported at Calcutta and Allahabad. A medical mission: was started in the valley of the Kashmir in 1865, which is very successful. A divinity school was started at Poona, in Western India, in 1886. Ceylon, as the result of the society's work, has 6508 adherents; Trinity College, at Kandy, and important schools at Cotta and Jaffra. It has 92 stations, with 6548 members. It is now more liberal than formerly in regard to India, and is entering upon all kinds of aggressive work. Among the latest is a medical mission. Its work is now in a critical condition, owing to the great number professing conversion. Many of the churches and schools are self-supporting, and are themselves animated by a missionary spirit. This district is in juxtaposition with: the South Travancore missions of the London Society, and with the Tinnevelly missions of the Propagation Society. Add the converts reported by these, and the 6000 of the American Board, and we have 8000 Tamil Christians within 150 miles of Cape Comorin. The Wesleyan Missionary Society devotes but a twelfth of its income to the Indian missions, which are, of course, among its smallest. It has stations at Madras and six other points in the Tamil country, seven or eight stations in the Canenere districts, 465 Church members in all, 5 native ministers, besides several candidates, and 3500 pupils in the schools.

The following are extracts from the late (1888) re-ports of some of the American societies. The American Board-has the Marathi Mission, established in 1813, the Madtlra, established in 1834, and the Ceylon, established in 1816. The Marathi Mission has 7 stations, 102 outstations, 12 preachers, 2 medical catechists, and with Bible readers and teachers, 255 native helpers.' The native contributions amounted to $4779. The Theological Seminary, suspended in 1866, was reopened in. 1888. There is a mission high-school and college at Admednagar, which had 311 pupils in 1887. The Madura Mission has 12 stations, 234 out-stations, 3233 church members, 11,881 adherents, 10 missionaries, 20 native pastors, 399 native workers of all classes, 13 common schools, with 3215 pupils, a collegiate theological institute, with 334 pupils; in all the mission 5680 pupils. A new feature is the employment of native evangelists by the native churches themselves for the outlying districts. The native contributions amounted to $6545. The Ceylon Mission has 7 stations, with 25 out-stations, 389 members, 8455 under instruction. Native contributions, $5752. This mission has had a wonderful educational work; the report claims that one in thirteen of the population are in school. Nearly all of the schools are  managed by the missionaries; 329 have been educated at Jaffra College. The Presbyterian Church sustains the Lodiana and Furrukhabad Mission, with 17 stations, 28 American and 11 native missionaries, 30 American and 120 native teachers, 456 communicants, and 6194 scholars in the schools. Out-stations are increasing in numbers. Tours into different districts have been made as in former years. Various melas have been attended, among which was Hardwar. The number of people present at this place, according to government officials, was almost 3,000,000. For days some twenty preachers, native and foreign, preached to many thousands. Frequently many remained after the service to discuss some of the points set forth in the discourse. Cases of self-torture were fewer than usual. “The more revolting rites of Hindiism are evidently becoming obsolete.” At this festival the brethren were ‘particularly struck with the marked increase in the knowledge of Christianity manifested by the pilgrims.” The Sabbath- school and prayer meeting are established at most of the stations, and in the Lodiana Mission the native Christians have contributed for religious and charitable objects during the year, 670 rupees. Nearly 11,000,000 pages of publications of various kinds have been issued. A “medical mission” is connected with these missions, at which 1311 patients have been treated.:

The (Dutch) Reformed Church has the Arcot Mission, organized in 1854. The mission occupies North and South Arcot, the united area of which is 19,925 square miles, with a population of 3,770,192; churches, 23; out- stations, 86; communicants, 1755; contributions of the native churches, $756 50. Besides the boarding schools for girls at Vellore and Madavaalle, with 98 pupils, there are 8 caste girls' schools, with 586 scholars. The school formerly known as the Arcot Seminary will hereafter be called the Arcot Academy. It had 71 pupils in 1887. The Theological Seminary in the Arcot Mission, for which an endowment of $65,000 has been secured by Dr. Chamberlain, was opened in March, 1888, with 13 students. It has 7 scholarships provided by churches, and 9 provided by individuals. In addition to the regular services at-stations and out-stations, the Gospel was preached during the year 1888 in 8978 places, to heathen audiences numbering 395,979; more than 14,000 tracts, books, etc., were distributed. In the hospital and dispensary at Arcot 5883 outpatients, and 475 in- patients were treated. The Rev. Dr. Scudder notes the change that has taken place in the attitude of the natives in the following terms: “As to the results, I have to mention that the temper of the people has been greatly  mollified. This is, perhaps, one of the most wicked districts in Southern India. Its inhabitants used to hear the preached Word with souls full of rage — rage gleaming in their eyes and disfiguring their countenances. It does seem to us that there has been a marked change within the year. Earnest, anxious, sometimes longing looks are cast upon us now as we repeat the sweet story of the cross. Tracts, Gospel portions, the smallest leaves, are eagerly received, where formerly volumes, or books of poetry, or English publications were sought for. There are now no refusals, where before friendly offers were fairly spurned. There are quiet, calm inquiries, where before were angry oppositions, or worse, sullen silence.”

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

“It is easy to see,” says Bishop Kingsley, in a letter to the Christian Advocate and Journal, ‘that both Hindu idolatry and Mohammedanism are losing their hold on the minds of those who still show them an outward deference. I have talked with intelligent Hindus with the red paint on their foreheads, indicating that they had faithfully attended to their religious rites, who nevertheless told me they had no faith in these mummeries, and felt the heathen yoke that was upon them an intolerable burden; deploring caste, and mourning over the degraded condition of their women. They will do utter violence to their doctrine of caste when it can be done without exposure. Mohammedans have made similar confessions to me, saying they felt at liberty, so far as any conscientious scruples were concerned, to violate the requirements of that religion. Besides all this, there seems to be a sort of foreboding in regard to many particulars that their ancient religion is about worn out. One is, that after about thirty years more the Sacred Ganges will lose its virtue.  In 1868 the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church in British, Portuguese, and French India were as follows:

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

## India, Mythology Of[[@Headword:India, Mythology Of]]

             SEE HINDUISM.

## Indian Caste[[@Headword:Indian Caste]]

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Brahmans,

(2) Kshattriyas,

(3) Vaishyas, and

(4) Sudra; below which is a yet more debased class,

(5) known as Pariahs, or outcasts, to be found in all portions of the country.

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

3. Rules. — These castes are all hereditary, the son always following the occupation of the father, however overburdened some departments of occupation may become by the accidents of birth. No classes except the highest two are assumed to intermarry, and all eschew contact with a lower class. They do not eat together, nor cook for nor serve food to each other. This dislike of contact extends to their vessels and other utensils. The usages, however, seem often arbitrary. Smoking from the bowl of another's pipe may not be an offence if one can make a stem of his fist, but the stem or snake of the pipe must not be touched, or it is rendered worthless to all parties. It is in accordance with caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be transported to another locality. Loads may be carried on the head by some castes, on  the back by some, and not at all by others. The poorest Hindu family do not wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touched by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

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

4. Effects. — The caste policy of India checks genius, yet as from the first the individual knows what his life business is to be, he pursues it, and attains a skill in handicraft unequalled. The Indian system tends likewise to give permanence to institutions, but it unfortunately perpetuates evils also. It has been the great hindrance to all progress, civil; political, religious, or, social, and has presented the greatest obstacles to the progress of Christianity. The railroads and other European conveniences have by some been looked upon as likely to make great innovations on caste-usage. There is already a large and well-organized portion of the population known as Brahmists who wholly ignore castes. SEE HINDUS, MODERN.

There is much less of caste observance among what is considered to be an older population than the Hindu, such as the people inhabiting the Himalaya Mountains, and the “wild tribes” of Central India. See Muir's Sanskrit Texts, vol. 1 (Loud. 1868); Colebrook's Miscellaneous Essays; Wilson's Transl. Vishnu Purana; Muller, Chips, 2, 295 sq. (J. T. G.)

## Indians, American[[@Headword:Indians, American]]

             Under this title may be included all the semi-civilized and wild tribes of North and South America, since the most thorough investigation shows that they were substantially the same people. In collating information concerning the Indian thought, it is important to distinguish between the forms it assumed before and after contact with Europeans.  1. Sources of Knowledge. — Notwithstanding the proverbial taciturnity of the North-American Indians, some information has been elicited by oral communication. Many of the tribes, also, have a species of records for their traditions. In some instances these seem to be little more than mnemonic signs, made on their skins, tents, clothing, mats, and rocks; but in others, as in Mexico, we find a series of symbols which are a species of idiographic writing, wherein signs stand for ideas, as the Arabic numerals do with us. Besides these there must have existed in some localities a phonetic alphabet prior to the coming of the white man. The only one known, however, is found with the Mayas, resident in the peninsula of Yucatan. It had “a well- understood alphabet of twenty-seven elementary sounds, the letters of which are totally different from those of any other nation, and evidently original with themselves.”

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

1. The monosyllabic character of their languages; and,

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

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

4. Religious beliefs. — It is generally believed that all approximations to monotheism observed among the tribes of the New World are little more than verbal. Their “Great Spirit,” as the phrase stands among Europeans, is at best the highest member of a group of spirits. He may be a personification of the mightiest of all natural energies, but not a personality distinct from nature, and controlling all things by his sovereign will. He is devoid of almost everything which constitutes the glory of the God of revelation. In spite of whatever grandeur, goodness, or ubiquity he may be endowed with, he exercises no control over the lives of individuals or the government of the world. “There is no attempt,” says Mr. Schoolcraft, ‘by the hunter-priesthood, jugglers, or powwows, which can be gathered from  their oral tradition, to impute to the great, merciful Spirit the attribute of justice, or to make man accountable to him here or hereafter for aberrations from virtue, good-will, truth, or any moral right” (Red Races).

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

The Manito or Manedo is alleged to have no personal meaning, but to be equivalent to “spirit,” or “a spirit,” perhaps somewhat akin to our thought of a guardian spirit. Schoolcraft thinks that, so far as a meaning distinct from an invisible existence attaches to it at all, the tendency is to a bad meaning, and that a bad meaning is distinctly conveyed in the inflection osh or ish (Red Races, p. 214). In considering this belief in manitos it is necessary to remember that the Indian conceives every department of the universe to be filled with invisible spirits, holding the same relation to  matter that the soul does to the body, and in accordance with which, not only every man, but every animal, has a soul, and is endowed with a reasoning faculty. Dreams are a means of direct communication with the spiritual world, and are generally regarded as the friendly warnings of their personal manitos. No labor or enterprise is undertaken against their indications, whole armies being sometimes turned back by dreams of the officiating priest. Under the guidance of a particular spirit, names are commonly supposed to be bestowed. These personal spirits are invoked to give success in hunting. These manitos are, however, of varied ability, and there is a constant fear lest the manito of a neighbor may prove more powerful than one's own.

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

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

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

Among all the tribes soul is equivalent to breath, or the wind. The same person may have more than one soul; some say four, and others even more than this number. Generally, however, there is some distinction made in these souls. One may remain with the body, being attached to its earthly functions, and is absorbed in the elements, while another soul may pass  away to the “Happy Hunting-grounds;” or, in other cases, one may watch the body, one wander about the world, one hover about the village, and another go to the spirit land. According to an author quoted by Mr. Brinton, certain Oregon tribes located a spirit “‘whenever they could detect a pulsation,” the supreme one being in the heart and which alone would go to the skies at death.

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

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

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

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

7. Religious Usages. — The Indians are alleged by Domenech to have had a few customs not wholly unlike some which obtained among the Jews. They have some feasts at which they are obliged to eat all that has been prepared for the banquet. They observe a feast of first fruits, and have  some forbidden meats, regarding some animals as impure. They observe the custom of sacrificing the first animal killed on the opening of great hunts, the animal being entirely eaten. They carry amulets under the name of medicine-bags, and accord a subordinate species of worship to idols of stone, wood, or baked clay. The amulets, lucky stones, and charms existed everywhere, and were a chief object of barter. In Yucatan and Peru pilgrimages to sacred shrines were so common as that, in some instances, “roads paved with cut stones” were constructed to facilitate the attendance on certain temples, and houses of entertainment constructed along the way.

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

8. Present Location and Numbers. — The large proportion of the Indians of the United States are now gathered within the Indian Territory, on  “Reservations” assigned them by the United-States government. There are others, however, in Oregon, Alaska, New Mexico, etc. Within the Indian Territory they do not “live by fishing, hunting, and trapping, but cultivate the soil, are settled, and have attained a considerable degree and shown a susceptibility of genuine civilization.”

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

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

## Indictio Paschalis[[@Headword:Indictio Paschalis]]

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

## Indictio Pestorum Mobilium[[@Headword:Indictio Pestorum Mobilium]]

             SEE INDICTIO PASCHALIS.

## Indiction[[@Headword:Indiction]]

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

(1) the Caesarean, used long in France and Germany, beginning on Sept. 24;

(2) the Constantinopolitan, used in the East from the time of Anastasius, and beginning Sept. 1; and

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

## Indifference, Liberty of[[@Headword:Indifference, Liberty of]]

             a name sometimes given, by metaphysical and theological writers, to the power in the human mind of choosing between opposing motives, or of resisting or yielding to a given motive. The upholders of fatalism consider this “liberty of indifference” as a chimera. If we were  indifferent, say they, to the motives which determine our actions, we should either not act at all, or we should act without motive, at hazard, and our actions would be effects without cause. But this is intentionally confounding indifference and insensibility. — We are necessarily sensible to a motive when that motive induces us to act, but the question at issue is whether there is a necessary connection between such a motive and such volition; that is, whether, when such a motive induces us to will anything, we can or cannot will the contrary in spite of that motive, or whether we cannot prefer another motive to that by which we determine to act. As soon as it is supposed that we act from a motive, it cannot be supposed that this motive does not determine us to act, for the two suppositions would contradict each- other: but it may be asked whether, before any supposition, our will was connected with the motive in such a manner as to render a contrary volition impossible. The advocates of moral liberty maintain that there is no physical or necessary connection between motives and volition, but only a moral connection, which does not prevent our resisting; in other words, that motives are the moral, not the physical causes of our actions. Because we are said to be determined by a motive, it does not follow that that motive acts, and we remain passive; it is absurd to suppose that an active faculty like volition could become passive under the influence of a motive, or that this motive, which after all is but an idea, a thought, could act upon us as we act upon a body we put in motion.

This metaphysical question is intimately connected with another long discussed by theologians, namely, the mode of action of grace on us, and in what sense grace is to be understood as being the cause of our actions. Those who consider it as their physical cause must, to be consistent, suppose the same relation between grace and the action to which it led as between any physical cause and its effect. As, according to natural philosophy, the relation in the latter case is a necessary one, we cannot perceive how the action produced under the influence of grace can be free. For this reason, other theologians look upon grace only as the moral cause of our actions, and admit between this cause and its effects only a moral connection, such as exists between all free action and its motive. It is, indeed, God who acts in us through grace, but his operation is so similar to that of nature that we are often unable to distinguish between them. When we perform a good action under the influence of grace-a supernatural motive-we feel as active, as free, as well masters of our actions as when doing it from a  natural motive, from temperament or interest. Why should we try to believe that God deceives our consciousness, acting upon us as though he left us free, while in reality he does not? Consciousness testifies to us that we can resist grace as readily as we resist our natural tastes and inclinations. Thus the testimony of conscience, that we are entirely free under the influence of grace, is complete. Let us not forget the saying of St. Augustine, that grace was given us, not to destroy, but to restore our free agency. The Pelagians erred in defining free agency to be indifference towards good and evil; they understood by this an equal inclination to either, an equal facility for choosing right or wrong (St. Augustine, Op. imp. l. 3, n. 109, 110, 117; Letter of S. Prosper, n. 4). They concluded from this that if grace destroyed this indifference, it would thereby destroy free agency. St. Augustine correctly affirms, in opposition, that in consequence of Adam's sin man is more inclined to evil than to good, and that he needs grace to restore the equilibrium. Those who accused St. Augustine of disregarding free will in maintaining the necessity of grace, misunderstood his doctrine as much as the Pelagians. Bergier, Dict. de Theologie, 3, 394 sq. (Comp. Barrow, Works, 2, 47; Palmer, Church of Christ, 1, 252-58, 321 sq.) SEE WILL.

## Indifferent things[[@Headword:Indifferent things]]

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

## Indifferentism[[@Headword:Indifferentism]]

             (indifferentismus), a word much used

I. By the theologians of Germany to denote

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

(2.) that state of mind which, carelessly admitting the truth of Christianity, holds that all discussion as to its doctrines is unimportant. An astonishing number of books have been written upon this subject. See Buddeus, Institut. Theol. Dogmat. p. 60; Bretschneider, Systen. Entwickelung, p. 13; Schubert, Institt. Theol. Polemn. 1, 569; Sack, Christliche Polemik, p. 65; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 657; and a full list of books on the subject in Danz, Universal- Worterbuch. p. 449 sq. SEE INTOLERANCE; SEE LATITUDINARIANISM; SEE TOLERATION.  II. The term is used also to denote that form of infidelity, or semi- infidelity, which holds that man is not responsible for his beliefs. “Gibbon, speaking of the paganism of ancient Rome, says, The various modes of worship which prevailed in the Roman world were all considered by the people as equally true, by the philosopher as equally false, and by the magistrate as equally useful.' The comment of some one is, ‘After eighteen centuries of the Gospel, we seem unhappily to be coming back to the same point.' A very weakened sense of responsibility, or an actual denial of it, lies at the bottom of that indifferentism which is so extensively prevalent in the present age. On the Continent, especially in Germany and France, not only are opinions destructive of the sense of responsibility widely diffused among the masses, but in the case of vast multitudes, who would not wish to be counted the foes of Christianity, there is an utter absence of anything like the religious obligation of belief. There is also a great deal of this kind of infidelity in England and America.

It is stated, or implied, in much of our current popular literature, that a man's creed does not depend upon himself. This dogma pervades the writings of Mr. Emerson. Napoleon, one of his ‘representative men,' of whom he tells ‘horrible anecdotes,' must not, in his view,' be set down as cruel, but only as one who knew no impediment to his will.' He depicts him as an exorbitant egotist, who narrowed, impoverished, and absorbed the power and existence of those who served him; and concludes by saying, ‘it was not Bonaparte's fault.' He thus condemns and acquits in the same breath, sends forth from the same fountain sweet water and bitter. Mr. Theodore Parker makes each- form of religion that has figured in the history of the world ‘natural and indispensable.' ‘It could not have been but as it was.' And, therefore, he finds truth, or the ‘absolute religion,' in all forms; ‘all tending towards one great and beautiful end' (Discourse of Religion, p. 81). Of course, the idea of the religious obligation of belief resting upon the individual conscience is here quite out of question. Mr. F. W. Newman, who is so fond of parting off things that most men connect together, would persuade us that there may be a true faith without a true belief, as if the emotional part of our nature was independent of the intellectual. ‘Belief,' says he, ‘is one thing, and faith another.' And he complains of those who, on religious grounds, are alienated from him because he has adopted ‘intellectual conclusions' different from theirs' the difference between them and him' turning merely ‘on questions of learning, history, criticism, and abstract thought' (Phases of Faith, Preface). The philosophy is as bad here as the theology. In the view of common sense and Scripture, a living faith is as the doctrine  believed. But Mr. Newman, in common with Mr. Parker and others, can lay down his offensive weapons when he wills, and take up a position on the low ground of indifference as to religious belief. Then, creeds become matters of mere moonshine, and responsibility is regarded as a fiction invented by priests. This is part of the bad theology of Mr. Bailey's ‘Festus.' The hero of the poem is made to say,

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

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

## Indigetes[[@Headword:Indigetes]]

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

## Indignation[[@Headword:Indignation]]

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

## Indix Raymi[[@Headword:Indix Raymi]]

             in Peruvian mythology, is the principal one of the four known festivals of the sun, celebrated yearly in honor of the supreme deity in the Andes. It began when the sun was at its height, and moved towards the equatorial region. At the first ray of the sun all fell on their knees and worshipped the benevolent god. After this festival eight days were spent in unbroken pleasure.

## Indo-Portuguese Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Indo-Portuguese Version Of The Scriptures]]

             Indo-Portuguese is a dialect spoken by the Portuguese settlers and their descendants in Ceylon and various parts of the Indian seas. A translation of a part of the Scripture into this dialect dates back to the year 1817, when the Wesleyan missionary, Newstead, stationed at Negombo, in Ceylon, commenced a translation of the New Test. for the benefit of this people, which was printed at London in 1826. A second edition appeared at Colombo in 1831, and the Pentateuch and Psalms were printed in 1833. A revised edition of the New Test. was published in 1853. (B.P.)

## Indra[[@Headword:Indra]]

             one of the Hindu deities of the Vedic period of the Hindu religion, who also enjoyed a great legendary popularity in the Epic and Puranic periods. SEE HINDUISM. He is, so to speak, the Hindi Jupiter. He is quite frequently styled “Lord of heaven” (divaspati diespiter). The name itself is of doubtful origin, meaning either (1) “blue” (as epithet of the firmament), or (2) “the illuminator,” or (3) “the giver of rain'” (compare Wuttke, Gesch. des leidenthuesss, 2, 242). Max Muller (Science of Language: 2nd series, p. 449) says the name “admits of but one etymology; i.e. it must be derived from the same root, whatever that may be, which in Sanskrit yielded indu, drop, sap. It meant originally the giver of rain, the Jupiter pluvius, a deity in India more often present to the mind of the worshipper than any other” (comp. Benfey, Orient and Occident, 1. 49). “In that class  of Rig-Veda hymns which there is reason to look upon as the oldest portion of Vedic poetry, the character of Indra is that of a mighty ruler of the bright firmament, and his principal feat is that of conquering the daemon Vritra, a symbolical personification of the cloud which obstructs the clearness of the sky, and withholds the fructifying rain from the earth. In his battles with Vritra he is therefore described as ‘opening the receptacles of the waters,' as ‘cleaving the cloud' with his ‘far-whirling thunderbolt,' as ‘casting the waters down to the earth,' and ‘restoring the sun to the sky.' he is, in consequence, ‘the upholder of heaven, earth, and firmament,' and the god ‘who has engendered the sun and the dawn.' And since the atmospherical phenomena personified in this conception are ever and ever recurring, he is ‘undecaying' and ‘ever youthful.' All the wonderful deeds of Indra, however, are performed by him merely for the benefit of the good, which, in the language of the Veda, means the pious men who worship him in their songs, and invigorate him with the offerings of the juice of the soma plant. SEE HINDUISM.

He is, therefore, the ‘lord of the virtuous,' and the ‘discomfiter of those who neglect religious rites.' Many other epithets, which we have not space to enumerate, illustrate the same conception. It is on account of the paramount influence which the deeds of Indra exercise on the material happiness of man that this deity occupies a foremost rank in the Vedic worship, and that a greater number of invocations are addressed to him than to any other of the gods (comp. Max Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, 1, 30-32, et al.). But to understand the gradual expansion of his mythical character, and his ultimate degradation to an inferior position in the Hindu pantheon of a later period, it is necessary to bear in mind that, however much the Vedic poets call Indra the protector of the pious and virtuous, he is in their songs essentially a warlike god, and gradually endowed by imagination not only with the qualities of a mighty, but also of a self-willed king. The legends which represent him in this light seem, it is true, to belong to a later class of the Rig-Veda hymns, but they show that the original conception of Indra excluded from his nature those ethical considerations which in time changed the pantheon of elementary gods into one of a different stamp. Whether the idea of an incarnation (q.v.) of the deity, which, at the Epic and Pur Anic periods, played so important a part in the history of Vishnu, did not exercise its influence as early as the composition of some of the Vedic hymns in honor of Indra, may at least be matter of doubt. He is, for instance, frequently invoked as the destroyer of cities-of seven, of ninety- nine, even of a hundred cities and he is not only repeatedly called the slayer  of the hostile tribes which surrounded the Aryan Hindus, but some of the chiefs slain by him are enumerated by name. The commentators, of course, turn those ‘robbers' and their ‘chiefs' into daemons, and their cities into celestial abodes; but as it is improbable that all these names should be nothing but personifications of clouds destroyed by the thunder-bolt of Indra, it is, to say the least, questionable whether events in the early history of India may not have been associated with the deeds of Indra himself, in like manner as, at the Epic period, mortal heroes were looked upon as incarnations of Vishnu, and mortal deeds transformed into exploits of this god.

“The purely kingly character of Indra assumes its typical shape in the Aitareya Brahmana, where his installation as lord of the inferior gods is described with much mystical detail; and from that time he continues to be the supreme lord of the minor gods, and the type of a mortal king. During the Epic and Puranic periods, where ethical conceptions of the divine powers prevail over ideas based on elementary impressions, Indra ceases to enjoy the worship he had acquired at the ‘Vedic time, and his existence is chiefly upheld by the poets, who, in their turn, however, work it out in the most fantastical detail. Of the eight guardians of the world. he is, then, the one who presides over the east, and he is still the god who sends rain and wields the thunderbolt; but poetry is more engrossed by the beauty of his paradise, Swarga, the happy abode of the- inferior gods, and of those pious men who attain it after death in consequence of having, during life, properly discharged their religious duties; by the charms of his heavenly nymphs, the Apsarasas, who now and then descend to earth to disturb the equanimity of austere penitents; by the musical performances of his choristers, the Gandharvas; by the splendor of his capital, Amaravati; by the fabulous beauty of his garden, Nandana, etc. A remarkable trait in this legendary life of Indra is the series of his conflicts with Krishna (q.v.), an incarnation of Vishnu, which end, however, in his becoming reconciled with the more important god. As the god who is emphatically called the god of the hundred sacrifices (Satakratu), Indra is jealous of every mortal who may have the presumption of aiming at the performance of that number of sacrifices, for the accomplishment of such an intention would raise the sacrificer to a rank equal to that which he occupies. He is, therefore, ever at hand to disturb sacrificial acts which may expose him to the danger of having his power shared by another Indra. According to the Puranas, the reign of this god Indra, who is frequently called also Sakra, or  the mighty, does not last longer than the ‘first Manwantara, or mundane epoch. After each successive destruction of the world, a new Indra was created, together with other gods, saints, ands mortal beings. Thus the Indra of the second Manwantara is Vipaschit; of the third, Susdnti; of the fourth, Sivi; of the fifth, Vibhu; of the sixth, Manojava; and the Indra of the present age is Purandara” (Chambers, s.v.). In works of art, Indra is generally represented as riding on an elephant. In paintings, his eyes are veiled. See also Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 173.

## Indra (2)[[@Headword:Indra (2)]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the god of the sun, one of the twelve Aditvas, the son of the god Kasyapa and Aditi, a deity of the second class, but very much worshipped. He rules over space, and is king of all genii who live in space, or in the superterrestrial paradise. Daily he rides around the earth. He sees and knows everything, for he has a thousand eyes. His wife is called Sachi, by whom he had a son, Jayanta. The mountain Meru, towards the north pole, is his dwellingplace. Amarawati is the name of his celestial city, Wardayanta is his palace, Nandana his garden. Airawat is his first elephant, and Mattala charioteer. He rules over wind and rain.

## Induction[[@Headword:Induction]]

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

## Induction (2)[[@Headword:Induction (2)]]

             (Lat. inductio, from inducere, "to infer") is the philosophical name for the. process of real inference in other words, the act or process of reasoning from the known to the unknown, or from the limited to the unlimited. "All things that we do not know by actual trial or ocular demonstration, we know by an inductive operation. Deduction is not real inference in this sense, since the general proposition covers the case that we apply it to; in a proper deduction, the conclusion is more limited than the premises. By the inductive method we obtain a conclusion much larger than the premises; we adventure into the sphere of the unknown, and pronounce upon what we have not yet seen.... Accordingly, it is now considered a part of logic to lay down the rules for the right performance of this great operation." One of the greatest problems of inductive inquiry is that peculiar succession denominated cause and effect. Mill, in his Logic, has consequently illustrated in detail the methods to be adopted to ascertain. definitely the true causative circumstance that, may precede a given effect. They resolve themselves mainly into two. "One is, by comparing together different instances in which the phenomenon occurs. The other is, by comparing instances in which the phenomenon does occur, with instances, in other respects similar, in which it does not. These two methods may be respectively denominated the method of agreement, and the method of difference."

There are many problems growing out of the application of induction to the great variety of. natural phenomena. "Thus, the great induction of universal gravity was applied deductively to explain a great many facts besides those that enabled the induction to be made. Not merely the motions of the planets about the sun, and the satellites about the planets, but the remote and previously unexplained phenomena of the tides, the precession of the equinoxes, etc., were found to be inferences from the general principle. This mode of determining causes is called the deductive method. When several agents unite in a compound effect, there is required a process of calculation to find from the effects of the causes acting separately the combined effect due to their concurrent action, as when the path of a projectile is deduced from the laws of gravity and of force. It is. the deductive stage of science that enables mathematical calculation to be brought into play with such remarkable success as is seen in astronomy, mechanics, etc.  "The circumstance that phenomena may result from a concurrence of causes, leads to the distinction between ultimate laws and derivative or subordinate laws. Thus, gravity is an ultimate law; the movement of the planets in ellipses is but a subordinate law. These inferior laws may be perfectly true within their own limits, but not necessarily so beyond certain limits, of time, place, and circumstance. A different adjustment of the two forces that determine a planet's motion would cause a circular or a parabolic orbit; and therefore when phenomena result from a combination of ultimate laws acting under a certain arrangement, they are not to be generalized beyond the sphere where that arrangement holds. These inferior laws are sometimes mere inductions that have not been resolved into their constituent laws, and then they go under the name of 'Empirical Laws.' Thus, in the hands of Kepler, the elliptic orbit of the planets was only an empirical generalization, ascertained by the method of agreement; Newton converted it into a derivative law, when he showed that it resulted from the more general laws of gravity, etc. The earlier stages of induction present us with many of those empirical laws; in some subjects, as physiology, medicine, etc., the greater number of inductions are of this character. The cure of disease is especially an example of this: hardly any medicine can have its efficacy traced to ultimate laws of the human system. Hence the uncertainty attending the application of remedies to new cases, and also the want of success that often attends them in circumstances where we think they ought to succeed." Induction applies also to the laws of causation, to the laws of uniformities, and to those of coexistence. See Mill, Logic, especially book 4.

## Indulgence[[@Headword:Indulgence]]

             (Lat. indulgentia), in English history, is the title applied to a proclamation of Charles II (A.D. 1662), and especially to one of James II, April 4, 1687, announcing religious toleration to all classes of his subjects, suspending all penal laws against nonconformists, and abolishing religious tests as qualifications for civil office. The king's object was simply to favor Roman Catholics, and therefore neither the English Church nor the great body of the dissenters received the illegal stretch of prerogative with favor, and refused to believe that a “dispensing power” exercised by the king independently of Parliament could be of any lasting advantage. Howe and Baxter maintained this opinion. The same instrument was extended to Scotland, and divided the Covenanters into two parties. At first the king, asked toleration for Papists only, but the Scottish Parliament, usually very. obsequious would not listen. He finally declared, as if Popery were already  in the ascendant, that lie would never use “force or invincible necessity against any man on account of his Protestant faith,” and all this he did “-by his sovereign authority, prerogative royal, and absolute power.” — Macaulay, Hist. of England, 1, 213; 3:44 sq.; Skeats, Hist. of Free Churches of England, p. 77 sq.; Stoughton, Eccl. Hist. of England since the Restoration, 2, 296, et al.

## Indulgence (2)[[@Headword:Indulgence (2)]]

             The use of this word by ecclesiastical writers is derived from that of the jurisconsults, who employ it to designate a remission of punishment or of taxes, especially such a general amnesty as was sometimes proclaimed by an emperor on an extraordinary occasion of rejoicing. Hence the word passed into ecclesiastical usage in the sense of a remission of penalties for offences against church discipline and order.

Usually there were four stages or degrees through which offenders had to pass before regaining communion: (1) weepers, (2) hearers, (3) kneelers, (4) bystanders; and usually several years had to be spent in each. Now the bishop, according to St. Gregory, might, in proportion to their conversion, "rescind the period of their penance; making it eight, seven, or even five  years instead of nine, in each stage, should their repentance exceed in depth what it had to fulfil in length, and compensate, by its increased zeal, for the much longer time required in others to effect their cure." Eventually this system was greatly extended, until it reached the abuses that provoked the Reformation. Indulgentia (indulgence), a name sometimes applied to baptism in the early Christian Church, as being attended, when blessed by the Holy Spirit, with absolution or the remission of sins. It was esteemed the most universal absolution and the greatest indulgence in the ministry of the Church.

## Indulgences[[@Headword:Indulgences]]

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

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

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

II. Scholastic Doctrine of Indulgence. — The practice of indulgence had been going on for some time when the Scholastic theologians took it up, and formed a speculative theory to justify it. Three great men contributed to this task: Alexander de Hales (q.v.), Albertus Magnus (q.v.), and Thomas Aquinas (q.v.). Alexander de Hales (t A.D. 1245) laid a firm foundation for the theory in the doctrine, first fairly propounded by him, of the Treasure of the Church (thesaurus ecclesiae). It runs as follows: “The sufferings and death of Christ not only made a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of men, but also acquired a superabundance of merit. This superfluous  merit of Christ is conjoined with that of the martyrs and saints, which is similar in kind, though smaller in degree, for they likewise performed more than the divine law required of them. The sum of these supererogatory merits and good works forms a vast treasure, which is disjoined from the persons who won or performed them exists objectively, and, having been accumulated by the Head and members of the Church, and intended by them for its use, belongs to the Church, and is necessarily placed under the administration of its representatives, especially the pope, who is supreme. It is therefore competent for the pope, according to the measure of his insight at the time, to draw from this treasure, and bestow upon those who have no merit of their own such supplies of it as they require. Indulgences and remissions are made from the supererogatory merits of Christ's members, but most of all from the superabundance of Christ's own, the two constituting the Church's spiritual treasure. The administration of this treasure does not pertain to all, but to those only who occupy Christ's place, viz. the bishops” (Alex. Hales, Summa, 4, qu. 23, art. 2). As regards the extent of indulgence, Alexander is of opinion that it reaches even to the souls in Purgatory, under the condition, however, that there shall be the power of the keys in the party who dispenses it; faith, love, and devotion in the party to whom it is dispensed; and a competent reason and a proper relation between the two (1.c. par. 5). He does not, however, suppose that in such cases indulgence is granted in the way of judicial absolution or barter, but in that of intercession (“per modum suffragii sive interpretationis”).

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

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

III. Opposition to Indulgences within the Church of Rome. — Such a doctrine could not fail to offend truly pious souls even within the Church. Long before the Reformation the whole system was attacked by eminent doctors. One of its most powerful opponents was John of Wesel (q.v.), in the middle of the 15th century. A festival of jubilee, with vast indulgences, was proclaimed by pope Clement VI in 1450, and cardinal Cusanus visited Erfurt as a preacher of indulgence. This brought the subject practically before Wesel's mind, and he wrote a treatise against indulgences (Adversus  indulgentias: see Walch, Monum. Med. avi, 2, fasc. 1, 111-156). For a full account of it, see Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, 1, 258 sq. The flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences began to cause a reaction against the system even in the popular mind. In the 15th century, in particular, the disposal of them had become almost a common traffic; and a public sale of them was generally preceded by some specious pretext; for instance, the reduction of the Greeks under the yoke of the Romish Church, a war with heretics, or a crusade against the Neapolitans, etc. Too often the pretences for selling indulgences were in reality bloody, idolatrous, or superstitious. It was one of the charges brought against John XXIII at the Council of Constance, in 1415, that he empowered his legates to absolve penitents from all sorts of crimes upon payment of sums proportioned to their guilt. When such- indulgences were to be published, the disposal of them was commonly farmed out; for the papal court could not always wait to have the money collected and conveyed from every country of Europe. And there were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the papal chancery handsome sums for them. Thus both parties were benefited. The chancery came at once into possession of large sums of money, and the farmers did not fail of a good bargain. They were careful to employ skilful hawkers of the indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence with which they imposed upon the simple people.

Yet, that this species of traffic might have a religious aspect, the pope appointed the archbishops of the several provinces to be his commissaries, who in his name announced that indulgences were to be sold, and generally selected the persons to hawk them, and for this service shared the profits with the merchants who farmed them. These papal hawkers enjoyed great privileges, and, however odious to the civil authorities, they were not to be molested. Complaints, indeed, were made against these contributions, levied by the popes upon all Christian Europe. Kings and princes, clergy and laity, bishops, monasteries, and confessors, all felt themselves aggrieved by them; the kings, that their countries were impoverished, under the pretext of crusades that were never undertaken, and of wars against heretics and Turks; and the bishops, that their letters of indulgence were rendered inefficient, and the people released from ecclesiastical discipline. But at Rome all were deaf to these complaints; and it was not till the revolution produced by Luther that unhappy Europe obtained the desired relief (Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. cent. 3:sec. 1, chap. 10 Leo X, in order to carry on the expensive structure of St.  Peter's Church at Rome, published indulgences, with a plenary remission to all such as should contribute towards erecting that magnificent fabric. The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a share in the profits arising from the sale of them, was granted to Albert, elector of Mentz and archbishop of Magdeburg, who selected as his chief agent for retailing them in Saxony John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, of licentious morals, but of an active and enterprising spirit, and remarkable for his noisy and popular eloquence. Assisted by the monks of his order, he executed the commission with great zeal and success, but with no less indecency, boasting that he had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted by his preaching. He assured the purchasers of them that their crimes, however enormous, would be forgiven; that the efficacy of indulgences was so great that the most heinous sins, even if one should violate (which was impossible) the mother of God, would be remitted and expiated by them, and the person freed both from punishment and guilt; and that this was the unspeakable gift of God, in order to reconcile men to himself. In the usual form of absolution, written by his own hand, he said: “May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion.

And I, by his authority, that of his apostles Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous so ever they may be: even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend. I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservest in Purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which thou possessedst at baptism: so that when thou diest the gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delights shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.” The terms in which the retailers of indulgences described their benefits, and the necessity of purchasing them, were so extravagant that they appear almost incredible. If any man, said they, purchase letters of indulgence, his soul may rest secure with respect to its salvation. The souls confined in Purgatory, for whose redemption indulgences are purchased, as soon as the money tinkles in the chest, instantly escape from that place of torment, and ascend into heaven. That the cross, erected by the preachers  of indulgences was equally efficacious with the cross of Christ itself. “Lo,” said they, “the heavens are open: if you enter not now, when will you enter? For twelve pence you may redeem the soul of your father out of Purgatory; and are you so ungrateful that you will not rescue the soul of your parent from torment? If you had but one coat, you ought to strip yourself instantly and sell it, in order to purchase such benefit.” It was these abuses, as much as any other one cause, which led to the Lutheran Reformation, and it was against these that Luther first directed his attacks. SEE LUTHER; SEE REFORMATION.

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

The reasonable causes, on account of which indulgences are given, are, where “the cause be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but for any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God or the service of the Church, an indulgence will be valid.” We see, occasionally, the very greatest indulgences given for the very lightest causes; as when a plenary indulgence is granted to all who stand before the gates of St. Peter, whilst the pope gives the solemn blessing to the people on Easter day; for “indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending everything that is granted by an indulgence.” In some cases “the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but bear a certain proportion with the indulgence; that is, the work enjoined must tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of God than the satisfaction remitted,” “although it is not necessary that it be in itself very meritorious, or satisfactory, or difficult, and laborious (though these things ought to be regarded too, but that it be a means, apt and useful, towards obtaining the end for which the indulgence is granted.”

So “the large resort of people,” before the gates of St. Peter, when the pope gives his solemn blessing, “is a means, apt and useful, to set forth faith respecting the head of the Church, and to the honor of the apostolic see, which is the end of the indulgence” (Bellarmine, De Indulgentiis, lib, 1, can. 12). The first General Lateran Council granted “remission of sin to whoever shall go to Jerusalem, and effectually help to oppose the infidels” (can. 11). The third and fourth Lateran Councils granted the same indulgence to those who set themselves to destroy heretics, or who shall take up arms against them (see Labbe, 10, 1523). Boniface VIII granted not only a full and larger, but the most full pardon of all sins to all that visit Rome the first year in every century. Clement V decreed that they who should, at the Jubilee, visit such and such churches, should obtain “a most full remission of all their sins;” and he not only granted a “plenary absolution of all sins to all who died on the road to Rome,” but” also commanded the angels of Paradise to carry the soul direct to heaven.” “Sincere repentance,” we are told, “is always enjoined or implied in the grant of an indulgence, and is indispensably necessary for every grace” (Milner, End of Controversy, p. 304). But as the dead are removed from the possibility, so are they from the necessity of repentance; “as the pope,”  says Bellarmine, “applies the satisfactions of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living, they are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of payment (per modum solutionis).

For as when a person gives alms, or fasts, or makes a pilgrimage on account of the dead, the effect is, not that he obtains absolution for them from their liability to punishment, but he presents to God that particular satisfaction for them, in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from the debt of punishment which they had to pay. In like manner, the pope does not absolve the deceased, but offers to God, out of the measure of satisfaction, as much as is necessary to free them” (lb.). Their object is “to afford succor to such as have departed real penitents in the love of God, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sills of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into that country where nothing defiled is admitted” (Bull Leo XII). “We have resolved,” says pope Leo XII, in his bull of indiction for the universal jubilee in 1824, “in virtue of the authority given us by heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure, composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints which the author of human salvation has entrusted to our dispensation. During this year of the jubilee, we mercifully give and grant, in the Lord, a plenary indulgence, remission, and pardon of all their sins to all the faithful of Christ, truly penitent, and confessing their sins, and receiving the holy communion, who shall visit the churches of blessed Peter and Paul,” etc. “We offer you,” says Ganganelli, in his bull De Indulgentiis, “a share of all the riches of divine mercy which have been entrusted to us, and chiefly those which have their origin in the blood of Christ.

We will then open to you all the gates of the rich reservoir of atonement, derived from the merits of the Mother of God, the holy apostles, the blood of the martyrs, and the good works of all the saints. We invite you, then, to drink of this overflowing stream of indulgence, to enrich yourselves in the inexhaustible treasures of the Church, according to the custom of our ancestors. Do not, then, let slip the present occasion, this favorable time, these salutary days, employing them to appease the justice of God, and obtain your pardon.” “The temporal punishment due to sin, by the decree of God, when its guilt and eternal punishment are remitted, may consist either of evil in this life, or of temporal suffering is the next, which temporal suffering in the next life is called purgatory; that the Church has received power from God to remit both of these inflictions, and this remission is called an indulgence”  (Butler's Book of the Rome. Cath. Ch. p. 110). “It is the received doctrine of the Church that an indulgence, when truly gained, is not barely a relaxation of the canonical penance enjoined by the Church, but also an actual remission by God himself of the whole or part of the temporal punishment due to it in his sight” (Milner, End of Controversy, p. 305 sq.).

As to the present practice of indulgences, it subsists, with all its immoral tendencies, in full force to this day. It is true, however, that the abuses connected with the sale of indulgences are not so flagrant as in former times, especially in those countries where the Roman Church is destitute of political power. Where it has, the system is almost as bad as ever. It is said that, as lately as the year 1800, a Spanish vessel was captured near the coast of South America, freighted (among other things) with numerous bales of indulgences for various sins, the price of which, varying from half a dollar to seven dollars, was marked upon each.

They had been bought in Spain, and were intended for sale in South America. Seymour tells us as follows: “This inscription is placed in that part of the Church which is of all the most public. It is placed over the holy water, to which all persons must resort, on entering the Church, before partaking of any of its services. It is as follows: ‘Indulgence. — The image of the most holy Mary, which stands on the high altar, spoke to the holy pope Gregory, saying to him, Why do you no longer salute me, in passing, with the accustomed salutation? The saint asked pardon, and granted to those who celebrate mass at that altar the deliverance of a soul from Purgatory, that is, the special soul for which they celebrate the mass.' There is nothing more frequently remarked by Protestants, on entering the churches of Rome, than the constant recurrence of the words ‘indulgentia plenaria,' a plenary indulgence attached to' the masses offered there; and this is tantamount to the emancipation of any soul from Purgatory, through a mass offered at that altar. Instead of these words, however, the same thing is more plainly expressed in some churches. In the church Santa Maria della Pace, so celebrated for the magnificent fresco of the Sibyls by Raphael, there is over one of the altars the following inscription: ‘Ogni messa celebrata in quest' altare libera un animod al ‘purgatorio'--Every mass celebrated at this altar frees a soul from Purgatory. In: some churches this privilege extends throughout the year, but in others it is limited to those masses which are offered on particular days. In the church of Sta. Croce di Gerusalemme this privilege is connected in an especial manner with the fourth Sunday in Lent. And this is notified by a public notice posted in the church close to  the altar, setting forth that a mass celebrated there on that day releases a soul from Purgatory” (Seymour, Evenings at Rome).

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

1. A plenary indulgence is that by which is obtained a remission of all the temporal punishment due to sin, either in this life or in the next.

2. A non-plenary or partial indulgence is that which remits only a part of the temporal punishment due to sin: such are indulgences for a given number of days, weeks, or years. This sort of indulgence remits so many days, weeks, or years of penance, which ought to be observed agreeably to the ancient canons of the Church, for the sins which we have committed.

3. Temporary indulgences are those which are granted for a certain specified time, as for seven or more years.

4. Indefinite indulgences are those which are granted without any limitation of time.

5. Perpetual indulgences are those granted forever, and which do not require to be renewed after a given number of years.

6. A general indulgence is one granted by the pope to all the faithful throughout the world.

7. A local indulgence is attached to certain churches, chapels, or other places; it is gained by actually visiting such church or other building or place, and by observing scrupulously all the conditions required by the bull granting such indulgence.

8. A real indulgence is attached to certain movable things, as rosaries, medals, etc., and is granted to those who actually wear these articles with devotion; should the fashion of them cease, so that they cease to be deemed the same articles, the indulgence ceases. So long, however, as such articles continue, and are reputed to be the same, the indulgence continues in force, notwithstanding any accidental alteration which may be made in them, as the affixing of a new string or ribbon to a rosary.

9. A personal indulgence is one which is granted to certain particular persons, or to several persons in common, as to a confraternity or brotherhood. These privileged persons may gain such indulgences wherever they may happen to be, whether they are in health, in sickness, or at the point of death.

10. Other indulgences are termed enjoined penances, penitence injustice. By them is conferred the remission of so much of the punishment which is due to sins at the judgment of God as the sinner would have to pay by canonical penances, or by penances enjoined in all their rigor by the priest. An indulgence produces its effect at the very moment when all the works prescribed in order to obtain it are performed. (Richard et Giraud, Bibliotheque Sacree, 13, 366 sq.) The scales of payment are peculiar, being made to meet a variety of cases, and they are so lenient that the payment of them can form no bar against the subsequent commission of the crime for which an indulgence has already been received.”

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

V. Criticism of the Romish Doctrine of Indulgence. — We cannot attempt to give in this place a full refutation of the Romish doctrine of indulgences, nor is it necessary. In her 22nd Article, the Church of England formally condemns the Romish doctrine of indulgence as well as Purgatory (q.v.).  The article was framed (1558) before the Council of Trent, which endeavored to remedy the worst abuses arising from the practice of such a doctrine, but which nevertheless virtually sanctioned the principles naturally involved in the system. In the Parker MS. of 1562 (the 25th session of the Council of Trent, which was held Dec. 3 and 4, 1563) appears the change of terms from Scholasticorum doctrina to Doctrina Romanensiun (comp. Pusey's Eirenicon, part 1, p. 207; Blunt, Hist. of the Reformation, A.D. 1514-1547, p. 444, 465).

The English theologians held “(1) that temporal pain, the fruit of sin, is in its nature remedial and disciplinary, both to the sinner, and to others that they may see and fear; and (2) that as such it is not remissible by any sacrament or ordinance entrusted to the Church.” The former proposition they support by Jer 2:19; Isa 3:9; by the examples of Moses and David; Num 20:12; Deu 1:37; 2Sa 12:14. The following quotations cover, however, more nearly all the points: “Viewed even in its purest form, as stated by the most eminent doctors, and sanctioned by papal bulls, the doctrine of indulgence not only introduces a contradiction into the Catholic system, in respect that works of satisfaction, which were originally an integral part of the sacrament of penitence, are entirely disconnected with it, and viewed as a mere matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but it has this further radical defect pervading all its constituent parts, that moral and religious things, which can only be taken as spiritual magnitudes, are considered as material ones, quality being treated wholly as quantity, and, consequently, a standard of external computation and a sort of religious arithmetic applied, which involves contradiction. Even in order to establish the superabundance of the merit of Christ, it was affirmed that though a single drop of his blood would have sufficed for a universal atonement, yet the Savior had shed so much, as if it were not the divine sacrifice of love on the part of the Son of God and man, and his atoning death in general, but his several outward sufferings and their quantity in which its value and importance consisted.

In like manner, on the part of the saints, it was not their peculiar and more exalted moral and religious character, but their several works, and especially the volume rather than the worth of these, which was taken into account; and the whole was handled as something totally disconnected with their persons, as an objective fund, a sum of ready money in the Church's hands. According to the same category, the imputation of the merits of Christ and the saints was described as a purely external transference of a portion of that sum to one who needed it. For, although a penitent frame of mind was  required of the sinner, still it was not for the sake, nor according to the measure of that, that the merit of Christ and the saints was transferred to him, but solely for the sake of some service performed by him for the Church, and this performance, again, is quite an external and isolated work. At the same time, as respects the merits of the saints, the theory of indulgence rests on the supposition that a man, who is still human, although a saint, may not only possess a sufficiency of merit to answer his own need before God, but may likewise do more than the divine law demands of him, and thus acquire a surplus of merit for the use of others. Even this is a monstrous supposition, but still more monstrous perhaps is another, which invades the religious domain and the glory of God.

In point of fact, the doctrine and practice of indulgences gives the Church a position as an absolutely unerring and omniscient judicial power. It identifies the tribunal of the Church with that of God, and the tribunal of the pope with that of the Church, thereby indirectly identifying the pope's with God's, so that the pope is raised to a position, in virtue of which, as the visible head of the mystical body of Christ, and as the dispenser of all penalties and graces, he decides the highest questions involving the salvation of the living and the dead, according to his mere pleasure. Granting, however, that the whole doctrine were well founded, the position assigned to the pope would be one elevated far above the reach of fancy, and could be designated only as that of a terrestrial god. What an infinite amount of obligation would it impose upon the papacy, and with what conscientiousness sharpened to the utmost ought the popes, if they were bold enough to believe that such plenitude of power had actually been lodged in the hands of any child of the dust, to have dispensed the lofty blessings committed to their trust! How carefully ought they to have guarded them from perversion and debasement! And yet what do we see? Abuse upon abuse, and profanation upon profanation, in an ascending scale, for more than two centuries, until at last moral indignation bursts like a tempest upon their impiety” (Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, 1, 246). “Either the pope has the power of bringing souls out of Purgatory, or he has not. If he has not, the question is decided. If he has, what cruelty, then, for him to leave there whole millions of souls whom he might by a word bring out of it! Without going so far, why this strange inequality in the distribution of a treasure which is deemed inexhaustible? Why will a pater and an ave in my parish church avail only for five or six days' indulgence, when they avail for forty days in another church, before another Madonna or another cross? Why is the performance of the works  paid, in such or such a congregation, with a plenary indulgence, and in this or that other with a mere indulgence for a time? Why-but we should never end with the contradictions with which this matter is beset. Yet let us give one-just one more. If plenary indulgence be not merely a lure, how comes it that masses continue to be said for the souls of those who received it when dying?

Why that solemn deprofundis repeated at Rome during the whole reign of a pope on the anniversary of the death of his predecessor? This is what Luther said in his theses, and the objection is not the less embarrassing for being old. The only means of getting out of the difficulty would be to accept the consequences of the system. You have only to regard as well and duly entered into heaven all who left this world with that infallible passport, and to refuse, therefore, to say a mass for them. And why is this not done? We, have no need to explain. Between a mere act of Inconsistency added to so many others and the drying up of the very best source of her revenues, could Rome ever hesitate? But if there be ground to ask, on the one hand, why the popes and the bishops have not, at least, the charity to grant everywhere, and to all, as many indulgences as they have a right to dispense, no less reason have we to be astonished at the low price they put upon them, and the incredible facilities offered to such as wish to acquire them. See, for instance, the statutes of the brotherhood (confrerie) well known under the name of the Most Holy and Immaculate Heart of Mary. By a brief of 1838, plenary indulgence is accorded to those who shall worthily confess on the day of their reception into the brotherhood; which is as much as saying to people, ‘Come in among us, and all your previous sins will be wiped out.'

Plenary indulgence, moreover, to such as shall confess themselves, and communicate at certain epochs of the year, and these are ten in number. Further, indulgence of five hundred days to whosoever shall devoutly be present at the mass of Saturday, and shall pray for the conversion of sinners. Though we should believe in indulgences, it strikes us that we could not but feel some scruples at seeing them lavished away in this manner. For a mass that shall have cost you half an hour, to be exempted from Purgatory for near a year and a half! For one confession, to be exempted from it altogether, although you may have deserved a thousand years of it! If not stopped by shame, these bold traffickers in salvation ought at least, one would think, to dread lest their wares should suffer depreciation in consequence of being given away for so little. True, they do not cost them anything, and there is no limit to purchases. Nobody, well knowing to how many years of Purgatory he may be condemned, can reasonably stop in adding to the amount of indulgences  with which he is to appear at the bar of judgment. By placing himself on the most favorable conditions, and taking care to let no occasion be lost, a man of sixty might without difficulty have amassed them for above a million of years, over and above the plenary ones, each one of which ought to suffice, and with which one does not well see what the rest can signify” (Bungener, Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 520, 521).

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

## Indult[[@Headword:Indult]]

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

## Industrial Schools[[@Headword:Industrial Schools]]

             In Germany, Great Britain, France, and in the United States, efforts have of late years been made to combine with the general rudimentary education of the common school the teaching of the mechanical arts and of agriculture, and thus to afford the poorer classes the advantages of a literary and industrial education within a smaller limit than formerly, thereby greatly alleviating the wants which are so frequent among them. “In elementary schools for girls, industrial work, to the extent of sewing, shaping, knitting, and netting, has been almost universally introduced, and forms one of the most important and interesting features of female primary education, more  especially in Great Britain; but the attempt to connect with these subjects instruction in cooking, washing, and ironing has been tried as yet only to a limited extent, and has been only partially successful. In ragged schools, on the other hand, no department of the schoolwork seems to thrive better, partly because it enters so largely into the scheme of instruction, partly because the children are removed from the control of parents. In England the ragged schools are recognized by the Legislature as ‘industrial schools,' and may be defiled as schools in which the pupils are fed and clothed (wholly or partially), as well as taught the elements of an ordinary education, and the practice of some trade.

By a statute passed in 1861, children under 14 found vagrant or begging or convicted of petty offences, may be sent by a magistrate to an industrial school that has been certified by the home secretary. Parents also, on paying for board and lodging a small sum, may place they children in industrial schools if they can show that they are unable to control them. The treasury may contribute to the maintenance of these schools on the representation of the home secretary. If a child abscond from the school before he is 15, the justices may send him back, or place him in a reformatory school (q.v.). In 1861 there were in England 23, and in Scotland 16 industrial schools, and the number of pupils attending was respectively 1574 in the former, and 1606 in the latter” (Chambers, s.v.). In Germany, these schools prove even a greater boon to the poorer classes than elsewhere, especially to orphans. By law every child is obliged to attend school until confirmation (about 14 years of age), and the acquirement of some trade enables children of 14 to begin work to advantage, and earn at least their own livelihood if they may not even aid in the support of their parents or other near relatives. It is to be hoped that in the United States the generous spirit of the different Christian societies will especially further this work, and make industrial schools numerous in all our large cities at least. (J. H. W.)

## Indwelling Scheme[[@Headword:Indwelling Scheme]]

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

## Indwelling Sin[[@Headword:Indwelling Sin]]

             SEE SIN.

## Ineffabilis Deus[[@Headword:Ineffabilis Deus]]

             SEE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

## Inerrancy[[@Headword:Inerrancy]]

             SEE INDEFECTIBILITY.

## Infallibility[[@Headword:Infallibility]]

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

1. INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH. — The following is a condensed view of the infallibility of the Church of Rome, as collected from her own authors. Dens affirms. “That the Church, in matters of faith and manners, can by no means err, is an article of belief. Moreover, infallibility in the Church may be considered in a twofold point of view: the one active and authoritative, which is called infallibility in teaching and defining; the other passive or submissive (obedientialis), which is called infallibility in learning and believing. Infallibility, considered in the first sense, refers to the Church with respect to the head or chief pontiff, and the prelates of the Church; although this infallibility would not regard the laity or inferior pastors; for, as a man is said to see, although his vision does not apply to all his members, but to his eyes only, so the Church, in like manner, is said to be infallible, although this infallibility refers only to the prelates. But if the Church is not considered with regard to its head, but as it embraces all the faithful, or laics, under the obedience of the pope, it is not proper to say it is infallible in teaching and defining, because its gift in this respect is not to teach, but to learn and believe; wherefore the Church, in this view, is said to be ‘passably infallible,' or infallible in learning, believing, practicing, etc. Therefore it is impossible that the whole Church, obedient to the pope, should believe any thing as revealed, or practice any thing as good which is not such; hence it can be said that the sense of the universal Church is always true, and its practice or usage always good” (Dens, Theol., tom. 2,  De Ecclesia, No.80, De Infallibilitate Ecclesia). The same author affirms also that “the Church is an infallible judge of controversies of faith; that this authority is vested in the bishops only, especially in the pope, and that lay persons, priests, doctors, or others, have no part in making infallible decisions in the Church.” He says the government of the Church is a monarchy with regard to its head, but, at the same time, tempered with an aristocracy. A unanimous consent is not necessary to make a decision infallible; a majority is sufficient for this purpose. He also. says that a tacit consent is sufficient to make a decision infallible; for to be silent is to consent. Hence he concludes that “‘when the pope defines anything, and the majority of bishops do not object, it is impossible that this definition should embrace error” (Dens, Theol. tom. 2, No. 82, Qualis esse debeat Consensus Episcoporum). “From the above we collect four principal systems which concern the seat of infallibility, and these contain a considerable number of subdivisions; the chief of which are expressed in the following analysis.

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

(1.) The Church diffusive, that is, all her clergy as a body, inasmuch as the people, whenever infallibility is concerned, compose no part of the Church.

(2.) The bishops, as the representatives of the Church, though not assembled in council.

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

(1.) The decision of a council when approved by the whole Church.

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

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

(1.) A council convened by the pope.

(2.) A council confirmed by the pope.

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

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

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

(1.) The pope himself deciding officially.

(2.) The pope and a few bishops.

(3.) The pope, when his decisions are received by the whole Church.

(4.) The pope and a few bishops, whose decisions are received by the whole Church.

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

This infallibility of the Church Romanists attempt to prove

(1.) from a supposed unanimity of the bishops, which, they argue, would, if considered as mere human testimony, carry with it an amount of moral certainty admitting of no doubt, and therefore equivalent to infallibility;

(2.) from the divinely appointed mission of a clergy regularly descended from the apostles, who themselves had the most positive promises of Christ (Joh 20:21; Joh 15:15; Mat 28:19-20; Joh 14:16-17; Luk 10:16).

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

The same privilege has also been ascribed to the pope as successor of St. Peter, and God's only vicegerent. The ultramontanes, such as Bellarmine,  Baronius, etc., maintain that whatever dogmatic judgment or decision on a doctrinal point the pope addressed to the whole church, is necessarily correct. But as it has repeatedly occurred that the Church, as represented in councils, has disagreed with the pope on points of doctrine, it follows that, if both are equally infallible, the people are bound to believe equally two opposite doctrines. The French Church settled the difficulty by proclaiming general councils superior to the pope (or “more infallible”); the assembly of the clergy, in 1682, asserted that “in controversies of faith the office of the pope is the chief, and that his decrees pertain to all churches; nevertheless, that his judgment is not irreformable unless it is confirmed by the consent of the Church,” Bossuet sustained this principle with great talent and eloquence in his Defensio Declarat. Cleri Gallic. 2, pt. 1, 12 sq.

He proves by the decrees of councils, by the testimony of fathers, doctors, and schoolmen, by the declarations of popes themselves, and especially of Adrian VI, that the infallibility of the pope was a new doctrine, altogether unknown in the early ages of the Church. “He disproves the infallibility of the pope not merely by negative, but by a long and strong chain of positive evidence; by adducing a number of instances, as well as direct assertions of his infallibility from generation after generation; by showing, from a large induction of facts, that during a series of centuries he was regarded and treated as fallible, and never as otherwise than fallible; and that, when another opinion began to gain ground, it arose mainly from the exercise of that authority which belongs to a supreme, power” (Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 213). — Bossuet's views were held by Fleury, Dupin, cardinal Bausset, etc. They were attacked by De Maistre in his work Du Pape. A work of great interest on this subject is the recently discovered Refutation of all Heresies of Hippolytus, which gives us a clear idea of the manner in which the Roman bishops were considered in his times. “In Germany, where truth is held the most precious of all possessions, even by members of the Catholic Church the conviction of the mischief produced by the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope is so strongly felt by many, that one of the greatest philosophers of the last generation, Baader, who was a zealous champion of the Christian truth, and himself an earnest Roman Catholic, used perpetually to repeat the pregnant words of St. Martin, ‘Le Papisme est la faiblesse du Catholicisme; et le Catholicisme est la force du Papisme' (Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 218).

As regards the infallibility of the Church, Dr. Newman himself, in his Lectures on Romanism, p. 61, said: “In the creed of pope Pius not a word  is said expressly about the Church's infallibility: it forms no article of faith there. Her interpretation indeed of Scripture is recognized as authoritative; but so also is ‘the unanimous consent of the fathers, whether as primitive or concordant; they believe the existing Church to be infallible; and, if ancient belief is at variance with it, which of course they do not allow, but if it is, then antiquity must be mistaken-that is all.”'

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As soon as it became generally known that it was intended to bring this subject before the council, a number of works appeared, discussing the proposed innovation in every aspect. By far the most important of these is the one published in Germany under the title Der Papst und das Concil (Mentz, 1869; Engl. transl. The Pope and the Council), which gives an exhaustive history of the views of the Church concerning infallibility. The author of the work, who on the title page calls himself Janus, was subsequently found to be professor Huber, of the University of Munich. The book is a storehouse of immense learning, for the author quotes thousands of individual cases to show that no one can for a moment believe in this doctrine without falsifying the whole history of the Church. “For thirteen centuries,” says our author, “an incomprehensible silence on this fundamental article reigned throughout the whole Church and her literature. None of the ancient confessions of faith, no catechism, none of the patristic writings composed for the instruction of the people, contain a syllable about the pope, still less any hint that all certainty of faith and doctrine depends on him.” Not a single question of doctrine for the first thousand years was finally decided by the popes; in none of the early controversies did they take any part at all; and their interposition, when they began to interpose, was often far from felicitous.

Pope Zosimus commended the Pelagian teaching of Celestius, pope Julian affirmed the orthodoxy of the Sabellian Marcellus of Ancyra, pope Liberius subscribed an Arian creed, pope Vigilius contradicted himself three times running on a question of faith, pope Honorius lent the whole weight of his authority to the support of the newly-introduced Monothelite heresy, and was solemnly anathematized by three ecumenical councils for doing so. Nor do these “errors and contradictions of the popes” grow by any means fewer or less important as time goes on. The blundering of successive popes about the conditions of valid ordination-on which, according to Catholic theology, the whole sacramental system, and therefore the means of salvation, depend--are alone sufficient to dispose forever of their claim to infallibility. Neither, again, did the Roman pontiffs possess, in the ancient constitution of the Church, any of those powers which are now held to be inherent in their sovereign office, and which must undoubtedly be reckoned among the essential attributes of absolute sovereignty. They convoked none of the general councils, and only presided, by their legates, at three of them; nor were the canons enacted there held to require their confirmation. They had neither legislative, administrative, nor judicial power in the Church, nor was any further efficacy attributed to their excommunication than to that of  any other bishop.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

“Innocent III, in order to exhibit the papal power in the fullest splendor of its divine omnipotence, invented the new doctrine that the spiritual bond which unites a bishop to his diocese is firmer and more indissoluble than the ‘carnal' bond, as he called it, between man and wife, and that God alone can loose it, viz. translate a bishop from one see to another. But as the pope is the representative of the true God on earth, he, and he alone, can dissolve this holy and indissoluble bond, not by human, but divine authority, and it is God, not man, who looses it. (Decretal ‘De Transl. Episc.' c. 2, 3, 4. This was to introduce a new article of faith. The Church had not known for centuries that resignations, depositions, and translations of bishops belonged by divine right to the pope.) The obvious and direct  corollary, that the pope can also dissolve the less firm and holy bond of marriage, Innocent, as we have seen, overlooked, for he solemnly condemned Celestine III's decision on that point, and thus he unwittingly involved himself in a contradiction. Many canonists have accepted this as the legitimate consequence of his teaching.

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

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

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

“If this decree of the pope were really a rule of faith, the Eastern Church would have only four sacraments instead of seven; the Western Church would for at least eight centuries have been deprived of three sacraments, and of one, the want of which would make all the rest, with one exception, invalid. Eugenius IV determines in this decree the form and matter, the substance of the sacraments, or of those things on the presence or absence of which the existence of the sacrament itself depends, according to the universal doctrine of the Church. He gives a form of confirmation which  never existed in one half of the Church, and first came into use in the other after the 10th century. So, again, with penance. What is given as the essential form of the sacrament was unknown in the Western Church for eleven hundred years, and never known in the Greek. And when the touching of the sacred vessels, and the words accompanying the rite, are given as the form and matter of ordination, it follows that the Latin Church for a thousand years had neither priests nor bishops--nay, like the Greek Church, which never adopted this usage, possesses to this hour neither priests nor bishops, and consequently no sacraments except baptism, and perhaps marriage. (Comp. Denzinger, Enchirid. Symbol. et Definit., Wirceb. 1854, p. 200 sq. But Denzinger, in order to conceal the purely dogmatic character of this famous decree, has omitted the first part, on the Trinity and Incarnation, which is given in Raynaldus's Annals, 1439. [The same conspicuously untenable explanation was adopted in the Dublin Review for January, 1866. — Ti.])

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

Into dogmatic theology the doctrine of papal infallibility was introduced by Thomas Aquinas. On the basis of fabrications invented by a Dominican monk, including a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, giving all bishops an unlimited right of appeal to the pope, and on the forgeries found in Gratian, Thomas built up his papal system, with its two leading principles, that the pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and the absolute ruler of the Church. The popes were so well pleased with the teachings of Thomas that John XXII affirmed Thomas had not written without a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and Innocent VI said that whoever assailed his teaching incurred suspicion of heresy. The powerful mendicant orders of Dominicans and Franciscans found the papal system, with its theory of infallibility, indispensable for the success of their own claims against the bishops and universities, and they became the violent champions of the new doctrine. The boldest champions of papal absolutism admitted, however, that the popes could err, and that their decisions were no certain criterion. But they also held that in such cases a heretical pope ipso facto ceased to be pope, without or before any judicial sentence, so that councils, which  are the Church's judicature, only attested the vacancy of the papal throne as an accomplished fact. The contest between the Council of Basel and pope Eugenius IV evoked the work of cardinal Torquemada, whose argument, which was held, up to the time of Bellarmine, to be the most conclusive apology of the papal system, rests entirely on fabrications later than the pseudo-Isidore, and chiefly on the spurious passages of St. Cyril. Torquernada also holds that a pope can lapse into heresy and propound false doctrine, but then he is ipso facto deposed by God himself before any sentence of the Church has been passed, so that the Church or council cannot judge him, but can only announce the judgment of God, and thus one cannot properly say that a pope can become heretical, since he ceases to be pope at the moment of passing from orthodoxy to heterodoxy. The doctrine entered on a fresh phase of development from the time of Leo X. Its foremost defender at that time was Thomas of Vic or Cajetan, yet the doctrine was so far from becoming dominant at Rome that the successor of Leo X, Adrian VI, who, as professor of Louvain, had maintained in his principal work that several popes had been heretical, and that it was certainly possible for a pope to establish a heresy by his decision or decretals, caused, as pope, his work denying infallibility to be reprinted in Rome.

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

The bishops and prominent scholars of France, Spain, Germany, and other countries were almost unanimous in advocating the superiority of ecumenical councils over the pope. The turning of the tide was chiefly due to the influence of the Jesuits, who were naturally inclined to favor the  extremist absolutism in the Church. As their representative, cardinal Bellamrine further developed the ideas of Cajetan, in which he generally concurs; but he rejects decisively Cajetan's hypothesis of a heretical pope being deposed ipso facto by the judgment of God. A heretical pope is legitimate so long as the Church has not deposed him. If Cajetan said the Church was the handmaid of the pope, Bellamrine adds that whatever doctrine it pleases the pope to prescribe the Church must receive; there can be no question raised about proving it; she must blindly renounce all judgment of her own, and firmly believe that all the pope teaches is absolutely true, all he commands absolutely good, and all he forbids simply evil and noxious. For the pope can as little err in moral as in dogmatic questions. Nay, he goes so far as to maintain that if the pope were to err by prescribing sins and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to consider sins good and virtues evil, unless she chose to sin against conscience; so that if the pope absolve the subjects of a prince from their oath of allegiance, which, according to Bellamrine, he has a full right to do, the Church must believe that what he has done is good, and every Christian must hold it a sin to remain any longer loyal and obedient to his sovereign. Through the influence of Bellamrine and other writers of his order, the infallibility hypothesis now made immense strides. One great stumbling block had, however, to be removed. Every theologian, on closer inspection, found papal decisions which contradicted other doctrines, laid down by popes or generally received in the Church, or which appeared to him doubtful, and it seemed impossible to declare all these products of an infallible authority.

It became necessary, therefore, to specify some distinctive marks by which a really infallible decision of a pope might be recognized, or to fix certain conditions, in. the absence of which the pronouncement is not to be regarded as infallible. And thus, since the 16th century, there grew up the famous distinction of papal decisions promulgated ex cathedra, and therefore dogmatically, and without any possibility of error. By means of this ingenious distinction, some of the most inconvenient decisions of popes, which it was desirable to except from the privilege of infallibility generally asserted in other cases could be explained away. Thus pope Honorius, in the dogmatic letter which was condemned as heretical by the sixth ecumenical council, and the decision addressed by Nicolas I to the Bulgarian Church that baptism administered simply in the name of Jesus is valid, were declared to be judgments given by the popes as private persons. A number of other limitations were proposed by the theologians advocating infallibility, but only two were.  commonly received, viz. Bellarmine's, that the papal decree must be addressed to the whole Church; and Cellot's, that he must anathematize all who dissent from his teaching. According to this doctrine, which is taught by the most prominent dogmatic writer of the order in the present century, Perrone (Proelect. Theolog. 8, 497, Louvain, 1843), and received by pretty nearly the whole order; the pope is liable to err when he addresses an instruction to the French or German Church only; and, moreover, his infallibility becomes very questionable whenever he omits to denounce an anathema on all dissentients. Since the time of Bellarmine, the infallibility hypothesis has been one of the chief distinctions of the Jesuits and the most radical portion of the Ultramontane party on the one hand, and all other schools within the Catholic Church on the other. A number of synods, bishops, and prominent theologians, and in some instances the whole Catholic Church of several countries, put themselves on record against the doctrine, for which, on the other hand, the Jesuits and other Ultramontane writers incessantly strove to gain friends among bishops, clergy, and laity, and, in particular, among the sovereigns.

When pope Pius IX intimated his intention to convoke a council for the definition of the doctrine, a number of bishops, especially in France and Germany, declared themselves to be decidedly opposed to the doctrine, and at least one of them, the French bishop Maret (bishop of Sura in partibus infid., and dean of the theological faculty of Paris), published an elaborate work (On the General Council and the public Peace) to refute it, and to prove that it would subvert the very foundation of the Church. The substance of his argument against papal infallibility is as follows: According to the holy Scriptures the Church is a limited monarchy, which stands under the common rule of the pope and the bishops. The history of the councils is at least as much in favor of the divine right of the bishops as of the supremacy of the holy chair. Freedom of discussion, vote by majority, a juridical examination of the apostolic decrees, and in certain cases a right to condemn the doctrines and the person of the pope — these are rights which prove beyond all doubt the participation of the bishops in the sovereign powers of the holy father. But these rights do not extend far enough to give the episcopal body a supremacy over the pope, and the latter therefore exercises, in general, all the privileges of supremacy. He summons the council, presides over it, dissolves it, and sanctions its decrees. In a word, he always remains the head of the Church. If, however, the changes desired by a certain school are made, the Church will cease to  be a limited, and become an absolute monarchy. This would be a complete revolution; but what is truly divine is unchangeable, and, consequently, if the constitution of the Church is changed, it ceases to be divine. Pius IX, in his bull Ineffabilis Deus, has himself, said of doctrine, Crescat in eodem sensu, in eadem sententia; but the new dogma would lead to a development of doctrine in alio sensu, in alia sententia. It would therefore amount to a denial of the divinity of the Church. “If it were realized,” exclaims the bishop, “what a triumph would it be to the enemies of the Church! They would call the asseverations of centuries, and history itself, as witnesses against Catholicism: she would be crushed by the weight of opposing testimony; the holy Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils would rise in judgment against her. They would bury us in our shame, and from the desert atheism would rise more powerful and threatening than ever” (2, 378).

When the council met (Dec. 8. 1869) it was soon found that there were, with regard to this question, three parties among the bishops: one, which regarded the promulgation of this new doctrine as the best and most urgent work the council should attend to; the second, which petitioned the pope against this doctrine, which they believed would be at least a great stumbling block for all non-Catholics, and even for a great many members of the Catholic Church; the third, which was in favor of a compromise, would have some regard for the arguments adduced by the second class, and therefore, instead of promulgating in unmistakable and bold clearness the doctrine of papal infallibility, would attain the same end in a less offensive way, by inculcating the duty of an absolute submission to every decision of the pope in matters of faith. The majority of the bishops signed a petition for the promulgation of infallibility, which had been drawn up by the German bishop of Paderborn, and received 410 signatures. The counter address (or, rather, counter addresses) against the infallibility was signed by 162 bishops, among whom were 20 Americans, 46 Frenchmen, 37 Germans and Austrians, 19 Orientals, 2 Portuguese, 14 Hungarians, 3 Englishmen, and 15 Italians.

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

One of the most learned Church historians of the Roman Catholic Church, professor Döllinger, of the University of Munich, in a letter addressed to the Augsburger Zeitung, and since published as a pamphlet in an enlarged form (Erwagungen fur die Bischiof des Concils, Ratisbon, 1869), subjected the address of the bishops who asked for the promulgation of infallibility to the most crushing criticism, Dr. Döllinger says of this petition of the champions of papal infallibility that henceforth “one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be forced, on pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments, and everlasting damnation, to believe and to profess that which hitherto the Church has not believed, not taught.” The proclamation of this dogma, he says, would be an “alteration  in the faith and doctrine of the Church such as has never been heard of since Christianity was first founded.” The whole foundation of the Church would thereby be affected. Dr. Döllinger shows conclusively that until the 16th century the doctrine of papal infallibility was entirely unknown, and that, when it was taken up by cardinal Bellarmine, it could only be supported by the testimony of Isidorian decretals, which are forged, and those of Cyril, which are a fiction.

The views of Döllinger and Gratry received the emphatic assent of the large majority of the Catholic scholars of Germany and France. The governments of France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and other Catholic countries instructed their ministers in Rome to enter an earnest protest against a doctrine which would compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the pope to choose kings and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Even some of the members of the council, in particular the cardinal archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and bishop Hefele of Rottenburg, who was regarded as the most learned bishop of the council, published pamphlets against the dogmatization of infallibility while it was discussed by the council. But all this opposition failed to make the least impression upon the majority of the bishops.

From the opening of the council, the infallibilists showed themselves so uncompromising that they refused to give to the minority even one single representative in the important commission on dogmatical questions, which, on the other hand embraced the name of every bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position as a defender of infallibility: in particular, archbishop Manning, of Westminster; archbishop Dechamps, of Malines; archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; bishop Martin, of Paderborn; bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. The discussion of the question commenced on the 13th of May. The schema was comprised in a preamble and four chapters, and was known to form the first part of the dogmatic constitution De Ecclesia Christi. The debate is known to have been long and animated, many bishops entering a very earnest protest against the promulgation of such an innovation. Bishop Strossmayer, of Bosnia and Sirmium, in Croatia; bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans, in France; archbishop Darboy, of Paris; bishop Hefele, of Rottenburg, in Wurtemberg; cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna; cardinal archbishop prince Schwarzenberg, of Prague, are mentioned as those bishops who spoke with the greatest effect against the proposed doctrine. The regulations of the  council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the proposal being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made on the schema in general, one hundred and fifty bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the pope a protest against the closing of the general discussion, as it had deprived the council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments against the new doctrine.

The discussion of the schema as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole schema by name, with placet, or placet juxta modum, or non-placet. The result was as follows: 451 placets, 62 placets juxta modum, and 88 non-placets. Some of the placets juxta modum recommended the insertion of words that would make the decree clearer and stronger. The schema was accordingly altered, and the amendments were retained in the general congregation, held Saturday, July 16. The final step was then taken, in the fourth public session of the council, on the 18th of July. The roll of the members was again called, when 534 answered placet, 2 replied non-placet, and 106 were absent, some because sick, the far greater number not willing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known officially to Pius IX, he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, “Wherefore,” he continued, “by virtue of our apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read.” The following is a faithful translation of chapter iv of the schema, which treats of papal infallibility:

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

“The first law of salvation is to keep the rule of true faith. And whereas the words of our Lord Jesus Christ cannot be passed by, who said, Thou art  Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church (Mat 16:18), these words, which he spake, art proved true by facts; for in the apostolic see the Catholic religion has ever been preserved unspotted, and the holy doctrine has been announced. Therefore, wishing never to be separated from the faith and teaching of this see, we hope to be worthy to abide in that one communion which the apostolic-see preaches, in which is the fill and true firmness of the Christian religion.” [Formula of St. Hormisdas, pope as proposed by Hadrian II to the fathers of the eighth General Council (Constantinople, IV), and subscribed by them.]

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

In order to fulfill this pastoral charge, our predecessors have ever labored unweariedly to spread the saving doctrine of Christ among all the nations of the earth, and with equal care have watched to preserve it pure and unchanged where it had been received. Wherefore the bishops of the whole world, sometimes singly, sometimes assembled in synods, following the long-established custom of the churches (St. Cyril, Alexand., and St. Caelest. Pap.), and the form of ancient rule (St. Innocent I to Councils of Carthage and Milevi), referred to this apostolic see those dangers especially which arose in matters of faith, in order that injuries to faith might best be healed there where the faith could never fail (St. Bernard, epistle 190). And the Roman pontiffs, weighing the condition of times and circumstances, sometimes calling together general councils, or asking the judgment of the Church scattered through the world, sometimes consulting particular synods, sometimes using such other aids as divine Providence supplied, defined that those doctrines should be held which, by the aid of God, they knew to be conformable to the holy Scriptures and the apostolic  traditions. For the Holy Ghost is not promised to the successors of Peter that they may make known new doctrine revealed by him, but that, through his assistance, they may sacredly guard and faithfully set-forth the revelation delivered by the apostles, that is, the deposit of faith. And this their apostolic teaching all the venerable fathers have embraced, and the holy orthodox doctors have revered and followed, knowing most certainly that this see of St. Peter ever remains free from all error, according to the divine promise of our Lord and Savior made to the prince of the apostles: I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren (Conf. St. Agatho, Ep. ad Imp. a Conc. AEcum. VI approb.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

According to the opinion of Dr. Döllinger, more has been written on this subject during the last one hundred and thirty years than on any other point of Church history during fifteen hundred years. The most important work on the subject, that of Janus (The Pope and the Council), as well as the works of Maret, Döllinger, Maistre, and several works of former centuries, have already been noticed. Other important works treating on the subject are Ballerini, De Vi ac Ratione Primatus; Schrader (Jesuit), De Unitate Romana (vol. 1, Freiburg, 1862; vol. 2, Vienna, 1866); Philipp, Kirchenrecht (vol. 5); Rudis, Petra Romana (Mentz, 1869); Deschamps (archbishop of Malines), L'Infallibilite du Pape (Malines, 1869); Gratry, Lettres stur L'Infallibilite du Pape (Paris, 1869, 1870); Weninger (Jesuit), The Infallibility of the Pope (Cincinnati, 1869); Hergenrdther Anti-Janus (Wurzburg, 1870); Frohshammer. Zur Wurdigung der Unfehlbarkeit des Papstes und d. kirchle (Munich, 1869); Bickell, Gründe fur die Unfehlbarkeit des Kirchenoberhaluptes (Miinster, 1870); Rauscher (carlinal archbishop of Vienna), Observationes quaedum de infailibilitatis ecclesice subjecto (Naples, 1870, against the dogmatization of infallibility); Kleutgen (Jesuit), De Romani Pontifis Suprema potestate docendi (Naples, 1870); Schmitz, 1st der Papst perssnlich unfehlbar (Munich, 1870). The  fullest account of the proceedings of the council relative to the dogmatization of infallibility is given in Quirinus, Rinzische Briefe vom Concil (Munich, 1870). (A.J. S.)

## Infant Baptism[[@Headword:Infant Baptism]]

             SEE BAPTISM; SEE PAEDOBAPTISM.

## Infant Communion[[@Headword:Infant Communion]]

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

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

In the Greek Church we find passages of some theologians, which in their exposition of the doctrine of baptism would seem to imply that they rejected this necessity of infant communion based on John vi; 53; for they designate the former sacrament, as a purification through the blood of Christ, a partaking of the Lamb of God, etc. Yet infant communion was one of the early practices in that church, as is evident from the fact that in the Apostolic Constitutions (viii, 12) mothers are recommended to bring  their children with them to communion, and children are counted among those who partake of the Lord's Supper (viii, 13). (Comp. Stanley, Hist, of the Eastern Church, p. 118,119.) This custom is also defended by Pseudo- Dionysius (Hier. Ecc 7:11) against the profane, who considered it ridiculous. The Greek Church still upholds infant communion. According to Metophanes Kritopulos (Conf. Ecc. Gr. c. 9), children (βρἐφη), after they are baptized, should commune whenever their parents do.

The Roman Church and all Protestant churches now agree in rejecting infant communion. Nevertheless, there have been a few advocates of the practice even among Protestants in modern times. Among the most prominent of them is Pierce (Essay on the Eucharist, London, 1504), who argues for the practice (1) on the ground of primitive usage; (2) from Scripture. The latter argument is “that Christians succeeding to the Jews as God's people, and being grafted upon that stock, their infants have a right to all the privileges of which they are capable, till forfeited by some immoralities; and, consequently, have a right to partake of this ordinance, as the Jewish children had to eat of the Passover and other sacrifices; besides this, he pleads those texts which speak of the Lord's Supper as received by all Christians. The most obvious answer to all this is that which is taken from the incapacity of infants to examine themselves, and discern the Lord's body; but he answers that this precept is only given to persons capable of understanding and complying with it, as those which require faith in order to baptism are interpreted by the Paedobaptists.

As for his argument from the Jewish children eating the sacrifice, it is to be considered that this was not required as circumcision was; the males were not necessarily brought to the Temple till they were twelve years old (Luk 2:42); and the sacrifices they ate of were chiefly peace offerings, which became the common food to all that were clean in the family, and were not looked upon as acts of devotion to such a degree as our Eucharist is; though, indeed, they were a token of their acknowledging the divinity of that God to whom they had been offered (1Co 10:18); and even the Passover was a commemoration of a temporal deliverance; nor is there any reason to believe that its reference to the Messiah was generally understood by the Jews. On the whole, it is certain there would be more danger of a contempt arising to the Lord's Supper from the admission Of infants and of confusion and trouble to other communicants; so that, not being required in Scripture, it is much the best to omit it. When children are grown up to a capacity of behaving decently, they may soon be  instructed in the nature and design of the ordinance; and if they appear to understand it, and give proof of love to Christ, it would be advisable to admit them to communion, though very young; which, by the way. might be a good security against many of the snares to which youth are exposed.” See Augusti, Bandbuch d. christl. Archaöl. 2, 639 sq.; Bihmer, Die christlich-kirchliche Aterthumswissenschoft, 2, 365 sq.; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 7, 549 sq.; Zorn, Historia Euclaristice Ifantium (Berlin, 1736, 8vo); Knapp, Theology, § 144; Doddridge, Lectures on Divinity, lect. 207; Neander, Church History, 1, 311: 315, 2, 319; 3:496; Smith, Account of the Gr. Church, p. 161; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 15, ch. 3:§ 7; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. 21:§ 8; Neander, Hist. of Dogmas, p. 242; Gieseler, Dogmengeschichte, p. 542.

Infanticide is the term for the act or practice of murdering infants, which was very general among the ancients, and which still prevails among rude nations. The Greeks and Romans, with all their high notions of civilization, were guilty of favoring this horrible practice--by legislative enactments, and Plato and Aristotle are found among its supporters. Thus, at Sparta, the law required that a child, immediately after birth, was to be exhibited to the authorities for inspection, and if its look was not wholesome, or its limbs crippled, “it was thrown into a deep cavern at the foot of the mountain Taygetus; and it was said that this law had a wholesome effect, for it made women with child very careful as to their eating, drinking, and exercise, and hence they proved excellent nurses. In the other Grecian republics a similar disregard of the life of sickly infants was shown.” Among the Romans it seems to have been the duty of the father to decide the fate of his newborn babe. Among the Norse a somewhat similar rule determined the life of the infant. If weak, or of the weaker sex, the father not infrequently “disapproved of its living, and it was exposed to die by wild beasts or the weather.” Among the barbaric tribes, child-murder prevails most extensively.

Thus it is general throughout the whole of the South-Sea Islands, and is even a regular system among the Fijians (q.v.). In Vanu Levu, we are informed by a recent authority “the extent of infanticide reaches nearer two thirds than one half of all the children born.” Among the people of India, especially the Hindus, as well as the Brahmans, this evil prevailed to a very great extent, due no doubt, in a great measure, to the national prejudice of remarriage of a widow (compare Max Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, 2, 312). But, since the rule of the English, laws ‘have been enacted likely to modify the practice, if not to  cheek it altogether. “The Rajputs, it is said, destroy all the female children but the first-born-a peculiar custom, due to its being a point of honor with a Rajput to nearly ruin himself in the marriage feast and portion of his daughter, so that he could not afford to have more than one. The Mohammedans were inclined to the same practice, but effected their object by-means of abortion. In New Holland the native women think nothing of destroying by compression the infant in the womb, to avoid the trouble of rearing it alive. In China infanticide is supposed to be common, the chief cause being said to be the right of periodically repudiating their wives which is possessed by Chinamen. Some statistics, recently published in the Esperance of Nancy, indicate the fearful extent to which life is lost through this practice prevailing in so vast a population as that of China.” Newcomb (Cyclop. of Missions, p. 487) says, “It is computed from authentic data that not less than 9000 children are exposed in the streets of Peking every year, and as many more in the provinces, and that it is a part of the duty of the police to carry away in carts, every morning, those that have been exposed at night, some of whom are yet alive; but they are all carried to a pit without the walls, and buried promiscuously.”

In Japan, poverty of the parent is deemed an admissible excuse for the destruction of an infant's life, and in Greenland the infant is buried with the mother, if she dies in or shortly after childbirth. The South American women commit the same atrocity as the poor parents of Japan. In Africa the Bushmen follow the practices that we detailed as prevalent among the ancient Greeks and Romans; and so frequent has been the practice of feeding lions with infants' flesh, that “it has greatly increased the desire of the lion for human flesh.” “In Madagascar the fate of the infant depends upon the calculation of lucky and unlucky days.” Among the North American Indians infanticide has also prevailed, and does still prevail very extensively. The lower castes of the Natchez Indians on the lower Mississippi, Brinton (Myths of the New World [N.Y. 1868, 8vo], p. 239) says, deliberately murder their own children on the funeral pyre of a son or chief to gain admittance to a higher caste. But as a principal reason of the great extent of infanticide, especially of female children, among savage tribes, Lubbock (Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of Man [London, 1870, 8vo], p. 93) assigns the scarcity of game, and tie fact that female children are only consumers, and not providers. “Under these circumstances, female children became a source of weakness in several ways. They ate, and did not hunt; they weakened their mothers when young, and when growing up were a temptation to surrounding tribes.” But while these reasons, which seem  quite plausible at the outset, may have helped to aggravate and spread the horrid crime of infanticide, it is no doubt true, after all, that the practice of child-murder is due to a false comprehension of the duties and relations of man towards his Maker.

Perverted religious teachings have done much to foster this great crime among these ignorant human beings, whom Christianity is slowly but surely convincing of the error of their ways. The benign effect of Christianity, which was so marked on the legislation of the Greco-Roman empire in the treatment of woman, and, as a natural consequence, in the treatment likewise of her offspring, is already apparent also among these uncivilized tribes. One of the maxims of modern civilization, or, rather, of Christianity, is found among the enactments of the first Christian emperor, namely, Constantine's declaration that “the killing of a child by its father, which the Pompeian law left unpunished, is one of the greatest crimes” (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 3:114). “Instead of encouraging the destruction of life, modern civilization abounds in every kind of machinery for preserving it, however unsuccessful the attempt. The chief cause which, among Christian nations, leads to infanticide, is that of shame, which, however, operates only in the case of the child being illegitimate. The parents often incur the risk of committing the crime of murder to avoid social disgrace. In order, therefore, to appreciate the force of the checks put by the law on the tendency to infanticide, the law of bastardy, the practice of instituting foundling hospitals (q.v.), and the kind and degree of the punishments attending any attempt more or less direct to destroy the child, either before or after birth, require to be taken into account. The criminal law deals with the cognate offences which make up infanticide in the following manner, whether the child is legitimate or illegitimate.

As regards the procuring of abortion, every woman who takes poison or other noxious thing, or uses instruments or other means to procure her miscarriage, is guilty of felony, and liable to penal servitude for life, or not less than three years; and so is any person who administers poison, or uses instruments upon the woman with such intent. Whoever supplies drugs, poison, or instruments for the same purpose is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to penal servitude for three years. The concealment of birth is also a criminal offence. Whoever, after a child is born, by any secret disposition of the body, endeavors to conceal its birth, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to imprisonment for two years. This is the offence which, perhaps, is most frequently committed, or at least made the subject of prosecution in such cases, as the attempt to establish the larger crime of murder to the satisfaction of a jury is frequently foiled  by the secret sympathy shown towards the mother, who is presumed to have been the victim of seduction, or otherwise wronged” (Chambers). But one of the greatest difficulties we are beginning to encounter in our own day, in several Christian lands, among which our own is perhaps the most prominent, is the practice of abortion, only another form of infanticide, so general among the so-called higher classes of society. It is really alarming to the Christian man to see how extensive this great sin has become in this country, as well as in England.

We do not deign to speak of France, for that country, in this respect at least, can scarcely make the profession of being a Christian land. Houses for abortion are among us in the best parts of the largest cities. They are kept with the approval of our citizens, and are suffered to further a crime which must sooner or later prove the greatest curse that has yet befallen us. Mr. Greenwood, in his Seven Curses of London, speaks of “baby farming” as “a mischief of gigantic extent.” Recent statistics, and, indeed, the unblushing advertisements of abortionists, male and female, in the daily prints, proclaim the equally fearful extent of the crime of infanticide in our own land. It is high time that the clergy raise their voice against this varied form of feticide, which ‘threatens to decimate the population in the higher classes, and is poisoning the moral sense of outwardly respectable families. (J. H. W.)

## Infant Jesus, Daughters of the Congregation of the[[@Headword:Infant Jesus, Daughters of the Congregation of the]]

             is an order in the Romish Church which has its seat at Rome. It owes its origin to Anna Moroni, a native of Lucca, who, having come to Rome entirely destitute, succeeded by her industry and economy in securing a competency. In more advanced years, her charitable feelings prompted her to establish an institution where poor girls should be instructed in. such female work as would enable them to earn a livelihood. A priest, Cosmus Berlintani, and other members of the clergy, approved of her plan, and afforded her much assistance. By their joint efforts it was finally established as a regular institution, and in 1673 pope Clement X acknowledged the existence of the society, gave it bylaws, and endowed it with sundry particular privileges, under the appellation of “Daughters of the Infant Jesus.” The number of the “Daughters” allotted to each convent was fixed at 33, in commemoration of the number of years Jesus lived upon earth. The novitiate lasts three years; the sisters make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Such' as may wish to leave the convent are allowed to do  so before taking the vows, but, in that case, they are to leave to the convent all they brought to it at their admission. Prayers and fasts are strictly enforced. The regular habit of the order consists of a wide, dark brown dress, and a white hood. There also existed in former times an organization whose members bore the name of “Sisters of the good Jesus;” these, in the earlier part of the 15th century, were transformed from a lay association into a regular order, and supported themselves by suitable avocations. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6, 615.

## Infant Membership[[@Headword:Infant Membership]]

             SEE MEMBERSHIP IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

## Infant Regeneration[[@Headword:Infant Regeneration]]

             SEE REGENERATION.

## Infant Salvation[[@Headword:Infant Salvation]]

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

“Theologians have pursued two different methods in treating of this subject. (a.) Some are content with saying that God will pardon and save infants on account of the merits of Christ, which extend to all, although they may not have believed in Christ during their lifetime; and that their being born with natural depravity will not harm them, because they themselves are not to blame for it. These writers refer to Rom 5:15-17 for an analogous proceeding. This is the most simple and safest view.  (b.) Others, misunderstanding the passage Mar 16:16, suppose that faith in Christ is an indispensable requisite for salvation in all men, and have therefore (together with some schoolmen) embraced the doctrine of faith of infants, which they have variously explained and described as fides praesumpta, implicita, per baptismum m sine verbo (some say sine cognitione) inftsa; talis affectio in infante qualis Deo placeat. The schoolmen describe it as dispositio adjustitiam. But none of them succeed in conveying any intelligible idea. Nothing is said in the N.T. about such a faith. Faith always presupposes knowledge and power to exercise the understanding. Now, since children have neither of these requisites, faith cannot be ascribed to them; nor, indeed, disbelief, unless the word is used very improperly. The mere want of faith is not damnable, but unbelief only, or the guilty destitution of faith. Those who have adopted this view have thus been compelled (as appears from the preceding remarks) to vary the idea which is uniformly attached to the word faith where adults are referred to, as soon as they speak of children, and call something in them by this name which is nowhere else so denominated. The passage Mat 18:6, does not bear upon this point, since the-disciples of Christ are there meant. SEE BAPTISM. From the words of Christ, however, Mat 19:14, ‘Of such is the kingdom of God,' it is clear that he considers children as belonging to his kingdom. And this is enough” (Knapp, Theology, p. 423).

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

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

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

## Infel[[@Headword:Infel]]

             SEE INFULA.

## Inferential Theology[[@Headword:Inferential Theology]]

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

## Inferie[[@Headword:Inferie]]

             were sacrifices which the ancient Romans offered at the tombs of their deceased relatives at certain periods, consisting of victims, wine, milk, garlands of flowers, etc.

## Inferior Clergy[[@Headword:Inferior Clergy]]

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

## Infeudation[[@Headword:Infeudation]]

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

## Infidel[[@Headword:Infidel]]

             (ἄπιστος, 2Co 6:15; 1Ti 5:8), an unbeliever, as elsewhere rendered.

## Infidelity[[@Headword:Infidelity]]

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

I. Various Forms of Infidelity. — Pearson, in his excellent prize essay on Infidelity, its Aspects, Causes, and Agencies (Lond. 1860, 8vo), classifies the forms of modem infidelity as follows:  1. Atheism, or the denial of the divine existence;

2. Pantheism, or the denial of the divine personality;

3. Naturalism, or the denial of the divine government;

4. Spiritualism, or the denial of the divine redemption. To these may be added, what belong more properly to practical than to theoretical infidelity,

5. Indifferentism, or the denial of man's responsibility; and,

6. Formalism, or the denial of the power of godliness.

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

(1.) Rationalism. — “Infidelity, scarcely fashioned, and perhaps hardly conscious of its own true character, but yet really existing and putting forth some degree of energy, appears in the form of a rationalistic rejection of Christian doctrine. In this form, having reference rather to the substance of the Gospel than to its proofs and evidences, infidelity is susceptible of such diversified modifications, and assumes so many disguises, that it may. sometimes escape detection, and is often in a disposition to repel, with logical correctness, the charges which may be justly brought against it by those who perceive its real tendency and nature. The faintest, but still dangerous phase of this rationalistic spirit consists in the habit of making an arbitrary choice and selection of dogmas to be believed by those who professedly, and with more or less sincerity, accept the Christian revelation as a whole. From this unhealthy state or mind the transition is too easy to a systematic elevation of reason above all the notices of revelation; that is, to rationalism applied to the whole substance of the Gospel. This takes place when men systematically require that revealed truth shall be, not only not contradictory to sound reason, which is justly to be expected, but that it shall be in accordance with the independent notions of reason or deductions of the understanding.”

With the class of thinkers who have this tendency most prominently affiliates Mr. Leckey, who has lately published a History of Rationalism (London, 2 vols. 8vo). His aim, and that of his school, evidently is to reduce Christianity to a system of ethics, and deprive it of its supernatural character, holding that the contest between the champions and the adversaries of religion is no longer to be fought, as it  was in the 16th and 17th centuries, upon points of dogmatic theology, and that the dogmatic forms of the Protestant churches are no longer the efficient antagonists of the Church of Rome. Nor are the free-thinkers of the present day to be confounded with those of the old Voltairean school in France, or with the English Deists of the last century. Their system is no longer exclusively negative and destructive, but, on the contrary, intensely positive, and, in its moral aspect, intensely Christian. It embraces a series of essentially Christian conceptions-equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the education of the poor, the abolition of slavery, the diffusion of liberty. It revolves around the ideal of Christianity, and represents its spirit without its dogmatic system and its supernatural narratives. From both of these it unhesitatingly recoils, while deriving all its strength and nourishment from Christian ethics. Hardly conscious of its own character, as Mr. Riddle tells us, modern Rationalists go forth under such leaders as Leckey, and declare that “the idolatry of dogmas will pass away,” and that “Christianity, being rescued from sectarianism and intolerance that have defaced it, will shine by its own moral splendor, and, sublimated above all the sphere of controversy, will assume its rightful position as an ideal, and not a system; as a person, and not a creed.” We see this great result, which Mr. Leckey succeeds in picturing, in a somewhat modified form, in the efforts of the free-thinkers of our land, especially since the last meeting of the “Free Religious Association,” more particularly in the abolition of the Sunday laws for certain purposes in the city of Boston, inaugurated first by the followers of Theodore Parker. SEE RATIONALISM.

(2.) Spiritualism. — “But while Rationalism appears to have lost much of its former reputation, there is another method of arriving at the same end which finds acceptance in the minds of many persons at the present day. These men are not Rationalists; they are so-called Spiritualists. They do not deny the great truths which lie on the very surface of the sacred record; nor do they disavow the fact of a divine revelation, and so leave man entirely to the dictates of his reason, and the conclusions of his understanding, with the additional aid to be derived from his fellow- creatures, all uninspired like himself. But their theory is this. There is, say they, a revelation made from God to man, but it is only subjective, inward, to the already existing spiritual life, or religious consciousness of humanity: the inspiration by which this life or consciousness is awakened is common to every man who will wait and seek for it; and as to religious truth, it is simply that which individuals, or the mass of humanity, so far as their  powers have been heightened by the divine afflatus, are able to apprehend. According to this system, we are not to suppose that the Gospel announces positive spiritual facts, such, for example, as that which is usually understood by the atonement; but it propounds ideas which may be differently received by different men, and will possess a power and value according to the spiritual mould into which they may be cast. Now, in this Spiritualism, let it be observed, there is nothing original or new. This system is, in substance, only one of those phases of unbelief which have appeared-and disappeared at intervals from the earliest ages of Christianity, but which, thanks be to God, have never yet succeeded in making the Gospel obsolete, and in robbing mankind of the knowledge of salvation. It is, however, fraught with danger, and its power of mischief arises, in no small degree, from its capability of disguise. It can put on the semblance of Christian truth; it can comply with any form of words, even the soundest form, in creeds and confessions drawn up with the greatest fidelity and care.” (Comp. Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 5 sq.) SEE SPIRITUALISM.

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

(4.) Deism. — “This is a class of anti-Christian principles well known as having prevailed in England chiefly in the last century.” Infidelity in this form no longer appears as mere philosophy, or speaks in the accents of calm or lofty speculation. It includes, indeed, some attempts at historical and verbal criticism, and makes some show of wisdom suited to the age in which it flourished; but, for the most part, it opens its mouth in blasphemy, and proclaims aloud the sentiments of an evil and ungodly heart. For, whether we ‘consider the ignorant misrepresentations of Paine, the sneers of Gibbon, or the scoffings of Voltaire, it is impossible not to perceive that  their opposition to the Gospel is founded upon moral repugnance and distaste. Their writings are a clear echo of that rebellious sentiment, ‘We will not have this man to reign over us' (Luk 19:14). And, so far as the school of infidelity continues to subsist, we find its adherents, for the most part, among men of depraved moral habits, of low taste and uncultivated intellect reveling very often in the haunts of profligacy and vice, or filled with political rancor, and struggling against the restraints of all laws, human and divine.” (Comp. Materland, Works, 5, 4 sq.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, 1, 38 sq.) SEE DEISM.

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

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

II. Causes of Infidelity. — The chief source of infidelity is undoubtedly a moral one. “It is evident,” remarks Pearson (Modern Infidelity, pt. 2, ch. 1), “that unbelief, generally speaking, can originate in only one of two sources; either in a deficiency of evidence, or in a state of mind and heart on which the clearest and strongest evidence has no power. The causes of infidelity, we are persuaded, are more ethical than intellectual. This  persuasion is greatly strengthened by the perusal of some of the productions of our modern infidel writers.” “Nothing can be more contemptible,” says professor Garbett (Mod. Philosoph. Infidelity, p. 5), “than the argumentative resources of modern infidelity. It does not reason, it only postulates; it dreams and it dogmatizes. Nor can it claim invention.” This testimony is true. Indeed, we venture to assert, that the general strain of argument brought to bear against Christianity by its modern assailants would not be tolerated for a moment within the province of purely literary criticism. The strong determination to withstand everything in the shape of reasonable evidence contrasts very much with the feeble argumentation by which many of the truths of religion are set aside. Be it atheism or pantheism, naturalism or spiritualism, indifferentism or formalism, the will has much to do with it. Moral evidence is the appropriate proof of moral truth. All moral evidence is cumulative; but, however strong it may be, it is never irresistible. An indocile mind can ward it off. The existence of God, SEE GOD does not admit of demonstration, but moral certainty. SEE EVIDENCE.

So the personality of God, though much more rational than pantheism, does not admit of mathematical demonstration. Christianity is based upon evidence. The reason why evidence is necessary-is to be found in our moral constitution as rational, discriminating, accountable agents; and in the fact that, from the existence of evil in the world, we were otherwise liable to deception in reference to our highest interests. It could never be a man's duty to believe in a revelation claiming to itself the authority of heaven, unless that revelation bore, legibly on its front, heaven's signature, or was in some way attended with heaven's evidencing power. The evidence that attests the truth of Christianity, vast, varied, and of great cumulative power though it be, is not, however, irresistible. No man is warranted to expect it to be so. Faith is a moral act, and, while resting on a strong groundwork of proof, it must have some difficulties over which to triumph. Origen, speaking of the difficulties in the Bible revelation, and of those in the revelation of nature, says: “In both we see a self-concealing, self-revealing God, who makes himself known only to those who earnestly seek him; in both are found stimulants to faith, and occasions for unbelief.” “There is light enough,” says Pascal, “for those who sincerely wish to see, and darkness enough for those of an opposite description.” Mr. Newman tells us it “supersedes the authoritative force of outward miracles entirely” to say that “a really overpowering miraculous proof would have destroyed the moral character of faith.” This, however, is not argument, but a foolish dogmatic assertion.  The Christian miracles are of “a convincing and stupendous character,” and yet not so overpowering as the axiom that a whole is greater than its part; and we lack sagacity to perceive where lies the contradiction between these statements. Evidence is obligatory on man, not because it is overpowering or irresistible, but because it preponderates.

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

For further information, see the different articles referred to above, and also the articles SEE EVIDENCES OF CHRISTIANITY; SEE PARKER; SEE POSITIVISM; SEE UNBELIEF. See also Garbett, Modern Philosophical Infidelity; Rogers, Reason and Faith; Rogers, Eclipse of Faith; Riddle, Natural History of Infidelity (Bampton Lect. for 1852, 8vo); Thomson, Aids to Faith (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Morgan, Christianity and Modern Infidelity (London, 1854, 12mo); Pearson, Prize Essay on Infidelity (Lond. 1860, 21st edition); London Review, No. 5, art. 1; Ch. of  England Review, Oct. 1854, art. 3; Wharton, Theism and the Modern Skeptical Theories (Phila. 1859,12mo); Saintes, History of Rationalism (Lond. 1849, 8vo); Christian Review, 3, 134; North British Review, 15, 18; Princeton Review, 12, 31; Nelson, Cause and Cure of Infidelity (N. Y. 12mo); Godwin, Philosophy of Atheism (Lond. 1853); Van Mildert, Boyle Lectures on the Rise and Progress of Infidelity (Lond. 1820, 2 vols. 8vo); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism (2nd ed. N. Y. 1866, 8vo); Hagenbach, German Rationalism (N. York, 1865); Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought (N. Y. 1863, 8vo); Evangel. Quart. Rev. 1865, p. 162 sq.; Mercersb. Rev. July, 1869; Meth. Quart. Review, 1863, p. 687 sq.; 1864, p. 682 sq.

## Infinite[[@Headword:Infinite]]

             SEE ATTRIBUTES; SEE GOD.

## Infinity[[@Headword:Infinity]]

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

I. The Indefinite. — Besides the definite consciousness of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an indefinite consciousness which cannot be formulated. Besides complete thoughts, and besides the thoughts which, though incomplete, admit of completion, there are thoughts which it is impossible to complete, and yet which are real, in the sense that they are normal affections of the intellect. Positive knowledge, however extensive it may become, does not and never can fill the whole region of possible thought. At the uttermost reach of discovery there arises, and must ever arise, the question, What lies beyond? Regarding science as a gradually increasing sphere, we may say that every addition to its surface does but bring it into wider contact with surrounding nescience. There is always something which forms alike the raw material of definite thought, and remains after the definiteness which thinking gave to it has been destroyed (H. Spencer, First Principles, p. 21 sq., 88, 90 sq.). This vague element in thought, which is ineradicable, Spencer considers to be the groundwork of the feeling of awe, and-of natural religion. It is the infinite in this sense, the attempt to conceive which involves a contradiction in terms; which can only be believed to exist, but can never become an object to consciousness. “If all thought is limitation; if whatever we conceive is, by the very act of conception, regarded as finite, the infinite, from a human point of view, is merely a name for the absence of those conditions under which thought is  possible” (Mansell's Bampton Lectures, p. 48; comp. p. 30, 63, 80, 118; see esp. notes on p. 48 and 51, 4th ed.).

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

(a) From the unlimited duration of time;

(b) from the possibility of perpetually subdividing magnitudes;

(c) from the continuance of growth and decay in nature;

(d) from the fact that limitation is always relative, and never absolute; and

(e), “the strongest proof of all,” from the inability to conceive a limit to number, magnitude, and space.

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

It follows from this that, if infinity is an idea realizable by the mind, it must be conceived in some other way than as a linear series; it must be capable of an expression which is at once definite, and yet preserves the true character of infinity. Mathematical science does this by ‘the summation of an infinite series in a finite expression, and manipulates both the infinite and the infinitesimal as terms having a definite meaning in calculation. The possibility of conceiving the infinite as complete may be seen more easily from the consideration that any object which we can see, handle, imagine,  conceive, without any difficulty, e.g. a fruit, or a stone, is really-the sum of an infinite number of parts into which it may be divided, an infinite, therefore, which is not merely coming into existence, but actually exists here and now. Regarded, too, under the aspect of a term in the line of causation, any object in nature sums up an infinite series in itself. For, as an effect, it is the result of all previous causes, and, as a cause, the germ of all succeeding effects.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) On the other hand, it would be a reversal of the true order to conceive the infinite to be, as its etymology suggests, the mere negation of the finite, and, as such, a secondary and derived idea. On such a supposition it becomes impossible to explain how we become conscious of limitation at  all. How, it may be asked, do we know that thought is finite if we know nothing first of the infinite? How is the consciousness of limitation possible except as the negation of what is unlimited? The infinite is thus, as the condition of the finite, prior and positive; the finite, as the limit excluded, included, self-imposed by the infinite, posterior and negative.

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

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

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

(1) The double image is dismembered. The symbol of Thales is water alone; of Anaximander, the void in suspense; of Anaximenes, the atmosphere of Xenophanes, the globe of the sky.  (2) The infinite is not pictured as preceding the emergence of finite things, but as underlying the process of nature, as it is ordinarily known.

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

## Infirmary, Monastic[[@Headword:Infirmary, Monastic]]

             In his enumeration of Christian duties Benedict (Regula, c. 4) specifies that of visiting the sick; and elsewhere he speaks of it as a duty of primary and paramount obligation for monks, quoting the words of Christ, "I was sick, and ye ministered unto me." Beyond, however, saying that the sick are to have a separate part of the monastery assigned to them, and a separate officer in charge of them, that they are to be allowed meat and the luxury of baths, if necessary, that they are not to be exacting, and that the brethren who wait on them are not to be impatient, he gives no precise directions Subsequently it was the special duty of the "infirmarius," the "cellerarius" (house-steward), and of the abbot himself, to look after the sick; no other monk might visit them without leave from the abbot or prior. Everything was to be done for their comfort, both in body and soul, that they should not miss the kindly offices of kinsfolk and friends; and, while the rigor of the monastic discipline was to be relaxed, whenever necessary, in their favor, due supervision was to be exercised, lest there should be any abuse of the privileges of the sick-room. The "infirmarius" was to enforce silence at meals, to check conversation in the sick-room at other times, and to discriminate carefully between real and fictitious ailments. The sick were, if possible, to recite the hours daily, and to attend mass at stated times, and if unable to walk to the chapel, they were to be carried thither in the arms of their brethren. The meal in the sickroom was to be three hours earlier than in the common refectory. The abbot might allow a separate kitchen and  "buttery" for the use of the sick monks. The rule of Caesarius of Aries ordered that the abbot was to provide good wine for the sick, the ordinary wine of the monastery being often of inferior quality. SEE HOSPITAL.

## Infirmerer[[@Headword:Infirmerer]]

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

## Informers[[@Headword:Informers]]

             This class of men originated before the Christian sera, and, indeed, before the establishment of the Roman empire. When persecution arose against the Church, the informers naturally sought gain, and probably some credit with the civil authorities, by giving information against those who practiced Christian rites, since the secret assemblies of Christians for worship came under the prohibition of the Lex Julia. Tertullian states (Apol. c. 5) that Tiberius threatened the accusers of the Christians, but the story rests only upon his statement. He also claims M. Aurelius as a protector of Christians. Titus issued an edict, forbidding slaves to inform against their masters or freedmen against their patrons. Nerva, on his accession, republished this edict. "Jewish manners," i.e., probably Christianity, is especially mentioned as one of the subjects on which informations were forbidden. In Pliny's well-known letter to Trajan we find the informers in full work. The Christians who were brought before him were delated, and an anonymous paper was sent in, containing a list of many Christians or supposed Christians. Trajan, in his answer, though he forbade Christians to be sought out (i.e., by government officials), did not attempt to put a stop to the practice of delation; those who were informed against, if they continued in their infatuation must be punished. In the subsequent persecutions a large part of the suffering arose from unfaithful brethren who betrayed their friends. SEE DELATORES.

## Infralapsarians[[@Headword:Infralapsarians]]

             SEE SUBLAPSARIANS.

## Infula[[@Headword:Infula]]

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

## Ingathering, Feast of[[@Headword:Ingathering, Feast of]]

             SEE FESTIVALS; SEE TABERNACLES, FEAST OF.

## Inge, Hugh, D.D[[@Headword:Inge, Hugh, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was born at Shepton Mallet, in Somersetshire, educated in William of Wickham's school at Winchester, and made perpetual fellow of New College, Oxford, in 1484. In 1496 he travelled in foreign countries. On his return he was successively prebendary of East Harptree, subchanter of the Church of Wells, warden of Wapulham, in the diocese of Lincoln, of Duttying, in Somersetshire, by the presentation of Richard the Abbot and the convent of Glastonbury, and of Weston. In 1504 he was in Rome, at which time he was one of king Henry's orators, selected to take the renunciation of all prejudicial clauses in the apostolic bulls for the translation of cardinal Hadrian to the see of Bath and Wells, and his oaths  of fealty and allegiance to that monarch. In 1512 he was appointed bishop of Meath, where he remained ten years. In 1521 he was promoted to the see of Dublin. In 1527 he was made chancellor of Ireland. He repaired the palace of St. Sepulchre. Hedied in Dublin, August 3, 1528. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 182.

## Ingelheim[[@Headword:Ingelheim]]

             is the name of a place at which a church council (Concilium Igelenheinmense) was held June 27. 948, under the presidency of the Roman legate Marinus, and in the presence of the German emperor Otho I and king Louis Outremer. The principal business of the council was the punishment of Hugo, count of Paris, whom it excommunicated. It also decided that no layman should present a clerk to a church, or dispossess him, without the consent of the bishop; that the whole of Easter week be kept as a festival, and the three days following Whitsunday; that St. Mark's day be kept with fasting on account of the great litany, as was done on the rogation days preceding the feast of the Ascension: and that all differences  as to tithe be settled in an ecclesiastical synod, instead of granting this power to the civil courts. — Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 267.

## Ingelram[[@Headword:Ingelram]]

             (called also by some Newbigging), a Scotch prelate, was rector of Peebles and archdeacon of the Church of Glasgow, and when in this office he was made chancellor by king David. He was elected and consecrated bishop of the see of Glasgow in 1164. He died February 2, 1174, leaving, Epistolae ad Diversos: — In Evangelia Dominicalia: — Rationes Regni Administrandi. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 233.

## Ingelramne[[@Headword:Ingelramne]]

             a German prelate, brought up in the schools of Goze and St. Anold, was made bishop of Metz in 768, being at the same time abbot of Senones. He died in 791. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ingen[[@Headword:Ingen]]

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

## Ingen (2)[[@Headword:Ingen (2)]]

             a hero-god of Japan, was a native of China, who lived about 1650. He was a zealous Buddhist, and was looked upon as an illustrious saint. But he was more especially venerated because, in answer to a kito, or special prayer which he offered, a plentiful rain had fallen in a time of drought.

## Ingersoll, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Ingersoll, Edward, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal. clergyman, was born at New Haven, Connecticut, November 26, 1810. He graduated from Yale College in 1831; became minister at Westport, also at Troy and Genesee, N.Y.; rector of Trinity Church, Buffalo, in 1834, a. position which he retained for thirty years, and died there, February 6, 1883.

## Ingham, Benjamin[[@Headword:Ingham, Benjamin]]

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

Within a few years, the number of “Inghamite” societies reached eighty-four. In 1741, Mr. Ingham married Lady Margaret Hastings, sister to the earl of Huntingdon, (on which he removed his residence from Ossett to Abberford, where he continued to reside till his  death. After forming this connection, he was so far from relaxing in his exertions to preach the Gospel that he greatly extended the sphere of his operations, and, in process of time, may be said to have evangelized all the surrounding country. Ingham was admitted to Wesley's Conference in Leeds, but the precise relation of his societies to the Wesleyan body was never defined. He had his own Conferences also, and at one of them was elected a general overseer, or bishop. Lady Huntingdon, who could not approve all the disciplinary features of his ‘societies, attempted to promote a union of them with Wesley, and she sent Whitefield to Newcastle-upon- Tyne to meet the Wesleys for consultation on the subject. Charles assented, but John declined the overture, very wisely, as events demonstrated.

In 1759, Ingham read “Sandeman's Letters on Theron and Aspasio,” and “Glas's Testimony of the King of Martyrs.” These works produced such an impression on his mind that he deputed two of his preachers to Scotland to learn more fully the views of their authors. At Edinburgh they met Sandeman, and Glas at Dundee. They returned converts to the Sandemanian principles, and immediately spread discontent and disputes among the societies. Ingham's authority could not control the partisan violence which soon broke out. He called in the assistance of his friends. The countess of Huntingdon wrote them letters. Whitefield used his influence to save them. Romaine hastened into Yorkshire, but could not restrain them. Ingham attempted to excommunicate the disturbers, but it was an endless task. The whole order was wrecked and sunk. Thirteen societies only remained from more than eighty which had flourished with all the evidences of permanent prosperity. Ingham seems to have remained a Sandemanian (q.v.), and developed his views in a Treatise on the Faith and Hope of the Gospel (1762). He died in 1772. Some of his societies came to the Wesleyan Church; others united with the Daleites (q.v.), a class of Scotch Independents. See Stevens, History of Methodism, 1, 390 sq.; Tyerman, Oxford Methodists, p. 57-154.

## Ingham, Richard, D.D[[@Headword:Ingham, Richard, D.D]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born at Stansfield, Yorkshire, in 1810. For some years he was a student at Oxford University, and afterwards in the academy of the celebrated Rev. Daniel Taylor, in London. He was baptized November 20, 1829; ordained deacon of a Baptist Church, December 26, 1832; licensed to preach, April 5, 1833; gave up his secular business in 1835, and pursued a course of theological study at Wisbeach; was ordained April 2, 1839, in Bradford, and remained pastor of the Tetley Street Church till November 1847, when he removed to Louth. His next pastorate was in Halifax, from 1854 to 1862. After two or three brief pastorates in other places, he returned to Bradford and became pastor of the Infirmary Street Church. His death took place June 1, 1873. He published, in 1865, his Hand-book on Christian Baptism, and in 1871 his Christian Baptism,  its Subjects and Modes. He also published his Appeal to Friends, on the subject of baptism. At the time of his death he had completed an extended work on the Church Establishment. Dr. Ingham filled a high place among the scholars and preachers of that branch of English Baptists with which he was identified, the "General Baptists," corresponding in most respects with the Freewill Baptists of the United States. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1874, page 277. (J.C.S.)

## Inghamites[[@Headword:Inghamites]]

             SEE INGHAM.

## Inglis, Alexander[[@Headword:Inglis, Alexander]]

             a Scotch prelate, dean of Dunkeld, archdeacon of St. Andrews, and keeper of the rolls, was. chosen bishop of Dunkeld in 1483. But the pope, being displeased because he had not been consulted first, annulled the election. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 91.

## Inglis, Charles, D.D[[@Headword:Inglis, Charles, D.D]]

             was born in Ireland about the year 1733. Emigrating to America, he took charge of the Free School at Lancaster, Pa., previous to 1759, and, having decided to enter the ministry, he went to England for ordination. The  Society for the Propagation of the Gospel appointed him their missionary at Dover, Del., his field embracing the whole county of Kent, including three churches. In 1765 he became assistant minister of Trinity, N. Y., and catechist to the Negroes. He received the honorary degree of A.B. from King's College, N.Y., in 1767, and those of A.M. and D.D. from Oxford some years later. ‘In the progress of the Revolution he took part with the Tories, and in 1775 replied to Paine's Common Sense by a pamphlet which was so offensive to the “Sons of Liberty” that they committed it to the flames. When preaching before Washington, in the same year, he refused to omit the prayer for the king and the royal family. After the Declaration of Independence he caused his church to be closed, and took refuge in Flushing, then in possession of the Royalists. He was chosen rector of Trinity, N. Y., in 1777. In consequence of many losses during the Revolution and political differences, he found it necessary finally to leave the country. In 1783 he sailed for Nova Scotia, of which province he was appointed- bishop in 1787, as the first colonial bishop of the Church of England. He resided at Halifax till his death, Feb., 1816. He published Two Sermons; and a Letter in “Hawkins's Historical Notices.” — Sprague, Annals, 5, 186; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 932.

## Inglis, David, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Inglis, David, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Reformed (Dutch), and afterwards a Presbyterian minister, son of Reverend David Inglis, was born June 8, 1824. He graduated from the University of Edinburgh in 1841; studied divinity under Drs. Chalmers and John Brown; was licensed by the Presbytery of Carlisle in 1845, and came to America in 1846. He served the Presbyterian Church in the following places Scotch Church, Detroit, Michigan (1846); stated supply at Washington Heights, New York city; Bedford, N.Y. (1847); St. Gabriel Street, Montreal, Canada, in July, 1852; Hamilton, Ontario (1855); professor of systematic theology in Knox College, Toronto (1871); pastor of Reformed Church, Brooklyn Heights (1872), where he died, December 15, 1877. Dr. Inglis was a powerful and eloquent preacher of the great truths of the gospel. He was prominent in the deliberations to further the union of the different branches of the Presbyterian Church of Canada, in the success and consummation of which he greatly rejoiced. His publications are, Exposition of International Sunday-school Lessons in Sower and Gospel Field (1874-77): — Historical Sermon in Commemoration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of the Church on Brooklyn Heights (1875): — many contributions to the press: — Vedder Lectures, in course of preparation at his death. See Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church in America, 3d ed. page 317.

## Inglis, James, D.D[[@Headword:Inglis, James, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1777. He graduated from Columbia College in 1795; studied theology privately, and was licensed to preach by the New York Presbytery in 1801. In 1802 he accepted a call to the First Presbyterian Church of Baltimore. He died August 15, 1820. He published, A Sermon on Fasting, Humiliation, and Prayer (1808 ): — A Missionary Sermon, preached in Philadelphia in 1812: — and a Discourse, delivered in the First Presbyterian Church of Baltimore in 1814. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:278.

## Inglis, John[[@Headword:Inglis, John]]

             a bishop of the Church of England, was born in New York city, December 9, 1777, where his father, Charles Inglis, D.D., was rector of Trinity Church. He received his education at King's College, Windsor. In 1800 he went to England to advance the interests of his alma mater; in 1801 he took orders, and was appointed to the mission of Aylesford. In 1816, Reverend Dr. Stanser, rector of St. Paul's, became bishop of Nova Scotia, and Dr. Inglis succeeded him as rector, and, in 1825, to the bishopric of Nova Scotia, which at that time included New Brunswick, Newfoundland, and Bermuda. He died in London, October 27, 1850. See Amer. Quar. Church. Rev. 1851, page 154.

## Inglis, John, D.D[[@Headword:Inglis, John, D.D]]

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

## Ingnersoit[[@Headword:Ingnersoit]]

             are the spirits of fire among the Greenlanders and live along the strand. They were formerly human beings, but when the flood came they were changed into spirits of fire.

## Ingraham, Ira[[@Headword:Ingraham, Ira]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Cornwall, Vt., Dec. 1, 1791, and educated at Middlebury College, where he graduated in 1815. After teaching for a time in the Southern States, pursuing also his theological studies, he was licensed to preach by the Addison Association, Addison. Vt., June 3, 1819. May 1820, the Congregational church in Orvill was offered him, and he was there ordained June 20, 1820. He left this charge in 1822, and after supplying several pulpits, and acting for a brief period as agent of the “Presbyterian Education Society,” he was installed over the Congregational church at West Bradford, Mass., Dec. 1,1824. In 1830 he removed to Brandon, Vt., and in 1834 left that place to assume the duties  of secretary of the Vermont Domestic Missionary Society. In 1839 he accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Lyons, N. Y. In 1848 he returned to the church at Brandon, but declined to be reinstalled, and finally accepted the position as agent of the “Society for the promotion of Collegiate and Theological Education at the West,” making Western New York his field of labor. He retired from this and all other active work five years after, and only preached at intervals. He died April 9,1864. Ingraham published five sermons (1826,1843,1844,1847, and 1848). — Congregational Quarterly, 1864, p. 300.

## Ingraham, Joseph H., D.D[[@Headword:Ingraham, Joseph H., D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Portland, Maine, in 1809. He entered Yale College, but did not graduate; went to Buenos Ayres, South America, as a commercial clerk; was for several years after his return a teacher; and about 1830 became professor in Jefferson College, near Natchez. While here he was witlely known as a writer of novels, etc., as The South-west, by a Yankee: — Lafitte: — Burton: — The Quadroon, etc. About 1847 he was confirmed as a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at Nashville, Tennessee, where he established a flourishing seminary for young ladies. He was ordained deacon in 1851, and presbyter  in 1852; became missionary at Aberdeen, Mississippi; afterwards was rector of St. John's Church, Mobile, Alabama; then at Riverside, Tennessee; removed to Holly Springs, in 1858, where he revived St. Thomas's Hall. He died there, December 18, 1860. Besides various religious pamphlets, Dr. Ingraham was the author of, The Prince of the House of David: — The Pillar of Fire: — and The Throne of David, which were very popular. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1861, page 186.

## Ingram, Robert[[@Headword:Ingram, Robert]]

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

## Ingulphus[[@Headword:Ingulphus]]

             the celebrated abbot of Croyland. long considered the author of the Historia Monasterii Croylandensis, is supposed to have been born at London about A.D. 1030. According to the account of his life in his history, he was educated at the University of Oxford. He was a great favorite of Edgitha, the wife of Edward the Confessor, and visited duke William of Normandy at his own court in 1051. About 1064 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On his return he entered the monastery of Fontanelle, in Normandy, and there remained till 1076, when he was invited to England by the Conqueror, and made abbot of Croyland. He died Dec. 17, 1109. The Historia Monasterii Croylandensis was printed by Savile (in the collection Script.) at London in 1596, and in a more complete edition by Gale (Rer. Angl. Script. Vet.), at Oxford, in 1684. An English translation of it was furnished by Riley in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. “Some writers, even, of the last century questioned the entire  genuineness of the book, though skepticism did not often proceed further than the hypothesis of interpolations by a later writer; but in 1826, the late Sir Francis Palgrave, in an article in the Quarterly Review, endeavored to prove that the whole so-called history was little better than a novel, and was probably the composition of a monk in the 13th or 14th century. His conclusions have been, on the whole, almost universally adopted.” See Chamber's Encyclopedia, 5, 579; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, v, 625 sq.

## Inheritance[[@Headword:Inheritance]]

             (frequently חֵלֶק,-che'lek, a “portion” or providential bestowment; but properly and usually some form of the verbs יָרִשׁ, yarash, to possess; נָחִל, nachal, to possess; κληρονομέω, to get by lot). God, as the creator of the earth, gave it to man to be held, cultivated, and enjoyed (Gen 1:28 sq.; Psa 115:16; Ecc 5:9); not to any favored portion of our race, but to the race itself-to man as represented by our great primogenitor, to whom the use of the divine gift was first graciously vouchsafed. The impression which the original gift of the earth was calculated to make on men, the Great Donor was pleased, in the case of Palestine, to render, for his own wise purposes, more decided and emphatic by an express re-donation to the patriarch Abraham (Gen 13:14 sq.). Many years, however, elapsed before the promise was fulfilled. Meanwhile the notices which we have regarding the state of property in the patriarchal ages are few and not very definite. The products of the earth, however, were at an early period accumulated and held as property. Violence invaded the possession: opposing violence recovered the goods.

War soon sprang out of the passions of the human heart. The necessity of civil government was felt. Consuetudinary laws accordingly developed themselves. The head of the family was supreme. His will was law. The physical superiority which he possessed gave him this dominion. The same influence would secure its transmission in the male rather than the female line. Hence, too, the rise of the rights of primogeniture. In the early condition of society which is called patriarchal, landed property had its origin, indeed, but could not be held of first importance by those who led a wandering life, shifting continually, as convenience suggested, from one spot to another. Cattle were then the chief property (Gen 24:35). But land, if held, was held on a freehold tenure; nor could any other tenure have come into existence till more complex and artificial relations arose,  resulting, in all probability, from the increase of population and the relative insufficiency of food. When Joseph went down into Egypt, he appears to have found the freehold tenure prevailing, which, however, he converted into a tenancy at will, or, at any rate, into a conditional tenancy. Other intimations are found in Genesis which confirm the general statements which have just been made. Daughters do not appear to have had any inheritance. If there are any exceptions to this rule, they only serve to prove it by the special manner in which they are mentioned. Thus Job is recorded (Job 42:15) to have given his daughters an inheritance conjointly with their brothers. How highly the privileges conferred by primogeniture were valued may be learned from the history of Jacob and Esau. In the patriarchal age doubtless these rights were very great. SEE BIRTHRIGHT.

The eldest son, as being by nature the first fitted for command, assumed influence and control, under his father, over the family and its dependents; and when the father was removed by death, he readily, and as if by an act of Providence, took his father's place. Thus he succeeded to the property in succeeding to the headship of the family, the clan, or the tribe. At first the eldest son most probably took exclusive possession of his father's property and power; and when, subsequently, a division became customary, he would still retain the largest share-a double portion, if not more (Gen 27:25; Gen 27:29; Gen 27:40). That in the days of Abraham other sons partook with the eldest., and that, too, though they were sons of concubines, is clear from the story of Hagar's expulsion: “Cast out (said Sarah) this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac” (Gen 21:10). The few notices left us in Genesis of the transfer of property from hand to hand are interesting, and bear a remarkable similarity to what takes place in Eastern countries even at this day (Gen 21:2-2; cf. Gen 23:9 sq.). The purchase of the Cave of Machpelah as a family burying-place for Abraham, detailed in the last passage, serves to show the safety of property at that early period, and the facility with which an inheritance was transmitted even to sons' sons (comp. Gen 49:29). That it was customary, during the father's lifetime, to make a disposition of property, is evident from Gen 24:35, where it is said that Abraham had given all he had to Isaac. This statement is further confirmed by Gen 25:5-6, where it is added that Abraham gave to the sons of his concubines “gifts, sending them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country.” Sometimes, however, so far were the children of unmarried females from being dismissed with a gift, that they shared, with  what we should term the legitimate children, in the father's property and rights. SEE CONCUBINE.

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

The original promise made to Abraham of the land of Palestine was solemnly repeated to Isaac (Gen 26:3), the reason assigned being because “Abraham obeyed my voice and kept my charge, my commandments, my statutes, and my laws,” while it is expressly declared that the earlier inhabitants of the country were dispossessed and destined to extermination for the greatness of their iniquity. The possession of the Promised Land was embraced by Isaac in his dying benediction to Jacob (Gen 28:3-4) to whom God vouchsafed (Gen 28:15; see also Gen 35:10-11) to give a renewed assurance of the destined inheritance. That this donation, however, was held to be dependent for the time and manner of its fulfillment on the divine will, appears from Gen 33:18, where Jacob, on coming into the land of Canaan, bought for a hundred pieces of money “a parcel of a field, at the hand of the children of Hamor.” Delayed though the execution of the promise was, confidence never deserted the  family of Abraham, so that Joseph, dying in the land of Egypt, assured his brothers that they would be visited by God and placed in possession of Canaan, enjoining on them, in this conviction, that, when conducted to their possession, they should carry his bones with them out of Egypt (Gen 50:25).

A promise thus given, thus repeated, and thus believed, easily, and indeed unavoidably, became the fundamental principle of that settlement of property which Moses made when at length he had effected the divine will in the redemption of the children of Israel. The observances, and practices too, which we have noticed as prevailing among the patriarchs, would, no doubt, have great influence on the laws which the Jewish legislator originated or sanctioned. The land of Canaan was divided among the twelve tribes descended through Isaac and Jacob from Abraham. The division was made by lot for an inheritance among the families of the sons of Israel, according to the tribes, and to the number and size of families in each tribe. The tribe of Levi, however, had no inheritance; but forty-eight cities with their suburbs were assigned to the Levites, each tribe giving according to the number of cities that fell to its share (Num 33:50; Num 34:1; Num 35:1). The inheritance thus acquired was never to leave the tribe to which it belonged; every tribe was to keep strictly to its own inheritance. An heiress, in consequence, was not allowed to marry out of her own tribe, lest property should pass by her marriage into another tribe (Num 36:6-9); This restriction led to the marriage, of heiresses with their near relations: thus the daughters of Zelophehad “were married unto their father's brother's sons,” “and their inheritance remained in the tribe, of the family of their father” (Num 36:11-12; comp. Joseph. Ant. 4, 7, 5). In general cases the inheritance went to sons, the first-born receiving a double portion, “for he is the beginning of his father's strength.” If a man had two wives, one beloved, the other hated, and if the firstborn were the son of her who was hated, he nevertheless was to enjoy “the right of the first-born” (Deu 21:15). If a man left no sons, the inheritance passed to his daughters; if there was- no daughter, it went to his brothers; in case there were no brothers, it was given to his father's brothers; if his father had no brothers, it came into possession of the nearest kinsman (Num 27:8). The land was Jehovah's, and could not, therefore, be permanently alienated. SEE HUSBANDRY.

Every fiftieth year, whatever land had been sold returned to its former owner. The value and price of land naturally rose or fell in proportion to the number of years there were to elapse prior to the ensuing fiftieth or jubilee year. If he who sold the land, or a kinsman, could redeem the land before the year of  jubilee, it was to be restored to him on his paying to the purchaser the value of the produce of the years remaining till the jubilee. Houses in villages or unwalled towns might not be sold forever; they were restored at the jubilee, and might at any time be redeemed. If a man sold a dwelling- house situated in a walled city, he had the option of redeeming it within the space of a full year after it had been sold: but if it remained unredeemed, it belonged to the purchaser, and did not return to him who sold it even at the jubilee (Lev 25:8; Lev 25:23). The Levites were not allowed to sell the land in the suburbs of their cities, though they might dispose of the cities themselves, which, however, were redeemable at any time, and must return at the jubilee to their original possessors (Lev 27:16). SEE LAND.

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

## Inhibition[[@Headword:Inhibition]]

             (Lat. inhibitio, from inhibeo, restrain) is in some churches “a writ by which an inferior is commanded by a superior ecclesiastical authority to stay the proceedings in which it is engaged. Thus, if a member of a college appeals  to the visitor, the visitor inhibits all proceedings against the appellant until the appeal is determined. When the archbishop visits, he inhibits the bishop of the diocese; when the bishop visits, he inhibits the archdeacon; which inhibitions continue in force until the last parish is visited. If a lapse happens while the inhibition is in force against the bishop, the archbishop must institute; institution by the bishop would be void, as his power is suspended.”

## Iniquity[[@Headword:Iniquity]]

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

## Initial Hymn[[@Headword:Initial Hymn]]

             SEE INTROIT.

## Initiati[[@Headword:Initiati]]

             a name applied to the faithful in the early Christian Church, as being initiated, that is, admitted to the use of sacred offices, and to the knowledge of the sacred mysteries of the Christian religion. Hence the fathers, in speaking of any doctrines which were not explained to the catechumens, were accustomed to say, "The initiated know what is said." St. Ambrose addressed a work especially to the Initiati.

## Initiation[[@Headword:Initiation]]

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

## Injury[[@Headword:Injury]]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Ink[[@Headword:Ink]]

             (דְּיוֹ, deyo', so called from its blackness, Jer 36:18; Gr. μέλαν, black, 2Co 3:3; 2Jn 1:12; 3Jn 1:13). The most simple, and hence probably the most ancient mode of preparing ink was a mixture of water with charcoal powdered, or with soot, to which gum was added. The Hebrews made use of different colors for writing, as did also the ancient Egyptians, and some of the books of the former are stated by Josephus to have been written in gold. The mode of writing mentioned in Numbers 5, 23, where it is said that “the priest shall write the curses in a book and blot them out with the bitter water,” was with a kind of ink prepared for the purpose, without any calx of iron or other material that could make a permanent dye; these maledictions were then washed off the parchment into the water, which the woman was obliged to drink: so that she drank the very words of the execration. The ink still used in the East is almost all of this kind; a wet sponge will completely obliterate the finest of their writings. The ancients used several kinds of tinctures as ink; among them that extracted from the cuttle-fish, called in Hebrew תְּכֵֵֶלת, tekeleth.

Their ink was not so fluid as ours. Demosthenes reproaches AEschines with laboring in the grinding of ink, as painters do in the grinding of their colors. The substance found in an inkstand at Herculaneum looks like a thick oil or paint, with which the manuscripts had been written in a sort of relievo, visible in the letters when a leaf is held to the light in a horizontal  direction. Such vitriolic ink as has been used on the old parchment manuscripts would have corroded the delicate leaves of the papyrus, as it has done the skins of the most ancient manuscripts of Virgil and Terence in the library of the Vatican;' the letters are sunk into the parchment, and some have eaten quite through it, in consequence of the corrosive acid of the vitriolic ink with which they were written. SEE WRITING.

## Ink-horn[[@Headword:Ink-horn]]

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

## Inlaga[[@Headword:Inlaga]]

             are a class of spirits whose worship forms the most prominent feature in the superstitious practices of Southern Guinea. They are the spirits of dead men; but whether good or evil, even the natives themselves do not know. The spirits of their ancestors the natives call Abambo; but the Inlaga are the spirits of strangers, and have come from a distance. Sick, and especially nervous, persons are supposed to be possessed with one or the other of these classes of spirits, and various ceremonies are performed to deliver them from their power. The patient is first tested by the priest, to ascertain which class of spirits has possession of him; he is then exorcised, and when sufficiently recovered, sent about his affairs, but under certain restrictions, lest his disease return..

## Inn[[@Headword:Inn]]

             (מָלוֹן, mnaldn, Gen 42:27; Gen 43:21; Exo 4:24, a lodging- place, as elsewhere rendered; κατάλυμα, Luk 2:7, a place for loosing the beasts of their burden, rendered “guest-chamber,” Mar 14:14;  Luk 23:11; πανδοχεῖον, Luk 10:34, a place for receiving all comers). Inns, in our sense of the term, were, as they still are, unknown in the East where hospitality is religiously practiced. The khans, or caravanserais, are the representatives of European inns, and these were established but gradually. It is doubtful whether there is any allusion to them in the Old Testament. The halting-place of a caravan was selected originally on account of its proximity to water or pasture, by which the travelers pitched their tents and passed the night. Such was undoubtedly the “inn” at which occurred the incident in the life of Moses narrated in Exo 4:24. It was probably one of the halting-places of the Ishmaelitish merchants who traded to Egypt with their camel loads of spices. Moses was on his journey from the land of Midian, and the merchants in Genesis 37 are called indiscriminately Ishmaelites and Midianites. At one of these stations, too, the first which they reached after leaving the city, and no doubt within a short distance from it, Joseph's brethren discovered that their money had been replaced in their wallets (Gen 42:27).

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

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

“The house of paths” (Pro 8:2, ἐν οἴκῳ διόδων, Ven. Vers.), where Wisdom took her stand, is understood by some to refer appropriately to a khan built where many ways met and frequented by many travelers. A similar meaning has been attached to גֵּרוּת כַּמְהָם, geruith Kimham, “the hostel of Chimham” (Jer 41:17) beside Bethlehem, built by the liberality of the son of Barzillai for the benefit of those who were going down to Egypt (Stanley, Sin. and Palest. p. 163; App. § 90). The Targum says, “which' David gave to Chimham, son of Barzillai the Gileadite” (comp. 2Sa 19:37-38). With regard to this passage, the ancient versions are strangely at variance. The Sept. had evidently another reading with בand גtransposed, which they left translated γαβηραχαμάα, Alexand. γηβηρωθχαμάαμ. The Vulgate, if intended to be literal, must have- read גֵּרַים בְּכַמ, peregrinantes in Chanaam. The Arabic, following the Alexandrian MS., read it ἐν γῇ Βηρωθχαμάαμ, “in the land of Berothchamaam.” The Syriac has bedre,  “in the threshing-floors,” as if בְּגָּרְנוֹת, begornoth. Josephus had a reading different from all, בְּגַדנְרוֹת, begidroth, “in the folds of” Chimham; for he says the fugitives went “to a certain place called Mandra” (Μάνδρα λεγόμενον, Ant. 10, 9, 5), and in this he was followed by Aquila and the Hexaplar Syriac.

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

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

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

II. Sphere. — The German inner missions endeavor to promote infant, secular, and Sunday school associations, institutions of refuge, intercourse with the families, etc. They at the same time take part in the social questions of the day, and labor to systematize the aid given to the poor, to promote personal intercourse between the giver and the receiver, the purification of morals; and for these purposes they have established female benevolent associations, diaconies, nurseries, labor societies, etc. The influx of communistic ideas they seek to counterbalance by establishing schools for apprentices and adults, societies for the education of servants, both male and female, and for the propagation of good books. They oppose unchristian and unecclesiastical tendencies by promoting the study of the Scriptures, establishing family worship, awakening religious feelings in the families, organizing book and tract societies, sending out colporteurs and street preachers, and opposing prostitution, drunkenness, and all other immorality. They discountenance revolution as subversive of political organization, and as the enemy of religion and of morality: in this  department they act through political speeches and the press, in raising the standard of popular literature, and especially by their influence over the rising generation. They also attend to the prisons, trying to promote Christian love in the hearts of the officers entrusted with their charge, and forming persons for that office in their institutions. Aside from the protective associations for culprits who have finished their time of imprisonment, they endeavor also to establish asylums for them.

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

The interest of Germany in the cause of inner missions has of late greatly increased. The Congress for Inner Missions, which in 1848 was organized in connection with the Church Diet (Kirchentag), has ever since held annual or biennial general meetings in connection with the sittings of the Church Dict. At these meetings reports are made on the condition of  religious life in Germany, and the proper remedies for the existing evils are discussed. The establishment of houses of refuge and of Christian lodging- houses, the care of the poor and of discharged prisoners, the solution of the social question, the extension of Young Men's Christian Associations, and of Bible and other religious societies, are the chief subjects which engage the attention of every congress. In addition to the General Congress for Inner Missions, a number of provincial associations for the same purpose have been organized. Thus a South-western Conference for Inner Missions was established in 1865; a central association for the inner mission of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the kingdom of Saxony in 1868. The Central Committee for Inner Missions, which is elected at every meeting of the Congress for Inner Missions, and is composed of some of the most prominent clergymen and laymen of Germany, endeavors to carry out the resolutions of the congresses, and to invoke the proper legislation of the state government for the suppression of vice and immorality, especially of prostitution. Germany has a number of papers advocating the cause of inner missions, the most important of which, the Flieggende Blatter fur innere Mission, is published by Wichern (established in 1850). See also Merz, Armuth u. Christenthum (1841); Wichern Denkschijft (1849); Braune, Fünf Vorlesungen (1850); Buss (Roman Catholic), Die Volksmissionen (1851); Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 8:919. For a fuller account of the subject, especially with regard to America, Eng. land, and other countries, SEE MISSIONS, HOME.

## Innes, John (1)[[@Headword:Innes, John (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated I bishop of the see of Moray, Janaury 23, 1407. He died April 25, 1414. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 142.

## Innes, John (2)[[@Headword:Innes, John (2)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was dean of Ross, and bishop of the see of Caithness about 1447. He died in 1448. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 214.

## Innocent[[@Headword:Innocent]]

             (prop. נָקַי, άθῶος). The Hebrews considered innocence as consisting chiefly in an exemption from external faults committed contrary to the law hence they often join innocent with hands (Gen 37:22; Psa 24:4). “I will wash my hands in innocency” (Psa 26:6).; “Then have I cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency” (Psa 73:13). Josephus admits of no other sins than those actions which are put in execution (Ant. 12:7, 1). Sins in thought, in his account, are not punished by God. This is a very different standard of morality from that of the Gospel (Mat 5:28; Joh 3:15), or even of the O.T. (Psa 51:6). To be innocent is used sometimes for being exempt from punishment. “I will not treat you, as one innocent” (Jer 46:28); literally, ‘I will not make thee innocent; I will chastise thee, but like a kind father. Jeremiah (Jer 49:12), speaking to the Edomites, says, “They who have  not (so much) deserved to drink of the cup of my wrath, have tasted of it.” Nah 1:3 declares that “God is ready to exercise vengeance; he will make no one innocent; he will spare no one;” (Exo 34:7, Heb.), “Thou shalt make no one innocent;” no sin shall remain unpunished. “With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure” (Psa 18:26); thou treatest the just as just, the good as good; thou never dost confound the guilty with the innocent.

## Innocent (2)[[@Headword:Innocent (2)]]

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

## Innocent I, St[[@Headword:Innocent I, St]]

             a native of Albano, near Rome, became pope April 27, 402, as successor of Anastasius I, St. Chrysostom had just been driven from Constantinople and exiled to Bithynia in consequence of his zeal against the Arians, and of his attacks against the empress Eudoxia. Innocent I at once actively took his part, and sought to have the affair referred to a council of the joint bishops of the Eastern and Western churches. Failing in this, he next attempted an arrangement with the emperor, but his envoys were ill-treated, and accomplished nothing. ‘St. Chrysostom died in the meantime, but Innocent resolved to cease all intercourse with Constantinople until justice was done to his memory. The Western Church was itself in a state of great disturbance; in Africa the Donatists (q.v.) were giving much trouble, and Innocent ‘finally caused them to be condemned by the Council of Carthage (405); in Rome Vigilantius opposed the abuses introduced into the Church, such as the celibacy of the priests, the worship of images, and monastic life. At the same time Alaric was marching with the Goths against Rome: the Christians fled to their churches, and Innocent permitted the heathen to offer up sacrifices to their gods; but prayers and sacrifices proved in vain, and the pope was obliged to pay to Alaric the ransom of the city, which was nevertheless taken by the barbarians Aug. 24, 410, and sacked. It was retaken, but plundered the following year by Astolf, Alaric's brother-in- law. After the Gothshad left the neighborhood of Rome, Innocent I, who had sought refuge with the emperor at Ravenna, returned to the city, and by his efforts to restore its prosperity gained a great many heathens to the Church. He commanded that Sundays should be considered fast days as well as Fridays, enjoined celibacy on the priests, and took repressive measures against the Macedonians. His course against the Pelagians seems to have been variable. Schaff says that he commended the Africans, who had condemned Pelagianism in two synods (Carthage and Mileve, now Melas), for having addressed themselves to the Church of St. Peter to obtain an approval for their acts, but that he refrained from giving  judgment. He died March 12. 417, was canonized, and ranks among the highest saints of the Roman Catholic Church. He is commemorated on July 28. His decretals are to be found in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, and the most complete collection of his letters in Schonemann's Pontificum Romans epistole genuince. Labbe, Concil. 2, 1245-1308, gives thirty of his letters. Gennadio, in De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, ch. 3, ascribes to him the Decretum occidentalium et orientalium ecclesiis adversus Pelagianos datum, published during the reign of his successor, Zozimus I. See Bruys, Hist. des Papes (1735, 5 vols. 4to), 1, 160; Labbe and Cossart, Sacrosancta Concilia (1671, 15 vols. fol.), 2, 1241-1553; Baronius, Annales, 6, 401-632; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, 5, ch. 21; Vossius, Histor. Pelag.; H. de Noris (Norisius), Histoire du Pelagianisme; Alletz, Hist. des Papes, 1, 95; Anastasius, Vitae Roman. Pontificum, 1, 275; Ciaconius, Vite et res geste Pontificum Romanorum, 1, 63; Herzog, Real- Encyklop. 6, 662; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. 2; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 886; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, 2, 170,299,585:587; Schaff, Church History, 3:797 sq.

## Innocent II, Pope[[@Headword:Innocent II, Pope]]

             (Gregorio Papareschi), was born at Rome as one of the family of the Guidoni. He became successively abbot of the Benedictine convent of St. Nicholas at Rome, cardinal-deacon in 1118, and was finally elected pope by one party of the cardinals in 1130, as successor of Honorius II.:The other party elected Peter Leonis, under the name of Anacletus II. Innocent fled to France, where Bernard de Clairvaux caused him to be acknowledged as pope by Louis VI and by the Council of Etampes; he was soon after recognized also-by Henry II of England, by Lotharius, king of Germany, and even by the Synod of Pisa in 1134. In 1136 he returned to Rome with the emperor, and, after the death of Anacletus in 1138, was universally acknowledged as pope. He drove Arnold of Brescia out of Italy, and put king Roger under the ban, but, having taken the field against the latter, he was made prisoner at Galleccio in 1139. He was afterwards released by abandoning Sicily, Apulia, and Capua to Roger. He had also some severe conflicts with the king of France, and the Romans, having revolted against his government, re-established the senate, and declared themselves independent. In the midst of these troubles Innocent died, Sept. 23, 1143. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Fabricius, Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. et. 4, 33; Lannes, Pontificat du Pape Innocent II (Paris, 1741, 8vo);  Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 12, pt. 2, ch. 2; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, 4, 75, 144, 255.

## Innocent III[[@Headword:Innocent III]]

             (a) (Lothario Conti), by far the greatest pope of this name, was born of a noble family of Rome at Anagni in 1161. After a course of much distinction at Paris, Bologna, and Rome, he was made cardinal; and eventually, in 1198, was elected, at the unprecedented early age of thirty-seven, a successor of pope Celestine III. While at the high schools of Rome, Paris, and Bologna, he had greatly distinguished himself in the studies of philosophy, theology, and the canon law, and also by several written compositions, especially by his treatise De Miseria Conditionis Humance. “The gloomy ascetic views which he took in this work of the world and of human nature show a mind filled with contempt for all worldly motives of action, and not likely to be restrained in forwarding what he considered to be his paramount duty by any of the common feelings of leniency, conciliation, or concession, which to a man in his situation must have appeared sinful weaknesses. His ambition and haughtiness were apparently not personal.

His interest seems to have been totally merged in what he considered the sacred right of his see, ‘universal supremacy,' and the sincerity of his conviction is shown by the steady, uncompromising tenor of his conduct, and by a like uniformity of sentiments and tone throughout his writings, and especially his numerous letters.” The external circumstances of his time also furthered Innocent's views, and enabled him to make his pontificate the most marked in the annals of Rome; the culminating point of the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see. “The emperor Henry VI, king of Italy, and also of Sicily, had lately died, and rival candidates were disputing for the crown of Germany, while Constance of Sicily, Henry's widow, was left regent of Sicily and Apulia in the name of her infant son Frederick II Innocent, asserting his claim of suzerainty over the kingdom of Sicily, confirmed the regency to Constance, but at the same time obtained from her a surrender of all disputed points concerning the pontifical pretensions over those fine territories. Constance dying shortly after, Innocent himself assumed the regency during, Frederick's minority. At Rome, availing himself of the vacancy of the imperial throne, he bestowed the investiture on the prefect of Rome, whom he made to swear allegiance to himself, thus putting an end to the former, though often eluded claim of the imperial authority over that city. In like manner, being favored by the people, ever jealous of the dominion of foreigners, he drove  away the imperial feudatories, Such as Conrad, duke of Spoleti and count of Assisi, and Marcualdus, marquis of Ancona, and took possession of those provinces in the name of the Roman see.” He likewise claimed the exarchate of Ravenna; but the archbishop of that city asserted his own prior rights, and Innocent, says the anonymous biographer, ‘prudently deferred the enforcement of his claims to a more fitting opportunity.'

The towns of Tuscany, with the exception of Pisa, threw off their allegiance to the empire, and formed a league with Innocent for their mutual support. It was on this occasion that Innocent wrote that famous letter in which he asserts that, ‘as God created two luminaries, one superior for the day, and the other inferior for the night, which last owes its splendor entirely to the first, so he has disposed that the regal dignity should be but a reflection of the splendor of the papal authority, and entirely subordinate to it.” It was in the affairs of Germany, however, that Innocent's position most clearly manifested the greatness of the papal power over the destinies of the world. Setting himself up as supreme arbitrator between the two claimants who were contending for the imperial crown, he decided (in 1201) in favor of Otho because he descended from “a race (welf) devoted to the Church,” with the condition that the disputed-concession of the countess Mathilda be wholly resigned to the decisions of the holy see; and, as a- natural consequence, he proceeded at the same time to excommunicate Otho's rival, Philip. In spite of a determined resistance of Philip and his friends, which for a time seemed almost to prove successful, but which finally ended in the assassination of Philip, Innocent's triumph in Germany was complete, and his vassal emperor Otho was made temporal lord of the West. But a further triumph crowned the efforts of Innocent in Germany only a short time after.

Otho, incurring the displeasure of the pope by his estrangement from the papal see, was excommunicated and deposed in 1210, and Innocent's own ward, Frederick of Sicily, was brought forward as a candidate for the vacated throne, and finally crowned emperor at Aix- la-Chapelle, with the approval of the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215). “For the second time Innocent was triumphant in Germany. Twice he had decided an imperial election. Against one of the emperors whom he supported he had made his sentence of excommunication and deposition valid; the other he had put forward, intending him to be a mere puppet and instrument in his own hands” (Reichel). But, if Innocent proved himself a great statesman, it must be conceded also that he was very much unlike many of his predecessors, very strict and uncompromising in his notions of discipline and morality. Irregularity and venality were repressed  everywhere as soon as discovered. Thus he excommunicated Philip Augustus of France because he had repudiated his wife Ingerburga of Denmark, and had married Agnes de Meranie. “The interdict was laid on France: the dead lay unburied the living were deprived of the services of religion.

Against an antagonist armed with such weapons, even Philip Augustus, brave and firm though he ‘was, was not a match. The idea of the papal power had too firmly taken hold of men's minds; the French would gladly have remained true to their king; they dared not disobey the vicar of Christ. Besides, as in the case of Nicholas I's intervention with Lothair, Innocent's power was exercised on behalf of morality. Philip was obliged- to take back his divorced wife, not yielding, as one of his predecessors, Robert I of France (996-1031), had done, to a feeble superstition; not subdued, like ‘Henry IV, by internal dissensions, but vanquished in open fight with an opponent stronger than himself.” As we have already said, the external circumstances of that day seem to have favored Innocent, and enabled him “to assert without concealment the idea of papal theocracy;” that the pope was “the vicegerent of God upon earth;” that to him “was entrusted by St. Peter the government not only of the whole Church, but of the whole world.” “Next to God, he was to be so honored by princes that their claim to rule was lost if they failed to serve him; princes might have power on earth, but priests had power in heaven; the claim of princes to rule rested ‘on human might, that of priests on divine ordinance.' In short, all the prerogatives which had once attached to the emperors were wrested from them, and transferred, with additions, to the popes” (Reichel). The same fate that had befallen Philip Augustus threatened king Leon of Spain for a marriage of his own cousin, the daughter of the king of Portugal.

Not willing to submit to the pope's decision against such a marriage, and supported in his resolution by his father-in-law, excommunication was first resorted to, followed by an interdict on both kingdoms. Not more successful, though engaged in a much better cause, was John, king of England. John having appointed John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, to the vacant see of Canterbury, Innocent would not approve the selection, and bestowed the canonical investiture upon Stephen Langton; and the monks of Canterbury, of course, could and would receive no other archbishop. E In a fit of rage, John drove away the monks and seized their property, for which the whole kingdom was laid under an interdict; and, as John continued refractory, the pope pronounced his deposition, released his vassals from their oath of allegiance, and called upon all Christian princes and barons to invade England and dethrone the impious tyrant, promising  them the remission of their sins.

By the consequent preparation of Philip Augustus of France to carry out the pope's invitation, John was not only forced to yield the point in dispute, agreeing to submit to the pope's will and pay damages to the banished clergy, but he even took an oath of fealty to the Roman see, and at the same time delivered to the papal envoy a charter testifying that he surrendered to pope Innocent and his successors forever the kingdom of England and lordship of Ireland, to be held as fiefs of the holy see by John and his successors, on condition of their paying an annual tribute of 700 marks of silver for England and 300 for Ireland. Nor were England and Sicily the only countries over which. Innocent acquired the rights of a feudal suzerain. “In order to make his crown independent of his powerful vassals, and to baffle the claim to supremacy of the king of Castile, Peter II of Aragon voluntarily made himself tributary to the pope, binding himself and his successors to the annual payment' of 200 pieces of gold. In return, he was crowned by Innocent at Rome, and took an oath to the pope as his feudal suzerain. From innocent, too, as his liege lord, John, duke of Bavaria, accepted the kingly crown. Denmark looked to him, and obtained from him justice and redress for the injury inflicted on her royal daughter; and his legate was dispatched to Iceland, to warn the inhabitants not to submit to the excommunicated and apostate priest Severo. Perhaps it was well that in those ages there should be some recognized tribunal and fountain for royal honor; and in times of turbulence princes probably gained more than they lost by becoming the vassals of the pontiffs. Still, such power vested in the hands of an ecclesiastic was a new thing in the Church, and placed beyond dispute the greatness which the papal power had reached” (Reichel).

If, as we have seen, Innocent III would admit of no compromises with immorality and irregularity, he was certainly stern and even more unflinching in his dealings with all those who separated themselves from the body of the Romish Church. “To him, every offence against religion was a crime against society, and, in his ideal Christian republic, every heresy was a rebellion which it was the duty of the rulers to resist and repress.” To extirpate this, “the deadliest of sins,” he sent two legates, with the title of inquisitors, to France. One of them, Castelnau, having become odious by his severities, was murdered near Toulouse, upon which Innocent ordered a crusade against the Albigenses (q.v.), excommunicated Raymond, count of Toulouse, for abetting them, and bestowed his domains on Simon, count of Montfort. He addressed himself to all the faithful, exhorting them “to fight strenuously against the ministers of the old serpent,' and promising them the kingdom of heaven in reward.  He sent two legates to attend the crusade, and their letters or reports to him are contained in the collection of his “Epistles” (especially Epistola 108 of B. 12, in which the legate Anmaldus relates the taking of Beziers, and the massacre of 30,000 individuals of every age, sex, and condition). Innocent, however, who did not live to see the end of-the conflagration he had kindled, can hardly be held responsible for the fearful excesses into which it ran. In 1215 he convened a general council at the Lateran, in which he inculcated the necessity of a new crusade, which he regarded not merely as lawful, but even a most glorious undertaking in behalf of religion and piety. He also launched fresh anathemas against heretics, determined several points of doctrine and discipline, especially concerning auricular confession, and sanctioned the establishment of the two great mendicant monastic orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former to extirpate heresy, and the latter to preach sound doctrines; and to assist the parochial clergy in the execution of their duties. For if ever watchfulness was required by the clergy, it was at this time. “It was in this very century that the darkness of the Middle Ages began to disappear.

It was during this very reign of Innocent III that the gray dawn of twilight gave the first promise of modern intelligence and modern independence. Nothing could be more evident than that this spirit of independence, that was everywhere raising its menacing front… if not either subjugated or controlled, would revolutionize the whole structure of society, both feudal and ecclesiastical. To control or subjugate the new spirit was therefore the great problem presented to the Church of the 13th century” (Prof. C. K. Adanis, in the New-Englander, July, 1870, p. 376). But if, by establishing these mendicant orders, Innocent III had provided himself with willing minions to spread over Europe, and to purify the Church from “modern intelligence” and “modern independence,” he had certainly, at the same time, created for himself an opposition which afterwards became a still greater danger to the hierarchy itself, by the opposition which these mendicant orders created among the laity against the parochial clergy (compare Reichel, p. 576 sq.). It remains for us only to add one of the greatest achievements of Innocent's day, undertaken by him, no doubt, that nothing might be wanting to the completeness of his authority throughout the then known world, viz. the establishment of the Latin kingdom at Jerusalem, and the Latin conquest of Constantinople, which Ffoulkes (Christendoms's Divisions, 2, 226), while yet a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church, does not hesitate to pronounce “one of the foulest acts ever perpetrated under the garb of religion in Christian times; a  sorry connection, unquestionably, for one of his high position and commanding abilities.”

At the very commencement of his pontificate, Innocent began writing epistles (209 of B. 11) to the patriarch of Constantinople, and other letters to the emperor Alexius, with the view of inducing the former to acknowledge the supremacy of the see of Rome; and although he failed in-this, he had, soon after, by an unexpected turn of events, the satisfaction of consecrating a prelate of the Western Church as patriarch of Constantinople; but this by no means resulted, as Innocent most probably desired, in a reunion of churches or Christians; it was only followed by an increase of Church revenues. The Crusaders, whom Innocent had sent forth, as he thought, for the re-conquest of the Holy Land, after taking Zara from the king of Hungary, for which they were severely censured by the pope, proceeded to attack Constantinople, and overthrew the Greek empire. All this was done without Innocent's sanction; but when Baldwin wrote to him acquainting him with the full success of the expedition, Innocent, in his answer to the marquis of Montferrat, forgave the Crusaders in consideration of the triumph which they had secured to the holy Church over the Eastern empire. Innocent sent also legates to Calo Johannes, prince of the Bulgarians, who acknowledged his allegiance to the Roman see (Innocentii III Epistolce). One year after the Lateran Council, “one of the latest acts, and by far the most momentous in the pontificate of Innocent,” he was seized with a fatal illness, and died July 16,1216, in the very prime of life, broken down by overwork, for “the work of the whole world was upon him, as may be seen from his letters, not one of which exhibits the impress of any other mind than his own.”

In Innocent III the Romish Church lost one of the most extraordinary characters, and in several respects the most illustrious, as he was certainly one of the most ambitious she has ever honored with the pontifical dignity. His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman see. At his death, “England and France, Germany and Italy, Norway and Hungary, all felt the power of Innocent; Navarre, Castile, and Portugal acknowledged. his sway; even Constantinople owned his supremacy, and owned it to her cost” (Reichel 247; compare Hallam, Middle Ages, vol. 2, pt. 1, ch. 7:p. 199). His works, consisting principally of letters and sermons, and the remarkable treatise On the Misery of the Condition of Man, above alluded to, were published in two vols. folio (Par. 1682). See Baronius, Annales; Pagi, Breviarium Histor. — criticum; Lannes, Histoire du Pontificat du Pope Innoc. III (Paris, 1741, 12mo); Fabricius, Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. alt. 4, 93 sq.; History  of the Christ. Church, in Encyclop. Metrop. vol. 3:ch. 1; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 12:pt. 2, chap. 2; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, 4,-.43, 75, 173, 199, 207, 268, 269, 270, 272, 306, etc.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25:890; Bohringer, Kirche Christi in Biographien, 2, 2, 321; Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages (Lond. 1870, 8vo), p. 242 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christ. (see Index); Bower, History of the Popes, 6:183 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 631 sq.; English Cyclopedia, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclopedia, s.v.; Hurter, Geschichte Inn. III u. seiner Zeitgenossen (Hamburg, 1834-42,4 vols.; 3rd ed. 1845 sq.).

## Innocent III (2)[[@Headword:Innocent III (2)]]

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

## Innocent IV[[@Headword:Innocent IV]]

             (Sinibaldo de' Fieschi, of Genoa) was elected as the Successor of Celestine IV in the year 1243. In the preceding bitter quarrels between Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II, cardinal Sinibaldo had shown himself rather friendly towards the emperor; and the imperial courtiers, on receiving the news of his exaltation, were rejoicing at it; but the experienced Frederick checked them by remarking, “I have now lost a friendly cardinal, to find another hostile pope: no pope can be a Ghibelline.” Anxious, however, to be relieved from excommunication, Frederick made advances to the new pope, and offered conditions advantageous to the Roman see; but Innocent remained inflexible, and, suddenly leaving Rome, went to Lyons, and there summoned a council in 1245, to which he invited the emperor. Thaddeus of Sessa appeared before the council to answer to the charges brought by the pope against Frederick; and, after much wrangling, Innocent excommunicated and dethroned the emperor, on the ground of perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and defiance of the Church, commanded the German princes to elect a new emperor, and reserved the disposal of the kingdom of Sicily to himself. In Italy the only consequence was that the war which already raged between the Guelphs  and Ghibellines continued fiercer than before; in Germany a contemptible rival to Frederick was set up in the person of Henry, landgrave of Thuringia, who was defeated by Conrad, Frederick's son. Frederick's sudden death in Apulia, A.D. 1250, led Innocent to return to Italy, and to offer the crown of Sicily to several princes, one of whom, Richard of Cornwall, observed that the pope's offer “was much like making him a present of the moon.” Conrad, the son of Frederick, who had so valiantly and so successfully defended his cause, was excommunicated; but he gave little heed to this act of Innocent's, and even went into Italy in 1252, and took possession of Apulia and Sicily. Two years after he died, and his brother Manfred, who became regent, in a like manner baffled both the intrigues and the open attacks of the court of Rome. Innocent himself died soon after, at the end of 1254, at Rome, leaving Italy and Germany in the greatest confusion in consequence of his outrageous tyranny. and his unbending hostility to the whole house of Swabia. He was succeeded by Alexander IV. He wrote Apparatus super decretales (fol., often reprinted): — De Potestate Ecclesiasticum et Jurisdictiore Inperii: — Officium in octavis festi Nativitatis B. Marie: — Interpretationes in Vetus Testamentum. Nineteen letters of his are given by Labbe, Concil. 11, 598- 632; forty-eight by Ughelli, Italisa Sacra; and five by Duchesne, Historice Francorum Scriptores, 5, 412, 861. See Labbe and Cossart. Sacrosancta Concilia, 11, 597-716; Bruys, Hist. des Papes, 3, 199; Fleury. Histor. Ecclesiasticum; Muratori, Rerum Italicarum Scriptores, 3, 589-592; Ph. de Mornay, Hist. de la Popaute, p. 376-404; Ciaconius, Vitae et res gestae Pontificum Romanorun, 2, 99; Paolo Panza, Vita del gran Pontefice Innocenzio Quarto (Naples, 1601, 4to); Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages (London, 1870,8vo), p. 264 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:906; Engl. Cyclop.; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 13:pt. 2, chap. 2; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, 4, 76,183; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 6:668.

## Innocent IX[[@Headword:Innocent IX]]

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

## Innocent V[[@Headword:Innocent V]]

             (Peter of Tarantasia, also called Peter of Champagni or of Champagniaco) was born at Moustier, in Savoy, in 1225. He was elected pope January 20, 1276, as successor of Gregory X. He was a member of the order of Preaching Friars, into which he had entered quite young, and where he had acquired a great reputation. He succeeded Thomas Aquinas as professor of theology in the University of Paris; was made archbishop of Lyons in 1272, and afterwards bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary. As  soon as he became pope he applied himself to the task of restoring peace to Italy, which was then divided into two contending factions, under the leadership of the Guelphs and the Ghibellines (q.v.), and in this he measurably succeeded. He was also on the eve of inducing the Greek emperor, Michel Palaeologus, to confirm the act of union between the Greek and Roman churches, drawn up in the Council of Lyons, when he died June 22,1276, having occupied the papal throne only five months. He wrote commentaries Super iv libros Sentniarum (Toulouse, 1652, 3 vols. fol.): — Super Pentateuchum; super Lucam; super Epistolas Pauli (Cologne, 1478; Antw. 1617, fol.); and various treatises: De Unitate Forme; De Materia Caeli; De Alternitate Formae; De Intellectu et Voluntate; and some other MS. works, the titles of which are given by Quetif, Scriptores Ordinis Preadicatorum (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Labbe, Concilia, 11, 1007: Ciaconius, Vitae et res gestce Pontifcum Romanorum, 2, 203; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, 1. 18:chap. 86; Duhesne, Hist. des Papes, 2, 208; Muratori, Rerum Ittalicarum Scriptores, 3, 605; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 6, 301,302; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 669; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25, 908; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. cent. 13:pt. 2, ch. 2.

## Innocent VI[[@Headword:Innocent VI]]

             (Etienne d'Albert or Aubert), a Frenchman, succeeded Clement VI in 1352. He resided at Avignon, like his immediate predecessors; but, unlike them, he put a check to the disorders and scandals of that court, which have been so strongly depicted by Petrarch, Villani, and other contemporary writers. He reformed the abuses of the reservations of benefices, and enforced the residence of bishops on their sees. His immediate predecessors having lost their influence in the States of the Church, Innocent VI determined on re-conquering these territories, and successfully reoccupied, with the assistance of the warlike cardinal Egidius Albornoz, the various provinces of the papal state which had been seized by petty tyrants. He then sent back to Rome the former demagogue Cola di Rienzo, who, being still dear to the people, repressed the insolence of the lawless barons, but who, becoming himself intoxicated with his power, committed acts of wanton cruelty, upon which the people rose and murdered him in 1354. In 1358 the emperor Charles IV was crowned at Rome by a legate deputed by pope Innocent for the purpose. Innocent died at Avignon, at an advanced age, in 1362. It was during his pontificate that the mendicant orders were persecuted in England, and declined to be an  unchristian order by Richard, archbishop of Armagh and primate of Ireland, in a book which he published in defense of the curates or parish priests, entitled Defensorium Curatorum. Of course Innocent rallied to the defense of the mendicants. He reprimanded the archbishop, and confirmed anew all the privileges which had been granted by his predecessors to men of that order. A letter of his is given by Labbe, Concilia, 11, 1930; four by Ughelli, Italia Sacra; and two hundred and fifty by Martene, Thesaurus novus Anecdotorulm, 2, 843-1072. See Duchesne, Hist. des Papes, 2, 261; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, I. 20, chap. 86; Sismondi, Hist. des Fralais, 10:397-596; Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6, 670; Engl. Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 25:910; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, 5, 44; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 14:pt. 2, ch. 2; Schlosser, Weltgesch. bk. 4:ch. 1, 408, 618; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 6:482 sq.

## Innocent VII[[@Headword:Innocent VII]]

             (cardinal Cosmo de Migliorati, of Sulmona), who had been appointed archbishop of Ravenna and bishop of Bologna by Urban VI, was elected by the Italian prelates as the successor of Boniface IX in 1404. At this time “the great Western schism” agitated the Romish Church, the French cardinals supporting a rival pope, Benedict XIII (q.v.), who held his court at Avignon, acknowledged by a part of Europe. After the election of Innocent, a tumult broke out in Rome, excited by the Colonna and by Ladislaus, king of Naples, which obliged the pope to escape to Viterbo. Ladislaus, however, failed in his attempt upon Rome; and Innocent, having returned to his capital, excommunicated him. Innocent died Nov. 6, 1406, after having made his peace with Ladislaus. Some think that he was poisoned. He is spoken of as a man who possessed great learning and virtue, and as governed by the purest motives in all his acts; hostile to all luxury, avariciousness, and simony-evils which were one and all possessed by his rival Benedict, and by his own predecessor Boniface (comp. Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 446 sq.). The charge which some lay to him that he did not keep the promise which he gave on his accession to the papal see that he would, if his rival: should be declared the proper incumbent, vacate the-papal throne, seems not well founded. It is true Benedict proposed a conference for the alleged purpose of restoring peace and union to the Church of Rome, which Innocent did not agree to, but this was done because Innocent knew that Benedict did not earnestly desire it. He wrote Oratio de Ecclesiastica Unione; Approbatio regule patrum et sororum de penitentia ordinis S. Dominici; and a letter of his is published  by Ughelli, Italia Sacra, 1, 1381. See Labbe, Concilia, 11, 2082; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, 1. 20:ch. 99: Duchesne, Hist. des Popes, 2, 299; Sismondi, Histoire des Francais, 12, 211; Maimbourg, Hist. du grand Schisme d'Occident; Bruni d'Arezzo, De Rebus Italicis, and Epistolce Familiares; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 671; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 15, pt. 2, ch. 2; Hefele, Conciliengeschichte, 6, 748 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 25, 911; Neander, Hist. of the Christ. Religion and Church, 5, 70, 247; Bower, History of the Popes, 7:91 sq. (J H.W.)

## Innocent VIII[[@Headword:Innocent VIII]]

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

The pope received Jem with great honor, but took care to  secure his person, as he would be an important hostage. In this he was not mistaken, for Bajazet feared the power of his brother, and, to secure his throne, he sent an ambassador to Rome to offer Innocent a large sum if he would keep Jem in prison. The pope accepted the dishonorable bargain, although the sultan of Egypt, who desired Jem, as commander in chief of his forces, to march against Bajazet, offered, on condition of his release, to restore Jerusalem to the Christians, and was even ready to pledge himself to surrender to the pope all the territory that should be taken from the Turks. Under Innocent's successor, the depraved Alexander VI, Jem was poisoned by order of the pope (comp. Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 530). Bajazet, of course, showed himself very generous towards his accomplice, Innocent VIII. On May 29, 1492, he sent him the iron of the spear with which, he asserted, Christ was pierced on the cross, and which was among ‘he booty taken by Mohammed II after the downfall of Constantinople. The relic (although received with great ceremony) was, unfortunately, the third of the kind in Europe, for the emperor of Germany claimed to have the holy lance at Nuremberg, and the king of France in the Holy Chapel at Paris. Innocent VIII died July 25, 1492., Among the principal acts of his administration are the confirmation, in 1485, of the order of the Conception, founded at Toledo by Beatrix of Sylva; the canonization of Leopold of Austria in 1485; the condemnation of the propositions of Mirandola in 1487; the union under the crown of Spain of the three military orders of Calatrava, St. James, and Alcantara, in 1488; and the confirmation of the Brotherhood of Mercy, instituted at Rome for the benefit of condemned criminals. Two letters of Innocent are published by Ughelli, Italia Sacra, 1, 710; 5, 948. Roman Catholic writers endeavor to free Innocent VIII from the charge of gross immorality by asserting that he had only two illegitimate children, and that they were born before he was made pope; but” the success of Innocent VIII in increasing the population of Rome was a favorite topic with the wits of the day” (Innocuo priscos aquum est debere Quirites. Progenie exhaustam restituit patriam. — Salnnazarii Epigram. lib. 1), and he was graced with “the epitaph which declared that filth, gluttony, avarice, and sloth lay buried in his tomb” (Marultus, Epigram. lib. 4). But the conduct of Innocent VIII can hardly compare with the career of his successor, Alexander VI,” the most depraved of all the popes, uniting in himself all the vices of Innocent VIII and the unscrupulous family ambition of Sixtus IV.” Indeed, all the latter half of the 16th century scarcely saw a supreme pontiff without the visible evidences of human frailty around him, the unblushing acknowledgment of  which is the fittest commentary on the tone of clerical morality (Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 358, 39). See Labbe, Conciiia, 13:1465; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, lib. 23, ch. 15; Duchesne, Historiac Friancorsum Scriptores, 2, 350; Sismondi, Hist. des Franfais; Ciaconius, Vitae et res gestce Pontifcunz Romanorunm, 3:90; F. Serdonati, Vita e Fatti d'Innocenzo VIII (Milan, 1829, 8vo); Comines, Memoires, lib. 7:ch. 1; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6, 672; Engl. Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:912; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries, 1, 43,296; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. p. 436 ‘Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7, 317 sq.; Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 5, 641 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, 3:460 sq.

## Innocent X[[@Headword:Innocent X]]

             (cardinal Giovanni Battista Panfil), born at Rome in 1572, was elected in Sept. 1644, after the death of Urban VIII. He was then seventy-three years of age, and wholly under the control of his sister in-law, Donna Olimpia  Maidalchini Panfili, who appears to have been an unprincipled woman, very fond of money, and anxious to aggrandize her relatives. Innocent, however, displayed in several instances much firmness, justice, and prudence, and a wish to protect the humble and poor against the oppressions of the great. He diminished the taxes, which had been very heavy under his predecessor, Urban VIII, and at the same time embellished Rome.

The people of Fermo, on the Adriatic, revolted against their governor, being excited by the local nobility and landholders, who were irritated against him for having by an edict of annona kept the price of corn low; the governor and other official persons were murdered. Innocent sent a commissioner with troops, and the guilty, without distinction of rank, were punished, some being executed, and others sent to the galleys. The district of Castro and Ronciglione, near Rome, was still in possession of the Farnese dukes of Parma, notwithstanding the efforts of Urban VIII to wrest it from them.

Disputes about jurisdiction were continually taking place between the officers of the duke and those of the pope. Innocent having consecrated a new bishop of Castro who was not acceptable to the duke, the latter forbade his entering his territories, and as the bishop elect persisted, he was murdered on the road The pope immediately sent troops to attack Castro, which being taken, he ordered the town to be razed to the foundations, and a pillar erected on the site, with the inscription “Qui fu Castro.” He showed the same resolution against the Barberini, who had opposed his election, and was a steadfast enemy of cardinal Mazarin, the supporter of the Barberini. The French prelate, however, outwitted the pope, and obliged him to yield by threatening to take Avignon. Innocent also took an active part in the quarrel between the Jesuits and the Jansenists. As early as 1650, Hubert, bishop of Vabres, had denounced to the pope five propositions ascribed to Jansenius (q.v.), which, in the preceding year, had been referred to the theological faculty. Innocent established a special congregation to examine them, April 20,1651.

De Saint Amour and some other theologians sent by the Jansenists were heard May 19, 1653, but P. Annat, a Jesuit, informs us that the affair had already been judged and decided in advance. Finally a bull was issued. Cum occasione, May 30,1653, condemning the five propositions. It was received in France, and published by order of Louis XIV. Innocent died soon after, Jan. 6, 1654. His anxiety to further the interests of Rome throughout the world is manifest by the pecuniary assistance which he afforded the Venetians and Poles in their wars against the Turks, by his opposition to the peace of Westphalia, fearing' that it endangered the  Romish tenets, and even the pontifical chair, and especially by the assistance which he gave to the Irish to combat the English, and, if possible, to regain the English territory for his Church. In Germany) also, he secured, by his undaunted efforts, the conversion of several princes and noblemen of influence. He built two beautiful churches in Rome, and left a well-filled treasury, which proved very useful to his successor, Alexander VII. See Bruys, Hist. des Popes, 5. 253; Duchesne, Historic Francorum Scriptores, 2, 532; Ciaconius, Vite et res geste Pontificum Romanorum, 4, 642; Sismondi, Hist. des Francais, 24:78; Relation des deliberations du clerge de France sur la Constitution et sur le Bref de N. S. P. le pape Innocent X (Paris, 1656, fol.); De Lalane, Defense de la Constitution du pape Innocent X, etc. (1655, 4to); Vie de Madame Olympe Madachini, qui a gouverne Eglisependant le pottificat d'Innocent X (Amst. 1666, 18mo); Memoires du Cardinal de Retz, L 3; L de Saint Amour, Journal de ce qui s'est.fait a Rome dans l'affaire des cinq propositions (Paris, 1662, fol.); J. C. Rosstenscher, Historia Innocentii X (1676, 4to); Herzog, Real- Encyclop. 6, 673; Enyl. Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 915; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 182, 242; Mosheim, Ch. list. cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3:462 sq.

## Innocent XI[[@Headword:Innocent XI]]

             (cardinal Benedetto Odescalchi), born at Como in 1611, succeeded Clement X in 1676. It is said by some that he was a soldier in his younger days, though this has been denied by others (Count Torre Rezzonico, De Suppositis Militaribus Stipendiis Benedetto Odescalchi). He was a man of great firmness and courage, austere in his morals, and inflexible in his resolutions, and withal one of the most distinguished popes of the 17th century. He inaugurated many reforms, reduced very materially the pomp and luxury of the papal court, and suppressed various abuses. His administration was entirely free from the weakness of nepotism which had so greatly sullied the fame of many of the pontiffs who had preceded him. His own nephew he obliged to live at Rome, under his pontificate, in a private character; and in this respect, certainly, he has had few equals in the pontifical chair. Indeed, his austerity was so great that it made him many enemies, and oftentimes estranged even some who would gladly have offered him their friendship.

His greatest enemies, no doubt, were the Jesuitical order, which he was determined to crush out. The principal event of his pontificate, however, was his quarrel with the imperious Louis XIV of France, particularly provoked by the question of the immunities enjoyed  by the foreign ambassadors at Rome, an event which exhibits more clearly than any other act of his both his own character and that of the times, and deserves a few words of explanation. By an old usage or prescription, the foreign ambassadors at Rome had the right of asylum, not only in their vast palaces, but also in a certain district or boundary around them, including sometimes a whole street or square, which the officers of justice or police could not enter, and where, consequently, malefactors and dissolute persons found a ready shelter. These “quartieri,” or free districts, were likewise places for the sale of contraband articles and for defrauding the revenue.

The abuse had become contagious: several of the Roman princes and cardinals claimed and enforced the same rights and immunities, so that only a small part of the city was left under the sway of the magistrates. The classical advocates for this absurd custom quoted the example of Romulus, who made his new town a refuge for all the lawless persons of the neighborhood. Innocent determined to put a stop to the abuse, and to be master in his own capital; he, however, proceeded at first calmly and with sufficient caution. He would not disturb the present possessors of those immunities, but he declared and made it officially known that in future he would not give audience to any new ambassador who did not renounce for himself and his successors these abusive claims.

All the great powers of Europe took umbrage at this very reasonable determination; but the question was not brought to a crisis until the death of the marechal d'Estrees, the French ambassador at Rome. Just before Louis XIV had appointed the new ambassador, the pope repeated in a bull, dated May 1687, his previous resolve. In view of this action of the pope, which Louis was determined not to observe, he instructed his minister “to maintain at Rome the rights and the dignity of France;” and in order to support this resolve, he gave him a numerous retinue of military and naval officers, who were to frighten the pope in his own capital. Lavardin's entrance into Rome under such an escort resembled that of a hostile commander. He had also been preceded by several hundred French under-officers, who had entered Rome as private travelers, but who took their quarters near the ambassador's palace, ready for any mischief. Innocent, however, remained firm; he refused to receive the new ambassador, and all the anger of Louis, who seized upon Avignon, and threatened to send a fleet with troops on the Roman coast, had no effect upon him. Lavardin, having remained- eighteen months at Rome, unable to see the pope, was obliged to return to France with his credentials unopened.

The quarrel was not adjusted till the following pontificate; but the distinct immunities of the foreign  ambassadors at Rome continued, after various modifications, until the beginning of the 19th century. This quarrel was, however, not the initiative to a misunderstanding between the two sovereigns. It had been previously opened by the right which Louis XIV claimed to possess, in virtue of the Droit de Regne, to appoint to vacant benefices in his kingdom, and to collect the revenues. This right of the French king Innocent XI disputed. Louis. XIV issued edict after edict, the pope bull after bull against them; finally, the French clergy demanded that a council should be assembled. This was done, and on Feb. 3, 1682, the council declared that the French clergy indorsed the action of the king, and that the pope should be notified of their decision. While awaiting his answer, the assembly continued its sittings, intending to put an end to all further papal encroachments by establishing firmly the doctrines of the Galliean Church concerning the temporal power of the popes, their infallibility, and the independence of the king. The result of their deliberation was the famous four propositions promulgated March 16, 1682. SEE GALLICAN CHURCH.

Innocent XI, in a solemn consistory, condemned the: propositions and the bishops who had voted them, and April 11, 1682, issued a brief annulling the proceedings of the French council. In 1686 he also condemned the doctrines of Molinos (q.v.), who was obliged to make a public recantation, September 3,1687, besides suffering for the remainder of his life close confinement in the prisons of the Inquisition. At the close of 1676 Innocent took a threatening attitude towards the Jesuits,' forbidding them, among other things, to receive any novices into their order. They retorted by calling the pope a Jansenist, offered prayers for his conversion, and entered into an alliance with the French king. Innocent XI, however, died only a few years after, August 21, 1689. It was during his pontificate that James II of England became a Romanist, and endeavored, by a succession of bold attempts, not only to give Romanism toleration, but even make it a Church establishment of his country. (Compare Fox, James II, p. 332; Hallam, Constit. Hist. 2, 212; Mackintosh, Hist. of Revolution, ch. 5; ‘Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England [Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo], vol. 2, chap. 8.) Stoughton claims that these efforts accorded, however, only “with the daring policy of the Jesuits, who were masters at court, but not with the more cautious measures of the papacy.” No doubt this is true in a measure. Innocent XI was evidently unwilling to become master of the English ecclesiastical establishment if to be secured by the aid of an order which he abhorred, and which he was determined upon extinguishing; and this our supposition is strengthened by the demand which James II made upon Rome for a red hat for a Jesuit  named Petre. SEE JAMES II. Two letters of this pope are published by Ughelli, Italia Sacra, 4, 513; 10:53. He wrote also Breve ad Franciscum episcopum Apamiensem (Paris, 4to): — Decretum de sacrce communionis usu datum (Paris, 1679, 4to). See Palatius, it. Intocentius XI, in the 5th vol. of the Gest. Pontif. Romans vita. d'Innocenzo XI (Venet. 1690); Bruys, Hist. des Popes, 5, 360; Sismondi, Hist. des Franacis, 25:311; J. A. Costa (R. Simon), Hist. de l'Origine des Revenus ecclesiastiques (Francfort, 1684, 12mo); De Larroque, Nouveau Traite de la Regale (1685,12mo); Bayle, Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres (1686); Heidegger, Historia Papatus (Amst. 1698, 4to), pt. 2; De La Luzerne,- Sur la Declaration de l'assemblee du clergg de France en 1682 (Par. 1821, 8vo); F. Buonamici, De Vita et Rebus gestis Innocentii XI (Rome, 1776, 8vo); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 6:675; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, s.v, 919 Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 273, 279; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 17:sec. 2, pt. 1, ch. 1; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3:464 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, 7:486 sq.; English Cyclopaedia, s.v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Innocent XII[[@Headword:Innocent XII]]

             (cardinal Antonio Pignatelli) was born at Naples March 13, 1615, and succeeded Alexander VIII in July, 1691. He had a serious dispute with the emperor Leopold I, who, attempting to revive in Italy the rights of the empire over the former imperial fiefs, which had, during the wars and vicissitudes of ages, become emancipated, published an edict at Rome in June, 1697, enjoining all the possessors of such territories to apply to the emperor for his investiture within a fixed time, or they would be considered as usurpers and rebels. This measure, if enforced, would have affected the greater part of the landed property of Italy, and also the sovereignty of its governments, and of the Roman see among the rest. The pope protested against the edict, and advised the other Italian powers to resist such obsolete pretensions, and, with the support of France succeeded in persuading Leopold to desist from them. He also succeeded in putting an end to the difficulties existing between France and the see of Rome on the question of investiture, SEE INNOCENT XI, and obtained from the French clergy an address which amounted almost to a recantation of the four articles of the Galliean Church. The question of Quietism then reappeared. Bossuet accused Fenelon of favoring that tendency in his Explication sur a vie interieure. The book was moderately condemned by the pope, in accordance with the report of the Congregation of the Index (q.v.), and  Fenelon (q.v.), as is well known, submitted (see vol. 3:p. 529-530). Innocent built the harbor of Ponto d'Anzo on the ruins of the ancient Antium; he constructed the aqueduct of Civita Vecchia; the palace of the Monte Citorio at Rome, for the courts of justice; and the fine line of buildings at Ripagrande, on the north bank of the Tiber, below the town, where vessels which ascend the river load and unload. He also built the asylum, school, and penitentiary of San Michele, and other useful works. Innocent was of regular habits, attentive to business, a lover of justice, and averse to nepotism. He died Sept. 27, 1700, and was succeeded by Clement XI. See Bruys, Hist. des Popes, 5, 454; Sismondi, Hist. des Franvais, 26,69; De Prades, Abrige de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique, 2, 338; N. P. Giannetasio, Panegyricus in funere Innocentii XII (Naples, 1700, 8vo); Herzog, Real Encyklop. 6:676; English Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:923; Ranke, Hist. of the Papacy, 1, 281-313; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. 17, sec. 2, pt. 1, chap. 2 Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 3, 466 sq.

## Innocent XIII[[@Headword:Innocent XIII]]

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

## Innocent, Gizel[[@Headword:Innocent, Gizel]]

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

## Innocentiae Portus[[@Headword:Innocentiae Portus]]

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

## Innocentium Festum[[@Headword:Innocentium Festum]]

             SEE INNOCENTS DAY.

## Innocents Day[[@Headword:Innocents Day]]

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

“Salvete, flores martyium,

Quos Incis ipso in limine Christi ilusecutor sustulit,

Ceu turbo nascentes rosas!

Vos prima Christi victimla,

Grex immolatorum tener,

Aram sub ipsam simplices Palma et corona luditis.”

“Hail, ye flower of martyrs, whom the enemy of Christ cut off in your very entrance upon the light, as the tempest does roses in the bud! First victims for Christ, tender flock of sacrifices, ye play innocently with your crowns and garlands before the very altar.” It was a popular superstition in the old Church that Innocents' Day (or Childermass, as it was also called) is very unlucky to begin any work upon; and what day so ever that falls on, whether on a Monday, Tuesday, or any other, nothing must be begun on that day throughout the year. Though Childermass Day was reckoned unfortunate, nevertheless revels were held on it. The Society of Lincoln's Inn used to choose an officer at that season called the King of the Cockneys, who presided on the day of his appointment. But in the modern Church this feast is observed as a special holiday by the young, and many curious customs connected with it prevail in Catholic countries. Thus, in  private families, the children are on this day privileged to wear the clothes of the elders, and in some sort to exercise authority over the household in their stead. So, also, in communities of nuns, the youngest sister becomes for this day superioress of the house, and exercises a sort of sportive authority even over the real superior. In Church, the priest celebrating mass on this day wears a blue gown. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. 20:cap. 7:§ 12; Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten a.'der christl. Archaöl. (Lips. 1817), 1, 304 sq.

## Innocents, Massacre of, by Herod[[@Headword:Innocents, Massacre of, by Herod]]

             (Mat 2:16). It has been thought strange that Josephus should not mention this atrocity (see Volborth, Veram esse Infanticidii Bethlehem.  hait. Göttingen, 1788); but it was one only, and that a local one, of his many acts of tyranny and cruelty. SEE HEROD THE GREAT.

## Innovatio Beneficii[[@Headword:Innovatio Beneficii]]

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

## Innuarolit[[@Headword:Innuarolit]]

             are mountain spirits of the Greenlanders, extraordinarily small, but quite expert.

## Inquisition[[@Headword:Inquisition]]

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

Establishment of the Inquisition in France. — At the synod of Verona. in 1184, certain directions were given to the bishops “concerning heretics,”  who at this time formed a very formidable enemy of the Romish Church, more especially in the south of France. The sects had become so numerous that some of them, such as the Cathari (q.v.), the Albigenses (q.v.), and the Waldensians (q.v.), threatened the very existence of the papal hierarchy, and this led Innocent III (q.v.) in 1198 to dispatch ‘the Cistercians Raineri and Guido, and in 1206 Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, as papal legates to France, to assist the bishops and the civil authorities in punishing all heretics with the utmost rigor. But. to efface forever the last vestige of heresy, Innocent III determined to make a permanent institution of the Inquisition, “the most formidable of all the formidable engines devised by popery to subdue the souls and bodies, the reason and the consciences of men, to its sovereign will.”

Accordingly, the fourth Lateran Council (1215) made the persecution of heretics the chief business of synodal courts, in the form that every archbishop or bishop should visit, either personally, or through the archdeacon, or some other suitable person, the parish in which, according to rumor (in qua fama fuerit), there were heretics, and put under oath two or three of the inhabitants of irreproachable character, or, if necessary, all the inhabitants, to point out those who were known as heretics or those who held secret meetings, or departed from the faithful in their walk and conduct. The refusal to take oath justified the suspicion of heresy, haereticae pravitatis; the careless bishop was deposed (comp. Biener, Beitrage z. d. Gesch. des Inquisitionsprozesses [Lpz. 1827], p. 60 sq.). In name, the bishops still conducted the matter, but the legates had supervision over them and, in fact, conducted the persecution of heretics. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse confirmed this decision of the fourth Lateran Council, and published forty-five decrees to complete the institution of episcopal inquisition (see Mansi, 23, 192; Planck, Gesch. d. Kirchl. Gessellshaftsverfassung, 4, 2nd half, 463 sq.).

It was decided that each bishop should appoint in each district one priest and two or three laymen in good standing, who should devote themselves exclusively to ferreting out heretics, and then deliver them up to the archbishops, bishops, or other authorities for punishment. Every one guilty of concealing a heretic forfeited thereby his land possessions or offices; the house in which a heretic was found was to be torn down. In case of sickness, however severe, no heretic or unbeliever was to be allowed the aid of a physician; penitents were to leave their home, to wear a peculiar dress, and could hold no office except by a special dispensation from the pope. But, notwithstanding these rigid and definite regulations, and notwithstanding the great zeal of the legates in urging the execution of the laws by the  bishops, the see of Rome did not even approach the desired end. To accomplish this more certainly, the affairs of the Inquisition were taken from the bishops, and made a papal tribunal, and the bishops themselves were subjected to it. Accordingly, Gregory IX appointed, in 1232, in Germany, Aragonia, and Austria, in 1233 in Lombardy and South France (see Beziers, anno 1233, in Mansi, 23, 269 sq.; Raynald, Annal. a. 1233, n. 59 sq.), the Dominicans (q.v.) permanent papal inquisitors (later also the Franciscans became such). “The solitude and retirement of which these monks made profession, but of which, as it appeared in the sequel, they soon began to tire, afforded them leisure to attend incessantly to this new calling. The meanness of their dress, the poverty of their monasteries, and, above all, the public mendicity and humility to which they bound themselves, could not fail to make the office of inquisitors one that flattered any relic of natural ambition which might yet lurk within their minds.

The general renunciation which they made, even of the names of the families from which they sprang, must have gone a great way towards stifling those sentiments which the ties of kindred and civil connections generally inspire. Besides, the, austerity of their rules, and the severity which they were continually practicing upon themselves, were not likely to allow them to have much feeling for others. Lastly, they were zealous, as possessors of newly established religions commonly are; and they were learned, after the fashion of the times; that is to say, well versed in scholastic quibbles and in the new canon law. Moreover. they had a particular interest in the suppression of heretics, who were incessantly declaiming against them, and who spared no pains to discredit them in the minds of the people. On these monks, therefore, the pope conferred the office of inquisitors of the faith, and they acquitted themselves in such a manner as not to disappoint his expectations” (Shoberl, Persecutions of Popery, 1, 103, 104). So much eagerness did they display in hunting up and prosecuting heretics, that a popular pun changed the name of Dominicans into Domini canes (the dogs of the Lord). To preserve the Church, however, from the charge of blood-guiltiness, the civil authorities were made the executioners of its judgments, and orders to that effect were caused to be issued in 1228 by Louis IX of France, in 1233 by Raymond of Toulouse, and in 1234 by Frederick II, the emperor of Germany.

According to the regulations, the suspicion of heresy was sufficient cause for imprisonment; accomplices and culprits were deemed competent witnesses; the accused was never informed of his accusers, nor confronted with them; confession was extorted by torture, which, applied at first by  the civil authorities, was afterwards, for the sake of secrecy, entrusted to the-inquisitors themselves. To enlarge also the sphere, and last, but hardly least, to increase the pecuniary income of the Inquisition, a very wide meaning was given to the word heresy. It was not confined to views which departed from the dogmas of the Church, or to sectarian tendencies, but was made to include usury, fortune-telling by the hands, signs: lots, etc., insulting the cross, despising the clergy, pretended connection with the leprous, with Jews, demons and the devil, demonolatry, and witchcraft. The punishments were of three kinds: Upon those who recanted, besides penance in the severest form which the court might enact, was frequently inflicted even the deprivation of all civil and ecclesiastical rights and privileges, and the sequestration of goods; upon those not absolutely convicted, imprisonment for life; upon the obstinate or the relapsed, the penalty of death-death at the stake, death by the secular arm. “The Inquisition with specious hypocrisy, while it prepared and dressed up the victim for the burning, looked on with calm and approving satisfaction, as it had left the sin of lighting the fire to pollute other hands.” As if these horrible treatments of fellow-beings were not bad enough, pope Innocent IV in a bull (De extirpanda) in the year 1252, ordained that accused persons should be tortured, not merely to induce them to confess their own heresy, but also to compel them to accuse others. Such was the organization of the Inquisition in the 13th century — “a Christian code, of which the basis was a system of delation that the worst of the pagan emperors might have shuddered at as iniquitous; in which the sole act deserving of mercy might seem to be the. Judas-like betrayal of the dearest and most familiar friend, of the kinsman. the parent, the child ... No falsehood was too false, no craft too crafty, no trick too base for this calm, systematic moral torture, which was to wring further confession against the heretic, denunciation against others. If the rack, the pulleys, the thumbscrew, and the boots were not yet invented or applied, it was not in mercy. Nothing that the sternest or most passionate historian has revealed, nothing that the most impressive romance-writer could have imagined, can surpass the cold, systematic treachery and cruelty of these so-called judicial formularies” (Milman, Latin Christianity, 6:32, 33).

The excessive cruelties, however, of the inquisitors, their knavery even in accusing the innocent and robbing them of their possessions, exasperated the people, and they rose up-against the inquisitors. At Toulouse and Narbonne the inquisitors were banished in 1235, and four of them killed in the former city in 1242, and the pope was finally obliged to suppress the tribunal at the  former place altogether. When at last restored, the inquisitorial tribunal resumed its former cruelty, until Philip the Fair (A.D. 1291) ordered the civil officers to exercise great caution in acting on the accusations made by the inquisitors. But what insurrections and royal edicts in France could not accomplish, ecclesiastico political events, such as the papal schism in the 14th, and the reformatory councils in the 15th century, were caused to bring about.

The former crippled the power of the hierarchy with the latter, and limited thereby the power of the Inquisition, so that it now proceeded against secret or suspected heretics only on the accusation of sorcery and connection with the devil (compare the Breve of Nicholas V, in Raynald, a. 1451). In the 16th century, the time of the Reformation, the clergy, supported by the Guises, were able to rekindle violent persecutions against the Huguenots (q.v.), and endeavored to restore the Inquisition to its former power, but it had now lost its territory. Paul IV, it is true, published a bull (April 25,1557) to re-establish it (Raynald, a. 1557, no. 29), and Henry II compelled Parliament to pass a corresponding edict; but Paul, who on his death-bed commended the Inquisition as the main support of the Romish Church (Schröckh, Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformations, 3:248 sq.), died in 1559, and the new attempt to re-establish it failed; so that in France, where it took its rise first, it was also first discontinued, in spite of priest craft and Jesuitism. The Inquisition in Germany. — But from France the Inquisition soon cast its net over neighboring and distant countries, even beyond the ocean, by the aid of the Jesuits. Almost immediately after its firm establishment in France, the Inquisition spread to Germany. The first inquisitor was Conrad of Marburg, who organized the “holy office” with terrible severity during the years 1231-1233.

The sentences of death which this new tribunal pronounced were not few in number, and of course they always obtained the approval of the emperor, Ferdinand II. But there was a higher power than that of the reigning prince, which had been lost sight of; and though the people's voice was in those dark days not quite so powerful as in our own, it certainly sufficed to thwart the iniquitous designs of these “holy officers.” So energetically did the people and the nobles oppose the Inquisition, that it could carry out its sentences in a very few cases only. In 1233 the lower class of the people, always ready to execute judgment, took the law into their own hands, and Conrad of Marburg was slain in the streets of Strasburg. It was not really until the 14th century that the Inquisition can be said to have been properly established in Germany. It was at this time that the Beghards (q.v.) made their appearance. To suppress them, pope Urban V appointed in 1367 two  Dominicans as inquisitors, who engaged in a regular crusade against the new sect, and sustained by three different edicts of the emperor Charles IV, rendered in 1369, failed not to repeat in Germany the cruel practices of the French brethren of their order. Encouraged by their successes against the Beghards, and by the, to them, so favorable attitude of the emperor, pope Gregory XI increased in 1372 the number of the inquisitors to five, and in 1399 Boniface IX appointed no less than six of these “holy men” for such “holy” work for the north of Germany alone. But in proportion as the reformatory tendencies gained ground in Germany, the Inquisition lost its foothold. A desperate effort was made by Jacob Sprenger and Heinrich Kramer, two inquisitors appointed by Innocent VIII, under the plea of a prosecution of sorcerers and witches only. They even influenced the pope to publish the bull (Sulmmis desiderantes affectibus) in 1484 (Dec. 5) which reaffirmed the doctrines previously set forth concerning heresy in regard to sorcery and witchcraft, and the punishment by the Inquisition of those guilty of such crimes.' To justify their harsh dealings as executors of the Romish dicta, and to hide their iniquitous work behind the screen of devotion to the cause of Christ, they published a code called “Hexenhammer” (Malleus maleficorum), in accordance with which the prosecution was to be carried on. In this way they proceeded to condemn and execute a large number of persons. The Reformation at last completely overthrew the power of the Inquisition in Germany, and the attempts-to re- establish it, made mostly by the Jesuits, with an endeavor to check the progress of evangelical truth, as in Austria, Bohemia, and Bavaria (where a tribunal of the Inquisition was formally established in 1599), proved ineffectual, and of short duration.

In Italy the Inquisition was introduced under the direction of the Dominicans in 1224, but it was not until 1235 that it was firmly established as a tribunal by pope Gregory IX. Just here it may not be amiss to state that Lacordaire, in his Life of Dominic (Works, 1, 95 sq.), seeks to relieve the memory of Dominic, and also the Dominican order, of the special odium which attaches to them from their agency in establishing and conducting the Inquisition (compare Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 284- 292). The Dominicans certainly cannot be freed from this charge, which is too well founded, and the efforts of a Lacordaire even must prove to be in vain. But to return to the tribunal of Gregory IX. It was at this time intended especially against the Waldenses, who had fled from the south of France to Piedmont, and now threatened to infect all Italy with their  doctrines. Later its power was directed against other heretics; but the papal schism and the political commotions which agitated the country greatly weakened its power. The free states of which Italy was then composed neither could nor would long bear the arbitrary and vexatious proceedings” of the Inquisition; and “about the middle of the 14th century measures were generally adopted to restrain its exorbitant power, in spite of the opposition made by Clement VI and the censures which he fulminated.

The right of the bishops to take part with the inquisitors in the examination of heretics was recognized; they were restricted to the simple cognizance of the charge of heresy, and deprived of the power of imprisonment, confiscation, fine, and corporal punishment, which was declared to belong solely to the secular arm” (M'Crie, Ref. in Italy, p. 189; comp. Galluzzi, Istor. del Granducato di Toscano, 1, 142, 143). But such a mode of procedure the Church of Rome found to be ineffectual for suppressing free inquiry, and maintaining hierarchical authority, after the new opinions began to spread in Italy; and as in Germany and the south of France, so also here, the bishops in many instances having become lukewarm, some even dared to manifest a humane feeling towards those who chose to differ from them in religious views; the accused often suffered only very slight punishment, or were permitted to escape before the necessary orders for their arrest were issued. On these accounts pope Paul III finally resolved, at the instigation of cardinal John Peter Caraffa, to strengthen the power of the inquisitors by the establishment of the “Congregation of the Holy Office” (1534), with cardinal Caraffa (afterwards Paul IV) at their head, which the more zealous of the Romanists considered the only means of preserving Italy from being overrun with heresy. A constitution for a supreme and universal Inquisition at Rome was promulgated July 21, 1542, and operations commenced under it in 1543.

Six cardinals now received the title and rights of inquisitors general, and authority was given them on both sides of the Alps “to try all causes of heresy, with the power of apprehending and incarcerating suspected persons and their abettors, of whatsoever estate, rank, or order, of nominating officers under them, and appointing inferior tribunals in all places, with the same or with limited powers” (M'Crie, Ref. in Italy, p, 189 sq.; comp. Chandler's Limborch, Hist. of the Inquisition, 1, 151; Llorente, Histoire de Inqui. 2, 78). But while the inquisitors were to extirpate heresy and punish heretics, the vicar of Christ reserved for himself the graces of reconciliation and absolution. In the arrogance which Rome has ever manifested, the power which belonged to the judge was withdrawn, and the power of life and death over  the subjects of the different governments of the world asserted to belong to the papal see. Of course the new cardinal inquisitors made full use of their powers, and soon became the terror not only of Rome and Italy, but of all the countries over which they could possibly exert any influence. The Inquisition was especially severe against the press. “Books were destroyed, and many more disfigured; printers were forbidden to carry on their business without licenses from the Holy Office.” SEE INDEX.

The terror- stricken people, however, soon gained their foothold again, and oppositions against the encroachments of Rome were everywhere manifest. The greatest resistance to it was offered in Venice. The republic refused to submit to an inquisitorial tribunal responsible solely to the pope, and, after long negotiations, permitted only the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal on condition that, with the papal officers, a certain number of magistrates and lawyers should always be associated, and that the definitive sentence should not, at least in the case of laics, be pronounced before it was submitted to the senate (Busdragi Epistola: Scrinium Antiquar. 1, 321, 326 sq.; Thuani. Hist. ad an. 1548). In Naples like difficulties between the government and the pope arose on the endeavor of the latter to establish the inquisitorial tribunal Twice the Neapolitans had successfully resisted its establishment in their country at the beginning of the 16th century. In 1546, the emperor Charles V, with the view of extirpating the Lutheran heresy, renewed the attempt, and gave orders to set up that tribunal in Naples, after the same form in which it had long been established in Spain. The people rose in arms, and although Rome would have been only too glad to see this formidable tribunal established in Naples, yet, rather than to forego the introduction of an inquisitorial tribunal altogether, she took the part of the people against the government, and encouraged them in their opposition by telling them that they had reason for their fears, because the Spanish Inquisition (see below) was extremely severe. Here. it may be well to quote M'Crie (Ref. in Italy, p. 253 sq.) on the truth of this assertion, which many Protestant as well as Roman Catholic writers have not failed to repeat and urge in favor of the tendency to mercy at Rome. Says M'Crie: “Both the statement of the fact and the reasons by which it is usually accounted for require to be qualified. One of these reasons is the policy with which the Italians, including the popes, have always consulted their pecuniary interests, to which they postponed every other consideration. (Compare the opposition of the papacy to the Inquisition as a state institution in Portugal, below.)

The second reason is that the popes, being temporal princes in the States of the  Church, had no occasion to employ the Inquisition to undermine the rights of the secular authorities in them, as in other countries. This is unquestionably true; and it accounts for the fact that the court of the Inquisition, long after its operations had been suspended in Italy, continued to be warmly supported by papal influence in Spain. But at the time of which I write, and during the remainder of the 16th century, it was in full and constant operation, and the popes found that it enabled them to accomplish what would have baffled their power as secular sovereigns. The chief difference between the Italian and Spanish Inquisitions at that period consisted in their respective lines of policy as to the mode of punishment. The latter sought to inspire terror by the solemn spectacle of a public act of justice, in which the scaffold was crowded with criminals. — The report of the autos da fe (q.v.) of Seville and Valasdolid blazed at once over Europe; the executions of Rome made less noise in the city because they were less splendid as well as more frequent, and the rumor of them died away before it could reach the ear of foreigners.” But all that Rome could accomplish in Naples, in spite of her cunning, was the establishment of an independent Inquisition, such as Venice had permitted. In Sicily, on the other hand, Spain furnished a general inquisitor, and, though abolished for a time, the office was restored in 1782, and remained in force until Napoleon, as king of Italy, did away with it throughout the realm in 1808.

The fall of Napoleon, of course, at once enabled the papal see to re-establish the Inquisition, but, though Pius VII improved the opportunity (in 1814), it did not spread far, and met with great opposition. In Sardinia, where Gregory XVI restored it in 1833, it was not discontinued until the Revolution of 1848 again did away with it. “In Tuscany it was arranged that three commissioners, elected by the congregation at Rome, along with the local inquisitor, should judge in all causes of religion, and intimate their sentence to the duke, who was bound to carry it into execution. In addition, it (the Holy Office) was continually soliciting the local authorities to send such as were accused, especially if they were either ecclesiastical persons or strangers, to be tried by the Inquisition at Rome.” Everywhere within the territory persecution was let loose. Especially during the political reactions of 1849 the inquisitorial tribunal was perhaps nowhere so active and so severe in its dealings as in Tuscany (compare Ranke, History of the Papacy, 2, 156 sq.). It is only since the embodiment of that province with Italy (1859) that the country got rid of this great curse, from which all Italy suffered; and “popish historians” certainly “do more homage to truth than credit to their cause when they say that the erection of the Inquisition was  the salvation of the Catholic Church in Italy.” It certainly does not verify itself in our own days, though the tribunal of the Inquisition still exists at Rome, under the direction of a congregation, and though the last ecumenical council, which the landless pope, Pius IX, has just declared adjourned sine die, has but lately passed two canons (canon 6 and canon 12, De Ecclesia Christi) in its favor. Its action, by the circumstances of the day, is mainly confined to the examination of books, and to the trial of ecclesiastical offences and questions of Church law,-as in the late case of the Jewish boy Mortara; and its most remarkable prisoner in recent times was an Oriental impostor, who, by means of forged credentials, succeeded in obtaining his ordination as a bishop.

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

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

To this mental torture was soon after added the use of bodily tortures, together with the concealment  of the names of witnesses” (M'Crie, Ref. in Spain, p. 85 sq.). The arm of persecution was directed with special severity, in the 13th and 14th centuries, against the Albigenses (q.v.), who, from the proximity and political relations of Aragon and Province, had become numerous in the former kingdom. Indeed, the persecutions appear to have been chiefly confined to this unfortunate sect, “and there is no evidence that the ‘holy office,' notwithstanding papal briefs to that effect, was fully organized in Castile before the reign of Isabella. This is, perhaps, imputable to the paucity of heretics in that kingdom. It cannot, at any rate, be charged to any lukewarmness in its sovereigns, since they, from the time of St. Ferdinand, who heaped the fagots on the blazing pile with his own hands, down to that of John the Second, Isabella's father, who hunted the unhappy heretics of Biscay, like so many wild beasts, among the mountains, had ever evinced a lively zeal for the orthodox faith.” Upon the whole, the progress of the Inquisition during the 14th century was steady, and its vigor and energy constantly on the increase. Its jurisdiction the inquisitors succeeded in enlarging, and they severally multiplied its ramifications; autos da fé (q.v.) were celebrated in a number of places, and its victims were not a few.

“By the middle of the 15th century the Albigensian heresy had become nearly extirpated by the Inquisition of Aragon, so that this infernal engine might have been suffered to sleep undisturbed from want of sufficient fuel to keep it in motion, when new and ample materials were discovered in the unfortunate race of Israel.” “The ‘new Christians,' or ‘converts,' as those who had renounced the faith of their fathers were denominated, were occasionally preferred to high ecclesiastical dignities, which they illustrated by their integrity and learning. They were entrusted with municipal offices in the various cities of Castile; and as their wealth furnished an obvious resource for repairing, by way of marriage, the decayed fortunes of the nobility, there was scarcely a family of rank in the land whose blood had not been contaminated at some period or other by mixture with the mala sangre, as it came afterwards to be termed, of the house of Judah; an ignominious stain which no time has been deemed sufficient wholly to purge.”

Many of these noble men, of a race that can lay claim to the highest nobility that exists among men, felt that the irksome task of dissimulation which they had undertaken was too much below the dignity of a true Israelite, and rather than enjoy the favors of a nation as apostates from a religion which they still held to be the only true one (and who would expect that Romish treatment and Romish Christian example could instill confidence and produce impressions  favorable to the cause of Christ?), preferred an open confession of the opinions which they cherished in their hearts, even at the expense of losing positions of prominence to which they were ably fitted, but from which, as is too often the case even in our own day, their religious convictions, if openly avowed, not only debarred them, out which even endangered their very life. But Romish priests could not, of course, be expected to tolerate heresy in any form, “especially the Dominicans, who seem to have inherited the quick scent for heresy which distinguished their frantic founder; they were not slow in sounding the alarm, and the superstitious populace, easily roused to acts of violence in the name of religion, began to exhibit the most tumultuous movements, and actually massacred the constable of Castile in an attempt to suppress them at Jaen, the year preceding the accession of Isabella” (Prescott, Ferdinand and Isabella, 1, 235 sq.). After the union of Spain under one kingdom, governed by Ferdinand and' Isabella, towards the close of the 15th century, the Inquisition became general. It was at this time that the inquisitorial tribunal underwent “what its friends have honored with the name of a reform; in consequence of which it became a more terrible engine of persecution than before.

Under this new form it is usually called the Modern Inquisition, though it may with equal propriety bear the name of the Spanish, as it originated in Spain, and has been confined to that country, including Portugal, and the dominions subject to the two monarchies.... The principles of the ancient and modern Inquisition were radically the same, but they assumed a more malignant form under the latter than under the former. Under the ancient Inquisition the bishops always had a certain degree of control over its proceedings; the law of secrecy was not so rigidly enforced in practice; greater liberty was allowed to the accused on their defense; and in some countries, as in Aragon, in consequence of the civil rights acquired by the people, the inquisitors were restrained from sequestrating the property of those whom they convicted of heresy.

But the leading difference between the two institutions consisted in the organization of the latter into one great independent tribunal which, extending over the whole kingdom, was governed by one code of laws, and yielded implicit obedience to one head. The inquisitor general possessed an authority scarcely inferior to that of the king or the pope; by joining with either of them, he proved an overmatch for the other; and when supported by both, his power was irresistible. The ancient Inquisition was a powerful engine for harassing and rooting out a small body of dissidents; the modern Inquisition stretched its iron arms over a whole nation, upon which it lay like a monstrous incubus, paralyzing its exertions, crushing its energies,  and extinguishing every other feeling but a sense of weakness and terror” (M'Crie, Ref. in Spain, p. 86, 103). Most prominent among those who were active in bringing about this new order of things were the archbishop of Seville, Petro Gonzalez de Mendoza, the Franciscan (afterwards cardinal) Ximenes, and the Dominican prior Torquemada. But to the credit of Isabella be it said, that it was only her zeal for the cause of her Church that led her, when misguided, to commit the unfortunate error; “an error so grave that, like a vein in some noble piece of statuary, it gives a sinister expression to her otherwise unblemished character” (Prescott). Indeed, it was only after repeated importunities of the clergy, particularly of those- whom she believed to be sincere as herself in the zeal for the Romish religion, and only these when seconded by the arguments of Ferdinand, who, to his shame be it said, favored the project because he believed it likely to result in filling his coffer by means of confiscations, that she consented to solicit from the pope a bull for the establishment of the “holy office” in Castile.

“Sixtus IV, who at that time filled the pontifical chair, easily discerning the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome, readily complied with the petition of the sovereigns, and expedited a bull bearing date Nov. 1, 1478, authorizing them to appoint two or three ecclesiastics inquisitors for the detection and suppression, of heresy throughout their dominions” (Prescott, 1, 248,249). The appointment of these officers was made Sept. 17, 1480, the clergy in confidence with the queen professing to have failed in their attempts “to illuminate the benighted Israelites by means of friendly exhortation and a candid exposition of the true principles of Christianity,” which Isabella had counseled before violent measures were resorted to January 2,1481, the new inquisitors commenced their proceedings in the Dominican convent of St. Paul, at Seville. But the tribunal did not really assume a permanent form until two years later, when the Dominican monk Thomas de Torquemada, the queen's confessor, subsequently raised to the rank of prior of Santa Cruz in Segovia, was placed at its head as inquisitor general first of Castile, and afterwards of Aragon. “This man, who concealed more pride under his monastic weeds than might have furnished forth a convent of his order, was one of that class with whom zeal passes for religion, and who testify their zeal by a fiery persecution of those whose creed differs from their own; who compensate for their abstinence from sensual indulgence by giving scope to those deadlier vices of the heart, pride, bigotry, and intolerance, which are no less opposed to virtue, and are far more extensively mischievous to society” (Prescott, 1, 247).

Torquemada at  once set about his work, appointing his assessors, and erecting subordinate tribunals in different cities of the united kingdom. Over the whole was placed the Council of the Supreme, consisting of the inquisitor general as president, and three counselors, two of whom were doctors of law. His next employment was the formation of a body of laws for the government of his new tribunal. This appeared in 1484; additions to it followed from time to time; and as a diversity of practice had crept into the subordinate courts, the inquisitor general Valdes in 1561 made a revisal of the whole code, which was published in eighty-one articles, and continues, with the exception of a few slight alterations, to be the law to this day. They are substantially as follows: the accused was invited three times edictaliter to appear. If he did not come before the tribunal, he was excommunicated il contumaciam, and condemned to pay a fine, under reservation of more severe punishment if the Inquisition saw fit to apply such. Seldom did any one escape, for familiars, the holy Hermandad, and the Congregation of the Cruciada tracked mercilessly all who were denounced to the Inquisition. If the accused appeared before the court he was at once seized, and from that moment all his relations and friends were to abandon him as an outlaw, and he was not even permitted to give proofs of his innocence.

The prisoner and his house were now thoroughly searched, especially for papers or books, a list taken of all his possessions, and in general, his goods sequestered at once, to provide beforehand for the expenses of his trial. His hair was cut to make his recognition more certain in case he should escape, and he was placed in a dark cell. If he confessed his real or imputed sin, he did indeed escape with his life, as his confession was considered a proof of repentance, but he and all his family were dishonored, and became incapable of holding any office. If he asserted his innocence, and there was not sufficient proof against him to condemn him, he was liberated, but carefully watched by the familiares as an object of suspicion, and generally was soon arrested a second time. Now commenced against him the real, slow trial of the Inquisition, conducted after the Directorium Inquisitorium of the grand inquisitor of Aragon, Nicolas Eymericus. When the prisoner refused for acknowledge his fault at the first interrogatory, he was remanded to prison; after many months he was again brought forth, and asked to swear before a crucifix that he would tell the truth. If now he did not confess, he was immediately considered guilty, otherwise he was plied with leading questions until thoroughly bewildered.

The defender was not allowed to take his client's part, but only to invite him to declare the truth. Witnesses were not named, and their testimony the truth' of which they  were not required to prove, was only made known in disconnected fragments, and years after it had been given. Any sort of testimony was admitted. Two witnesses who would only testify of a hearsay were considered equivalent to an eye-witness. The accuser was examined as a witness. Friends and members of the family were also admitted to testify, but only against the prisoner, never in his favor. If the accused still persisted in asserting his innocence, he was now tortured by the whip, the water, and fire, under the direction of the inquisitors and the bishop of the diocese. If the prisoner then confessed, he was tortured a second time, to make him declare his motives, and afterwards a third time, to make him name his accomplices; and when the inquisitors had obtained from him all they wanted, they left him to his sufferings, without allowing a physician to assist him.

After this confession the prisoner was considered penitent, yet recantation was still demanded of him de levi; if heresy or Judaism was his crime, devehementi; and when he became reconciled to the Church, informa, which latter included a free assent to all further punishments the Inquisition might yet see fit to inflict on the penitent. After that he was generally condemned to imprisonment for life, or sent to the galleys, his possessions sequestered, and his family dishonored. Those who confessed and recanted at once were punished only by having to wear for a certain time the sanbenito (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black underfrock (comp. Encyclop. Britan. 12, 390). The penitent (sanbenitado) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; when he had accomplished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a statement of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a confession, the accused was put into a worse prison: if this did not succeed, the inquisitors tried the opposite plan: they made the accused comfortable, allowed his family and friends to have access to him, and led him to think that a confession. of his fault and profession of repentance would procure his pardon. When one suspected of heresy died, or when such suspicion arose after his death, the trial was carried on notwithstanding. If forty years had elapsed between the death of the party and his accusation, his descendants were permitted to remain in their possessions, but were dishonored, and incapable of holding office. If the remains of the accused could be found, they were burnt; if not, then he was burnt in effigy. When a number of trials were concluded, an auto da fe took place, i.e. the condemned were, with great pomp and parade, publicly burnt. SEE AUTO DA FE.

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

From the details of the proceedings of the inquisitorial tribunal which we have just enumerated, it clearly follows that “the Inquisition possessed powers which enabled it effectually to arrest the progress of knowledge, and to crush every attempt which might be made for the reformation of religion and the Church.” The terrors which Torquemada's tribunal spread by imprisonment, tortures, etc., not only called forth complaints from the Cortes, but even provoked rebellions, followed by assassinations of the inquisitors (Llorente, 1, 187 sq., 211 sq.); but it still prosecuted its bloody work. The suspicion of belonging to Judaism or Islamism, of protecting Jews or Moors, of practicing soothsaying, magic, and blasphemy, caused an endless number of trials. Upon the inquisitor general's advice, all Jews who would not become Christians were compelled (1492) to emigrate; a similar fate befell the Moors (1501).

The number of victims, as stated by Llorente, the popular historian of the Inquisition, is positively appalling. He affirms that during the sixteen years of Torquemada's tenure of office (1483-1498) nearly 9000 were condemned to the flames, 6500 were burned in effigy, and more than 90,000 were subjected to various penalties, besides a still larger number who were reconciled; “a term which must not be misunderstood by the reader to signify anything like a pardon or amnesty, but only the commutation of a capital sentence for inferior penalties, as fines, civil incapacity, very generally total confiscation of property, and not infrequently imprisonment for life” (Prescott, Ferd. and Isab. 1, 253; comp. also p. 267). His successor, Diego Deza, in eight years (1499-1506), according to the same writer, put above 1600 to a similar  death. Under the third general inquisitor, Francis Ximenes de Cisneros (1507-17), 2536 persons were killed, 1368 were burned in effigy, and 47,263 were punished in other ways (Llorente, 4, 252).

Not much better are the records of the proceedings of the other successive inquisitors general. M'Crie (Reform. in Spain, p. 109) ‘very rightly asserts that cardinal Ximenes, more than any other inquisitor general, contributed towards riveting the chains of political and spiritual despotism of Spain. “Possessed of talents that enabled him to foresee the dire effects which the Inquisition would inevitably produce, he was called to take part in public affairs at a time when these effects had decidedly appeared. It was in his power to abolish that execrable tribunal altogether as an insufferable nuisance, or at least to impose such checks upon its procedure as would have rendered it comparatively harmless. ‘Yet he not only allowed himself to be placed at its head, but employed all his influence and address in defeating every attempt to reform its worst and most glaring abuses.

Ximenes had obtained the title of a great man from foreigners as well as natives of Spain. But in spite of the eulogiums passed upon him, I cannot help being of opinion, with a modern writer, that Ximenes bore a striking resemblance to Philip II, with this difference, that the cardinal was possessed of higher talents, and that his proceedings were characterized by a certain openness and impartiality, the result of the unlimited confidence which he placed in his own powers. His character was essentially that of a monk, in whom the severity of his order was combined with the impetuosity of blood which belongs to the natives of the South” (p. 110- 112). Roman Catholics, of course, loudly protest against the credibility of these fearful allegations, assert that Llorente was a violent partisan, and allege that in his work on the Basque Provinces he had already proved himself a venal and unscrupulous fabricator; but they find it impossible to disprove his accuracy, and all that can possibly be done we see clearly in the efforts of one of the Catholic critics-Hefele, in his Life of Cardinal Ximenes-who produces many examples of Llorente's statements which he alleges are of a contradictory and exaggerated nature. Some Protestant historians, of course, fear that Llorente may have been too severe, as is apt to be the case with all apostates, and thus Prescott; in his Ferdinand and Isabella (3, 467-470), has pointed out many instances similar to those which Hefele produces, and Ranke does not hesitate (Fuirsten und Vilker des Südl. Europas, 1, 242) to impeach his honesty; Prescott even pronounces his ‘computations greatly exaggerated,” and his “estimates most improbable” (3, 468). Still, with all the deductions which it is possible  to make, even Roman Catholics must acknowledge that the working of the Inquisition in Spain, and in its dependencies in the New World too, involves an amount of cruelty which it is impossible to contemplate without horror.

But, in spite of the terrors which it spread, voices were repeatedly heard in Spain to pronounce against it, especially when it developed all its power to crush out evangelical doctrines during the great Reformation of the 16th century. Hatred towards it had spread itself far through the country (M'Crie, Reformation in Spain, chap. 5); and when Charles V ascended the throne, the Cortes of Castile, Aragon, and Catalonia endeavored to bring to pass a reformation of the tribunal (Llorente, 1 376 sq.). Negotiations to accomplish this end were entered into with the papal chair, and concessions were made, but they were not carried out. It directed its power now against those who openly or secretly adhered to evangelical doctrines. It published annually an edict of denunciation, and convened its chief tribunals at Seville and Valladolid. But it also directed its power against such members of its own Church as did not accept the doctrines of the Council of Trent concerning justification.

As, however, they succeeded in entirely suppressing Protestantism in Spain before the beginning of the 17th century, executions became rarer, and in the latter half of the 17th century the Inquisition abated its rigor, and was active principally in suppressing books and persecuting those who possessed or circulated forbidden books. Autos da fé were hardly ever heard of, and, as a result, the tribunal was less feared; and, finally, even Charles III forbade first the execution of capital punishment without royal warrant, and afterwards also set further limits to the power of the Inquisition, preventing it from rendering any final decision without the assent of the king, and also from making any new regulations. In 1762 the grand inquisitor was exiled into a convent for condemning a book against the king's will. In 1770 his minister Aranda circumscribed its power still further by forbidding the imprisonment of any royal subject, unless his guilt was well substantiated; and in 1784 followed the provision that the papers of every suit against a grandee, minister, or any other officer in the employ of the king, should always be presented to the sovereign for inspection before judgment could be pronounced; and although it afterwards regained ground for a while, public opinion proved too averse to it. Even the pope began to restrict its powers, and it was finally abolished in Madrid, Dec. 4,1808, by an edict of Joseph Napoleon. Llorente calculates that from the time of its introduction into Spain (1481) to that date (1808), the Inquisition had condemned in  Spain alone 341,021 persons. Of these, 31,912 persons were burnt alive, 17,659 in effigy, and 291,456 others punished severely.

When Ferdinand VII regained the throne of Spain in 1814, one of his first acts was the reestablishment of the Inquisition, but also one of the first acts of the Revolution of 1820 was the destruction of the palace of the Inquisition by the people, and the institution was suppressed by the Cortes. Yet, after the restoration, the apostolical party continued to demand its re-establishment; an inquisitorial junta was organized in 1825, and the old tribunal finally restored in 1826. The law of July 15, 1834, again suspended the Inquisition, after sequestering all-its possessions, and the Constitution of 1855 expressly declares that no one shall be made to suffer for his faith. Yet in 1857 the Inquisition showed itself still very vigorous in persecuting all persons suspected of Protestantism, and all books containing their doctrines. Such as were found with heretical books in their possession, or had read them, were severely punished.

The great political changes which the last few years have wrought on all the civilized world have not been without marked effects on Spain, and have removed not only in a measure, but, we hope, altogether, the deplorable effects of the Romish spirit of unmitigated intolerance, which has ever been praised, preached, and imperatively enjoined as one of the highest of Christian virtues by the antichristian see of Rome. Indeed the Inquisition, not only in Rome, but in every land, the papacy considered its masterpiece, “the firmest and most solid support of its power, both spiritual and temporal. Hence it put all things under the feet of its tribunal in the countries subject to its authority. There the most extravagant maxims were held to be incontestable, and the most unfounded pretensions established beyond dispute. Thus the infallibility of the popes, their superiority to general councils, their dominion over the possessions of all the churches in the world, the power to dispose of them as they pleased, their pretended authority over the temporal concerns of sovereigns, the right which they claim of deposing them, of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance, and giving away their dominions, are maxims which none dared to doubt in the countries of the Inquisition, much less to contest them, lest they should expose themselves to all the horrors of that detestable tribunal. No wonder that the popes, in return, so warmly supported all its pretensions, and earnestly and incessantly labored to procure for it so extensive an authority, that it at' length became formidable to the very princes by whom it was adopted” (Shoberl, Persecutions of Popery; 1, 113 sq.). These assertions, written (in 1844) long before the occurrence of the late so  auspicious events, deserve especial consideration, as among the first changes which the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy must inevitably bring is religious freedom all over the world. ((Comp. also Guetteee, The Papacy [N. Y. 1867, 12mo], Introd. p. 4 sq.)

Portugal. — From Spain the Inquisition was introduced into the different countries over which it held its sway. Thus it was not really introduced into Portugal until ‘its union with Spain in 1557, and only then after much opposition. It is true, under king Joan III of Portugal, an effort was made to establish the tribunal against the New-Christians of that country, imitating the Spaniards in this respect, and Henrique, the bishop of Ceuta, a former Franciscan monk and fanatic, even took the law in his own hands, and executed five New-Christians, to ‘hasten the establishment of the Inquisition. Many reasons swayed in favor to tolerate the Jews in Portugal, and they, of course, were in that country the first against whom the tribunal was intended to direct the bloody work. In 1531 Clement VII was even persuaded to issue a breve (Dec. 17) to introduce the Inquisition, but already, in the year following (Oct. 17, 1532), he revoked this order (comp. Herculano, Origem da Inqusicao em Portugal, 1, 276 sq., et al.).

But when the Inquisition, under Spanish influence, was at last introduced, as in Spain, it became also in Portugal a tribunal of the crown, and it is for this reason Roman Catholic writers argue that the see of Rome cannot be held responsible for the horrible deeds that it enacted in these two countries and in their dependencies. It is true, some of the popes protested against the establishment of the Inquisition as a state tribunal, but it must be remembered that the opposition was directed against it (as in Italy, above) not so much on account of its cruel measures, but because it chose to be independent of Rome. Indeed the popes, feeling their power insufficient to enforce obedience, found themselves compelled, from motives of prudence, to tolerate what they were powerless to suppress; i.e. unable to establish the Inquisition under their own immediate control, with the benefits accruing there from all flowing into their own treasury they yielded to a state tribunal, that gave them at least a part in the proceedings, as well as a part of the spoils. The highest tribunal of the Portuguese Inquisition was, of course, at Lisbon, the capital of the country, and the appointment of the grand inquisitor at the pleasure of the king, nominally also subject to the approval of the pope.

When, finally, Portugal became again independent under the duke of Braganza as John IV (1640), an effort was made by the Royalists to abolish the Inquisition, and to deprive it of  the right of sequestration. But John' IV found too strong an opposition in the priesthood, especially in the ever-plotting Jesuits, and he was prevented from executing his intentions successfully. After his death he was himself put under the ban, and his body was only a long time after officially absolved from this, one of the grossest sins a son of Rome could possibly have permitted, the attempt to cleanse his Church from the sin of unrighteousness. In the 18th century the Inquisition was further restricted in its activity and privileges by Pedro II (1706),a and a still more decided step was taken by Pombal under his son and successor, Joseph I.

The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and the inquisitorial tribunal was commanded by law to communicate to the arrested the accusations presented against him or them, the names of the accusers and witnesses, the right of an attorney to hold communication with the accused, and it was furthermore decreed that no sentence should be executed without the assent of the civil courts. At the same time, the auto da fe was also forbidden. After the fall of Pombal and the death of Joseph I the clergy regained their power for a season, but the spirit of enlightenment had made too great inroads not to conflict with the interference of the priests, and under king John VI (1818-26), when “this great engine for the coercion of the human mind, if worked with the unscrupulous, impassive resolution of Machiavellianism,” could no longer be made to accomplish its purpose, it breathed its last, and the very records of its proceedings were condemned to the flames.

Netherlands. — From Spain the Inquisition was also introduced into the Netherlands as early as the 13th century, and from this time forward exerted in this country, next to Spain, her authority most unscrupulously. Especially active was its tribunal during the Reformation. After a severe edict by Charles V at Worms against the heretics (May 8, 1521), he appointed as inquisitors to the Netherlands his councilor, Franz von der Hulst, and the Carmelite Nicolas of Egmont. They at once set out to do their task, and to inflict the usual penalties on their victims-banishment, etc. — and found especial helpmeets in the regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria, in connection with the bishop of Arras, Granvella. The printing, sale, and possession of heretical books were strictly forbidden, and the magistrates were required, under penalty of loss of office, to be active in discovering heretics, and send a quarterly report of their labors to the regent; the informers to receive a considerable reward for any proof (Raumer's Briefe, 1, 164 sq.). Nevertheless, the Reformation spread, and  the Inquisition was not even able to prevent the rise of fanatical sects, as the Anabaptists (q.v.), etc. But Charles, determined to uproot the Reformation, issued a new mandate for the organization of the Inquisition after the Spanish form (April 20, 1550) (see Sleidani Commentarii, ed. chr. car. Am Ende: Fref. ad M. 1785, 3, 203; Gerdesii Hist. Reformat. 3, App. p. 122).

But this attempt, like the former one, al-o failed. Maria, the widowed queen of Hungary, who in secret inclined to the Reformation, was now regent. Deputations of the citizens made her aware of the dangers which threatened her on that account; she went immediately to Germany to Charles, and was successful in effecting a change of the mandate in so far that in a new form of it (issued September 25, 1550) the words “Inquisition” and “inquisitors” were omitted. But it was still opposed, and could only be published in Antwerp on the condition of the municipal rights being preserved (Gerdesii, ut sup. 3, 216 sq.). That the Inquisition was very active up to this time in the Netherlands is certain; but the accounts that, under Charles V, 50,000, or even 100,000 persons lost their lives by it in that country (Sculteti Annales, p. 87; Grotii Annales et Historiae de rebus Belgicis, Amst. 1658, p. 12), seems to be exaggerated. When the Netherlands were placed under the government of Philip II a more severe policy was initiated, determined, if possible, not to modify the existing heresies, but to extinguish them altogether The Inquisition was at once set in full motion, and a zeal was manifested by its tribunal worthy of a better cause. But the cruelties which followed a people determined to worship their God in the manner which seemed to them a plain duty could excite no fear. but rather added new fuel to the flame already confined to too narrow limits, and it at last burst forth in all its maddened fury. At first the cities Louvain, Brussels, Antwerp, and Herzogenbusch united in demanding the abolition ‘of the Inquisition. Their example was imitated, and in February, 1556, a league of the nobility, called the Compromise, was formed, which energetically but humbly made the same request (Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 3, 390 sq.). After some delay this was accomplished in 1567. Shortly after, however, the terrible Alba was dispatched to the Netherlands with unlimited power.

Margaret was forced to resign the regency, and he now proceeded with unheard-of cruelty against those who had become suspected, or whose riches attracted him. Upon the 16th of February, 1568, by a sentence of the holy office, all the inhabitants of the Netherlands were condemned to death as heretics. “From this universal doom only a few persons especially named were excepted. A proclamation of the king, dated ten days later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition,  and ordered it to be carried into instant execution. Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sentenced to the scaffold in three lines” (Motley, Rise of the Dutch Republic, 2, 155). But even with these measures they failed in uprooting the Reformation as a dangerous heresy, and in 1573, when the provinces had almost become a waste, and depopulated by the emigration of hundreds of thousands and the execution of thousands of its most valuable citizens, Philip saw himself under the necessity of recalling the duke. The lesson that had been taught Spain was, however, insufficient to incline her to moderation. Philip now, as much as ever, was determined to uproot heresy by force, and these further attempts resulted finally in the independence of the northern provinces of the Netherlands, by a formidable union which they formed at Utrecht in 1579, and which the peace of Westphalia guaranteed to them. In the southern provinces the Jesuits continued to rule for a time, but soon there also the spirit of freedom abrogated their power, and the Inquisition, “all-seeing as Providence, inexorable as the grave; not inflicting punishment which the sufferer could remember but remorselessly killing outright; not troubling itself to ascertain the merits of a case, and giving the accused the benefits of a doubt, but regarding suspicion and certainty as the same thing,” was driven from the land.

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

             SEE INQUISITION.

## Insabbatati[[@Headword:Insabbatati]]

             SEE WALDENSIANS.

## Insacrati[[@Headword:Insacrati]]

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

## Inscriptions[[@Headword:Inscriptions]]

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

The oldest inscriptions now known to us are the Chinese, which profess to ascend to B.C. 2278. Those of India date only back to B.C. 315, the age of Sandracottus; but it has been thought that the hieroglyphical inscriptions of Central America and of Mexico may prove to be of much older date than those of China even. The Egyptian inscriptions are generally acknowledged to be as old as B.C. 2000; next in order come the Assyrian and Babylonian, reaching nearly as high an antiquity and then follow the Persian, and Median, and Phoenician, ail of about B.C. 700, while the Greek date only to B.C. 500 and 600, and the Etruscan and Roman to no remoter date than the Indian. i.e. B.C. 400-300. The most remarkable of all the known inscriptions are the trilingual inscription of Rosetta, that of Shalmanezer on the obelisk of Nimrud, and the cylinder of Sennacherib; the trilingual inscription of Darius I on the rock at Behistun; the Greek inscription of the soldiers of Psammetichus at Ipsamboul, and of the bronze helmet dedicated by Hiero I to the Olympian Jupiter; the inscription on the coffin of the Cyprian king Asmumazer; the Etruscan inscription called the Eugubine Tables; that of Mummius, the conqueror of Corinth, at Rome, and the will of Augustus at Ancyra; the inscription of the Ethiopian monarch Silco; the old monument of Yu, and the inscription of Se-gan-fu, recording the arrival  of Christianity in China (A.D. 631); the inscriptions of. Chandra-gupta and Asoka in India.

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

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

These inscriptions are found abundantly on the various monuments still remaining in Egypt, especially in the tombs and palaces of the several kings. They are found either alone, as documentary records, e.g. on the  obelisks and columns; or oftener in connection with pictorial representations of public or private scenes; very rarely, as in the famous Rosetta Stone, with interlinear translations in the corresponding Egyptian or a foreign language. SEE EGYPT.

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

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

IV. Sinaitic Inscriptions. — Wady Mokatteb, the cliffs of which bear these inscriptions, is a valley entering wady Sheik, and bordering on the upper regions of the Sinai Mountains. It extends for about three hours' march, and in most places its rocks present abrupt cliffs twenty or thirty feet high. From these cliffs large masses have separated and lie at the bottom in the valley. The cliffs and rocks are thickly covered with inscriptions, which are continued, at intervals of a few hundred paces only, for at least the distance of two hours and a half. Burckhardt says that to copy all of them would occupy a skilful draughtsman six or eight days. The inscriptions are very rudely executed, sometimes with large letters, at others with small, and seldom with straight lines. The characters appear to be written from right to left; and, although not cut deep, an instrument of metal must have been required, as the rock is of considerable hardness. Some of them are on rocks at a height of twelve or fifteen feet, and must have required a ladder to ascend to them. The characters were not known. The superior of the Franciscans, who visited the place in 1722, observes: “Although we had among us men who understood the Arabian, Greek, Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Turkish, English, Illyrian, German, and Bohemian languages, there was not one of us who had the slightest knowledge of the characters engraved in these hard rocks with great labor in a country where there is nothing to be had either to eat or drink.

Hence it is probable that these characters contained some profound secrets, which, long before the birth of Jesus Christ, were sculptured in these rocks by the Chaldaeans or some other persons.” This account excited profound attention in Europe; and it was thought by many that the inscriptions might have been formed by the Israelites during their stay in this region, and probably contained irrefragable evidence for the truth of the Mosaic history. Hence copies of them have been anxiously sought and secured; but, with the exception of a few in Greek, the character and language were still unknown. “Before they can be all deciphered,” says Laborde, “greater progress than has yet been attained must be made in the paleography and ancient languages of the East. The most general opinion is that they were the work of pilgrims who visited Sinai about the 6th century.” This seems to us very doubtful. The Greek inscriptions and the crosses, on which this conclusion chiefly rests, may indeed have been of that or a later age; but it does  not follow that those in the unknown characters necessarily were so too. — Kitto, Pict. Bible, note on Job 19:24. Rev. Charles Forster contends that they are records of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Palestine (Sinai Photographed, London, 1862, fol.). Better opportunities than had formerly been at the command of casual travelers were enjoyed by captain Palmer, a member of the expedition now employed in making a complete and exhaustive survey of the physical features and condition of the Sinaitic region. His collection of transcripts from wady Mokatteb and other localities exceeds 1500 in number, and he was much aided in the study of their meaning by finding several undoubted bilingual inscriptions were the Greek and Sinaitic characters occur together, and express the same meaning. The result of four months' steady devotion to this object has given a complete alphabet of the latter, so that captain Palmer can read and interpret any of the inscriptions with ease. Both the alphabet and language must have been employed by a late Shemitic people “in all probability a commercial community who inhabited, or at least colonized, the Peninsula for the first few centuries of the Christian era.”

That many of the writers were Christians is proved by the numerous Christian signs used by them; but it is equally clear, from internal evidence, that a large proportion of them were pagans. It is interesting to note that captain Palmer's researches were pursued without the knowledge of professor Beers's studies, though they mainly corroborate each other, and he bears testimony to the professor's acuteness and penetration. A writer in the Princeton Review (Oct. 1870), after giving the history of the discovery and decipherment of these inscriptions, thus concludes: “It seems to be ascertained that the writers were natives of Arabia Petraea, inclusive of the Sinaitic peninsula; and, whether they were subjects of the kingdom centering in Petra or not, they made use of the language and the mode of writing current there. They were neither Jews not Christians, but worshippers of heathen deities, and particularly of the heavenly bodies. They were mostly pilgrims on their way to certain celebrated sanctuaries, which were for centuries resorted to at special seasons by the pagans resident in this region. The inscriptions in the old native character belong to the period immediately preceding and following the Christian era; and they come down to the time when the Gospel and the Christian Church penetrated these localities, supplanted heathenism, and suppressed its sanctuaries. They then yield to legends in Greek and Latin, and even  more recent tongues, the work of Christians, who, in imitation of their heathen predecessors, have left the record of their pilgrimage to hallowed spots graven on the same imperishable works.”' Hence we find crosses and other marks of Christianity mingled in the pagan names and symbols. Similar inscriptions have been found scattered, but not so profusely, nor in such confusion in various other portions of the Sinaitic peninsula, and even in the outskirts of Palestine. (See the literature in the Princeton Review, ut sup.) SEE SINAI.

## Inscriptions, Christian[[@Headword:Inscriptions, Christian]]

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

1. The custom of tombstone inscriptions was borrowed by the early Christians from the Romans and Grecians; they simplified them, however, very much, and indicated the Christian knowledge, life, and rank of the deceased partly by significant symbols, partly by written signs, words, and expressions. These symbols, as they are found in Italy, France, and the countries on the Rhine, pertain partly to the designation of the Redeemer by means of pictorial representations, partly to the life after death, hope for the same through Christ and the cross. The name of Christ, their Lord and Master, is, as would be expected of his followers, everywhere the most  prominent, and is “repeated in an endless variety of forms, and the actions of his life are figured in every degree of rudeness of execution.” But remarkable it certainly is, that in the inscriptions contained in the Lapidarian Gallery, selected and arranged under papal superintendence, containing one of the largest, if not the largest collection of Christian inscriptions, there are no prayers for the dead (unless the forms “May you live,” “May God refresh you,” be so construed); no addresses to the Virgin Mary, nor to the apostles or earlier saints; and, with the exception of “eternal sleep,” “eternal home,” etc., no expressions contrary to the plain sense of Scripture. Neither is the second person of the Trinity viewed in the Jewish light of a temporal Messiah, nor is he degraded to the Socinian estimate of a mere example, but he is ever represented as invested with all the honors of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion as professed by the evangelical sects. On stones innumerable appears the good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, “sleeps in Christ;” another is buried with a prayer that “she may live in the Lord Jesus.”

But most of all, the cross in its simplest form is employed to testify the faith of the deceased; and whatever ignorance may have prevailed regarding the letter of Holy Writ, or the more mysterious doctrines contained in it, there seems to have been no want of apprehension of that sacrifice' whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven” (Maitland, Church in the Catacombs, p. 14,15). One of the principal signs used in referring to Christ is a monogram of the initial letters of the Greek name Χριστός. Most generally it is found to be composed of X and p, the latter placed in the heart of the former. Strange to say, we preserve in our own language a vestige of this figure in writing Xmas and Xtian, which can only be explained by supposing the first letter to stand for the Greek X.

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

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

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

The next is contained in Oderici:

which probably signified,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ΙΚΟΨΧ

BONO ET INOCENTI FILIO

PASTORI ῥ QV ῥ X ῥ Aῥ N ῥ IIII

NNIS X

ΙΞΟΨΧ

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

In a metrical Grecian inscription at Antrim, Christ himself, at the supper, is called ἰχθύς. Usually, however, it is the fisherman, who is Christ himself; he who also called the apostles to become the fishers of men (Mat 4:19; Mar 1:17). Clement observes that it refers to the apostle Peter, and the boys who were drawn out of the water (of baptism). To these the anchor is added, which, as early as the letter to the Hebrews (Heb 6:19), is made the symbol of hope resting in the centre of holiness (comp. Mai, Inscrip. Chr. p. 375, 4; 415, 9; 424, 7; 430,10; 449,4; 460,6). Less frequently we find the sailing ship, e.g. upon. an inscription of Firmia  Victoria, in the porch of Maria in Trastevere, in Rome, and (Mai, Inscrip. Chr. p. 430, 6) upon the tombstone of a certain virgin named Serenila. The same is also found in the Vatican. Clement calls it ναῦς οὐρανοδρομοῦσα, “the ship hastening heavenwards.” The lyre, as far as we know, does not occur on tombstones. The lyre is perhaps an ideal picture of the harmony which reigns in the Christian soul, or is used instead of Orpheus, by whom also Christ was represented. The clove, also specified by Clement, and the olive branch, are more numerous, as the signs of love and peace. The word peace is added to this facsimile from the Lapidarian Gallery.

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

DECEMBER S EVIVO FECIT SIBI BISOMVM.

Clement, among other things, forbids Christians to carry pitchers and swords upon their rings. The pitcher, with or without handle, does occur, however, frequently in Rome, Trier, and elsewhere, on Christian graves, usually between two doves. Whether this symbol refers to the doves drinking from a bowl, or whether it points to the water of life which is to refresh the thirsty soul, is not known. Instead of the sword, the axe occurs a few times on Christian tombstones: thus in Rome, at the church Nereo ed Achille, in the Palazzo Guilelmi, several times at Aringhi, etc. They are most probably a concealed representation of the cross, whose form they somewhat resemble. The Christians could use this symbol more readily, because it was also used by the heathens as dedicatio sub ascia. In addition to these, we find the seven-armed candlestick, which occurs in the cloister of St. Paola at Rome and elsewhere upon Jewish tomb-stones, but also upon Christian basilisks of Rome; not so frequently on graves, e.g. Mai,  Inscript. Chr. p. 408, 4.

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

NA VIBAS DOMINO E S V

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

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

Quite remarkable, however, is the distinguishing feature of Christian inscriptions of the early centuries, and perhaps one in which more than in any other it differs from pagan inscriptions, viz in its use of names. “While the heathen name consisted of several essential parts, all of which were necessary to distinguish its owner, the Christians in general confined themselves to that which they had received in baptism.” But as some of the converts came from Roman families, it was quite natural for them to retain their Gentile and other names, yea, genuine heathen names, and thus even the names of heathen gods occur, e.g. Azizos, the name of a Syriac goddess, we find in Trier (Centralmus, 3:53) given as the name of a Syriac Christian. Also Artemia, Martinus, Mercurilis, Jovinus, Venerosa, Venerigina, Saturninus, names united with Sabbatia, Sabbatius, Nundinas, and Dominica, taken in a great measure from the names of the days of the week. But the desire to simplify names, and to give them an ethical signification, is none the less noticeable even among the Roman converts; for while it was at that time nothing unusual in the heathen world for a person to have six, eight, or ten names, in Christian inscriptions (the name given at the time of baptism being always preferred) but one or two names generally occur.

The name was, as a rule, taken in view of facts universally believed to be good or desirable, e.g. with regard to lite: Vitalis, Vitalio, Vitalinus, Vitalissimus, Viventius, Zoe, etc.; in view of fortune: Felicio. Fortunio, Fortunula, Felicissima, Faustina. Prosper, Successus, Eutyches, etc.; of joy: Gaudentius. Gaudiosus, Hilario, Hilarianus, Jucunda, Edone; of victory: Victor, Vincentius, Nike, Pancratir; of strength: Virissimus, Fortissima, Alcimus, Dynamiola; of faith: Theophistus, Fidelis; of hope:  Spes, Helpis, Elpidia; of love: Philetus, Philumena, Agape, Agapetus, Caritosa; of spiritual blessing: Dorotheus, Theodorus. Theodota, Theodulus, Timothea, Theophila, and various others. The kingdom of nature has also its part in Christian names, e.g. months: Januarius, Februarius, Aprilis, Decembrina; animals, plants, employments of rural life, etc. Of Old Testament names few are found, e.g. Susanna, Daniel, and Daniel; of New-Testament names, Maria, Petrus, Paulus.

The consideration of national names is foreign to our purpose. After the name of the deceased there is frequently appended a short statement of his Christian position, views, or habits which distinguished him in civil life. He is called a neophyte (once in albis), a believer (fidelis), i.e. one who is really accepted: martyr, diacon, exorcista, subdiacon, etc.; child, virgin, man, wife; anima dulcis, mirae innocentiae anima or exemplum, dulcis aptissimus infans et visugrata et verbis dulcissima cunctis, filius innocentissimus. dulcissimus, bonus, sapiens, omnibus honorificentissimus et moneus, deo fidelis et dulcis marito, nutrix familiae, cunctis humilis, placata puro corde, amatrix pauperum, abstinens se ab omni maligna re, etc.; ‘the most common form is bene merens. Then follows the age, with a qui vixit or in' sceculo, ἔζησεν, ζήσας, either with an accurate account of the years, months, and days, or merely about the time, with the additional statement plus minus, πλέον ἐλάττον. Then the day of burial, with a depositus or deposito, not seldom the fasti for the year; sometimes, also, the announcement of the person who erected the stone (titulum posuit or posuerunt), and of his suffering (dolens, contra votum, etc.). Of course this arrangement is not always followed. Sometimes we find following the name a motto, such as ζήσης, vivas in Christo, in deo vivas, vivas in domino, spes pax tibi, accepta sis ll u nnrsto. The language is largely corrupted, the Latin degenerating into the Roman, but for this reason is very important in grammar. Occasionally we find Latin words written in Greek letters, or mixed inscriptions in both languages. When written in poetry, the hexameter or distich measure is commonly used, and yet they are rhythmical rather than metrical.

In such rhythmical inscriptions we find extension of thought not in the foregoing. The material upon which the inscriptions were made consists of small, plain marble slabs, either laid upon the grave or put into the coffin. Sometimes, to designate the death of martyrs, there occur vessels of blood and the instruments of death; also glasses, etc.

2. Besides the inscriptions on graves, which Rettberg first made useful to Church history, there are also sacred inscriptions, which we find partly upon glass, partly upon coins, gems, lamps, amulets, crosses, dishes, and other works of art. The more ancient Christian inscriptions have not yet been sufficiently sought for. In the collections of Fabretti, Reinesius, Gruter, Muratori, Donati, Castelli, Spon, Osann, Orelli, etc., they are badly injured. For descriptions of them, consult Franz, who speaks of the following: Bosio. Roma sotterranea (Rome, 1651); P. Aringhi, Ronma subterranea novissima (Rome, 1657; Paris, 1659), vols. 1 and 2; Boldetti. Osservazioni sopra i ciniteri de' santi martiri ed antichi christiani (Rome, 1720); Banduri, Numismata inmpp. Rom. a Traiano Decio ad paleologos Augustos (Paris, 1718), vols. 1, 2; Eckhel, Doctr. Nunm. vol. 8; Bellori, Lucernae veteres (Col. 1702); Ficoroni, Gemace ant. litt. Rome; Buonaruoti, Osservazioni sopra alcuni vast auntichi di vetro (Firenz. 1716); Seroux d'Agincourt, Histoire de l'artpar les monuments, etc. (Paris, 1823),vols. 1-4; Krebs, Lipsanotheca Weilburgensis (1820); Memoires de l'nstitut Royal de France (1837, 1838), vol. 3. The following are not mentioned by Franz; the treatise of Pellicia, De re lapidaria et siglis yet. Christian., in his Christianca ecclesie politia (ed. Braun, Colonise, 1838), 3:111-297; Kopp, Paleogr. Critic (Mannhemii, 1829), vols. 3 and 4; Mai, or rather Marini, Inscriptiones Christianme, in Mai, Script. veterum nova collectio (Rome, 1831), vol. 5, a work that leaves untreated much to be wished for. Earlier undertakings are spoken of by Mai in his introduction, p. 8 to 15. For the inscriptions at Naples, consult the works concerning the Catacombs there found; for those at Milan, Givo, Labus intorno alcuni monumenti epigrafici christiani scoperti in Milano l'anno MDCCCXIII nell' insigne basilica di san' Ambroqio (Milan, 1824, fol.); and the same, Intorno alcuni monumenti epi qrafici gentileschi e christiani scoperti nell' insigne basilica di S. Simpliciano (in the Giornale dell' J. R. Instituto Lombardo di Science, Lettere ed Arti, vol. 3, Milan, 1842); for those at Verona, Maffei's Miuseum Veronense (Veronae, 1749), p. 178-184. For those at Autun, comp. Franz. Das chrisfliche Denkilal (Berl. 1841, 8vo), in German and French. For Treves, see the works of Lersch. especially his Central Museum Rheinlandischer Inschriften (Bonn, 1842), 3:29-48; Steiner, Cod. inscrip. — Rhen, No. 829-849; Wyttenbach, Neue Beitrage z. antiken, heidnisch u. christl. Epigraphik (Treves, 1833); and others. For later epigraphs of the Middle Ages, see Otte, Abriss e. Kirchl. Kunst-Archaeol. d. Mittelalters (Nordhausen, 1845), p. 71-92; Menti, in Didron, Annales Archeologiques, 1, 106. For inscriptions still  later, see Galletti, Inscriptiones Romtance infimi cevi (Rome, 1760), vols. 1-3; Morcelli, Op. Fpigraph. (Patavii, 1823), vols. 4 and 5; Hipsch, Epigrammatographie (Cologne, 1801), vol. 2. See Aschbach. Kirchen- Lex. 3:484 sq.; Martigny, Dict. des Antiquites, p. 315 sq.; and especially Maitland, Church in the Catacombs (London, 1846, 8vo), from which we have freely quoted.

## Insect[[@Headword:Insect]]

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

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

## Insermentes or Refractaires[[@Headword:Insermentes or Refractaires]]

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

## Insignia of Clergy[[@Headword:Insignia of Clergy]]

             SEE VESTMENTS.

## Inskip, John S[[@Headword:Inskip, John S]]

             a noted Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Huntingdon, England, in 1816, and. came to America in 1820. He was converted at fourteen years of age, in 1836 joined the Philadelphia Conference, in 1845 was transferred to the Ohio Conference, in 1852 to the New York East Conference, later to the New York Conference, the Baltimore Conference, and finally, again to the New York East Conference, in all, of which he occupied important stations until his super-annuation in 1873, after which he was editor of the Christian Standard, in Philadelphia, until his death, at Ocean Grove, N.J., March 7, 1884. He was a pleasing and successful evangelist, and in his later years a powerful advocate of entire sanctification. He made a memorable defence of himself before the General Conference of 1852 from the charge of innovation in his pastoral rulings at Springfield, Ohio, concerning family sittings in the congregations. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1884, page 94.

## Inspiration[[@Headword:Inspiration]]

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

I. Definition. —

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

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

3. A psychological definition of the relation of this divine, consequently passively received perception to human spontaneity, is given by Plato in his doctrine of the divine μανία, the ἔνθεος εϊvναι. This position is the root of the divinely implanted tendency to knowledge which has not yet attained a clear consciousness (Zeller, Griech. Phil. 2, 166, 275; Brandis, 2, 428). Of this, in so far as it includes the idea in the form of beauty, artists and authors say: οὐ τέχνη ταῦτα τὰ καλὰ λέγουσι ποιήματα, ἀλλ᾿ ἔνθεοι ὄντες καὶ κατεχόμενοι (Ion. 533). Οὐ γὰρ τέχνη ταῦτα λεγουσιν, ἀλλὰ θείᾷ δυνάμει (ib. p. 534). This gives rise to the μαντική, which requires the προφήτης for its interpreter (Timceus, 72). This doctrine of Plato concerning inspiration has had great influence on the Jewish and Christian doctrine. Philo admits it, and derives from it the incompatibility  of divine and human knowledge (Quis reruza d. h. 1, 511, Mang.); ὅτε μὲν φῶς ἐπιλάμψει τὸ θεῖον, δύεται τὸ ανθρώπινον· ὅτε δ ἐκεῖνο δύει, τοῦτ᾿ ἀνίσχει καὶ ἀνατέλλει.

Yet he does not limit the divine influence to the inspiration of the sacred books, and does not hesitate to ascribe to himself an occasional θεοληπτεῖσθαι (De Cherubim, 1, 143). Some of the Greek fathers also describe the state of inspiration as purely passive (Justin, Cohort. c. 8: Οὔτε γὰρ φύσει οὔτε ἀνθρωπίνῃ ἐννοίᾷ οὕτω μεγάλα καὶ θεῖα γίνώσκειν ἀνθρώποις δυνατόν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἄνωθεν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἁγίους ἀνδρας τηνικαῦτα κατελθούσῃ δωρεᾶ'/, οϊvς οὐ λόγιον ἐδέησε τέχνης, ἀλλὰ καθαροὺς ἑαυτοὺς τῇ τοῦ θείου πνεύματος παρασχεῖν ἐνερ γείᾷ, ἵν᾿ αὐτὸ τὸ θεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατιὸν πλῆκτρον, éσπερ ὀργάνῳ, κιθάρας τινὸς ἤ λύρας τοῖς δικαίοις ἀνδράσι χρώμενον, τὴν τῶν θείων ἡμῖν ἀποκαλύφῃ γνῶσις: Athenag. Legat. c. 9: No, μίζω ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἀνοήτους γεγονέναι οὔτε τοῦ Μωϋσέως οὔτε τοῦ ᾿Ησαϊvου καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, ο‰ κατ῎ ἔκστασιν τῶν ἐκ αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος αὐτοὺς τοῦ θείου πνεύματος, ὰ ἐνηχοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν, συγχρησαμένου τοῦ πνεῦματος, ώσεὶ καὶ. αὐλητὴς αὐλὸν ἐμπνεῦσαι). We therefore find at an early time the notion of a literal inspiration (Iren. 3:16, 2: “Potuerat dicere Matthaeus: Jesu generatio sic erat. Sed previdens Spiritus S. depravatores et praemuniens contra fraudulentiam eorum, per Matthaum ait: Christi generatio sic erat.” Clemens, Cohort. 1, 71, ed. Pott.: Ε᾿ξ ῏ων γραμμάτων [he means the ἱερὰ γρὰμματα, 2Ti 3:14] καὶ συλλαβῶν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς συγκειμένας γραφὰς ὁ αὐτὸς ἀκολούθως Α᾿πόστολος θεοπνεύστους καλεῖ. Origen, Hom. 21 in Jeremiah: “Secundum istiusmodi expositiones decet sacras litteras credere nec unum quidem apicem habere vacuum sapientia Dei”). Yet all these expressions represent rather the general religious impression than the settled dogma; hence we find the ante-Nicene fathers recognizing some of the heathen books as inspired, e.g. the Sibyllian books (Theoph. ad Autol. 2, 9), whilst at the same time they expressed views excluding the idea of all parts of Scripture being equally inspired.

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

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

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

2. The Lord Jesus Christ possessed the spirit of wisdom without measure, and came to bear witness to the truth. His works proved that he was what he declared himself to be-the Messiah, the great Prophet, the infallible Teacher. The faith which rests on him rests on a rock. As soon, then, as we learn how he regarded the Scriptures, we have reached the end of our inquiries. His word is truth. Now every one who carefully attends to the four Gospels will find that Christ everywhere spoke of that collection of writings called the Scripture as the word of God; that he regarded the whole in this light; that he treated the Scripture, and every part of it, as infallibly true, and as clothed with divine authority--thus distinguishing it  from every mere human production. Nothing written by man can be entitled to the respect which Christ showed to the Scriptures. This, to all Christians, is direct and incontrovertible evidence of the divine origin of the Scriptures, and is by itself perfectly conclusive.

3. But there is clear concurrent evidence, and evidence still more specific, in the writings of the apostles. Particularly in one passage (2Ti 3:16), Paul lays it down as the characteristic of “all Scripture” that it “is given by inspiration of God” (θεόπνευστος, “divinely inspired”); and from this results its profitableness. Some writers think that the passage should be rendered thus: All divinely inspired Scripture, or, all Scripture, being divinely inspired, is profitable. According to the common rendering, inspiration is predicated of all Scripture. According to the other, it is presupposed as the attribute of the subject. But this rendering is liable to insuperable objections.

For θεόπνευστος and ώφέλιμος are connected by the conjunction καί, and must both be predicates, if either of them is; and unless one of them is a predicate there is no complete sentence. Henderson remarks that the mode of construction referred to ‘is at variance with a common rule of Greek syntax, which requires that when two adjectives are closely joined, as θέοπνευστος and ὠφέλιμος here are, if there be an ellipsis of the substantive verb ἐστί, this verb must be supplied after the former of the two, and regarded as repeated after the latter. Now there exists precisely such an ellipsis in the case before us; and as there is nothing in the context which would lead to any exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force.” He adds that “the evidence in favor of the common rendering, derived from the fathers, and almost all the versions, is most decided.” It cannot for a moment be admitted that the apostle meant to signify that divine inspiration belongs to a part of Scripture, but not to the whole; or that he meant, as Semler supposes, to furnish a criterion by which to judge whether any work is inspired or not, namely, its utility. “That author proceeds fearlessly to apply this criterion to the books of the Old Testament, and to lop off eight of them as not possessing the requisite marks of legitimacy. Many of the German divines adopt Semler's hypothesis.” But it is very manifest that such a sense is not by any means suggested by the passage itself, and that it is utterly precluded by other parts of the New Testament. For neither Christ nor any one of his apostles ever intimates a distinction between some parts of Scripture which are inspired and other parts which are not inspired. The doctrine which is plainly asserted in the text under consideration, and which is fully sustained  by the current language of the New Testament, is, that all the writings denominated the Scriptures are divinely inspired.

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

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

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

“But inspiration was concerned not only in making known the will of God to prophets and apostles, but also in giving them direction in writing the sacred books. In this, also, there was a diversity in the mode of divine influence. Sometimes the Spirit of God moved and guided his servants to write things which they could not know by natural means, such as new doctrines or precepts, or predictions of future events. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write the history of events which were wholly or partly known to them by tradition, or by the testimony of their contemporaries, or by their own observation or experience. In all these cases the divine Spirit effectually preserved them from all error, and influenced them to write just so much and in such a manner as God saw to be best. Sometimes he moved and guided them to write a summary record of larger histories, containing what his infinite wisdom saw to be adapted to the end in view, that is, the benefit of his people in all ages. Sometimes he influenced them to make a record of important maxims in common use, or to write new ones, derived  either from their own reason or experience, or from special divine teaching. Sometimes he influenced them to write parables or allegories, particularly suited to make a salutary impression of divine things on the minds of men; and sometimes to record supernatural visions. In these and all other kinds of writing the sacred penmen manifestly needed special divine guidance, as. no man could of himself attain to infallibility, and no wisdom, except that of God, was sufficient to determine what things ought to be written for permanent use in the Church, and what manner of writing would be best fitted to promote the great ends of revelation.”

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

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

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

(2.) The mystical, or. extremely strict view, thought to have been held by Philo, Josephus, and some of the primitive Christian fathers (but  condemned by the early councils as savoring of heathenish μαντεία), which regarded the sacred writers as wholly possessed by the Spirit, and uttering its dicta in a species of frenzy. This, in opposition to the former, has justly been characterized as the mechanical view, denoting the passivity of the inspired subject.

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

This last view is not to be confounded, however, with that of those who limit inspiration to such matters in holy Scripture as directly pertain to the proper material of revelation, i.e. to strictly religious truth, whether of doctrine or practice. Among English divines, those who have asserted this form of theory are Howe (Divine Authority of Scripture, lect. 8 and 9), Bp. Williams (Boyle Lect. serm. 4:p. 133), Burnet (Article 6:p. 157, Oxf. ed. 1814), Lowth (Vind. of Div. Auth. and Inspir. of Old and New Testament, p. 45 sq.), Hey (Theol. Lect. 1, 90), Bp. Watson (Tracts, 4:446), Bp. Law (Theory of Religion), Tomline (Theology. 1, 21), Dr. J. Barrow (Dis. sertations, 1819. 4th diss.), Dean Conybeare (Theological Lectures, p. 186), Bp. Hinds (Inspiration of Scripture, p. 151), Bp. D. Wilson (lecture 13 on Evidences, 1, 509), Parry (Inquiry into the Nature of the Inspiration of the Apostles, p. 26, 27), and Bp. Blomfield (Lectures on Acts, 5, 88-90). Others have even gone so far as to avow that the value of the religious element in the revelation would not be lessened if errors were acknowledged in the scientific and miscellaneous matter which accompanies it. Among those who have held this form of the theory are Baxter (Method. Theol. Chr. pt. 3, ch. 12:9, 4), Tillotson (Works, fol. 3:449, sermon 168), Doddridge (On Inspir.), Warburton (Doctr. of Grate, bk. 1, ch. 7), Bp. Horsley (serm. 39 on Ecclesesiastes 12:7, Works, 3:175), Bp. Randolph (Rem. on Michaelis' Introd. p. 15, 16), Paley (Evid. of Christianity, pt. 3, ch. 2), Whately (Ess. on Dif. in St. Paul, ess. 1 and 9; Sermons on Festivals, p. 90; Pecul. of Christianity, p. 233), Hampden (Bampton Lect. p. 301), Thirlwall (Schleiermacher's Luke, Introd. p. 15), Bp. Hebef (Barnpt. Lect. 8:577), Thomas Scott (Essay on Inspir. p. 3), Dr. Pve Smith (Script. and Geol. p. 276, 237, 3rd ed.), and Dean Alford (Proleg. to Gosp. ed. L859, vol. 1, ch. 1, § 22). (For other Writers who have held the same views, see Dr. Davidson's Facts, Statements, etc., in defense of his vol. 2 of Horne's Introd. 1857.) The inadmissibility, however, of either of these limitations to inspiration is evident from two  considerations: 1st, That the sacred writers themselves make no such discrimination in their professions of divine sanction; and it would, in fact, be subversive of the above distinction between inspiration and Revelation

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

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

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

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

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

(III.) The suggestion of the ipsissima verba to the minds of the sacred writers is incompatible with their free action, as evinced in the varieties and even blemishes of style. These are clearly the human element, partaking of the imperfection and diversity inseparable from man's productions. To say that God makes use of them is only evading the point. He does not directly supply them nor authorize them; he only suffers them. The inconsistency of  statement by Gaussen and other verbalists on this head is palpable, and shows the untenableness of their position in the face of infidel objections and rationalistic criticism. Equally inconclusive and self-contradictory is their method of disposing of the objection that if the actual Greek and Hebrew words are inspired, no translations can in any correlative sense be called “the word of God.”

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

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

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

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

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

(b.) Justin Martyr, after using the figure of the “lyre,” which is so much relied upon by the advocates of verbal inspiration, goes on to limit his remark to “those things in Scripture which are necessary for us to know” (Just. Ad Graec. § 8).  (c.) Irenceus, in a fragment on “the style of St. Paul,” alludes to the fact that his sentences were sometimes “unsyntactic,” and accounts for it by the “rapidity of his utterances (velocitas sermonum), and the impulsiveness of spirit which distinguished him.”

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

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

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

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

[3.] The period between the fathers and the schoolmen is of so little value in the history of theology that it is hardly worth while to refer to it. One or two writers of some note in this period adopted verbal inspiration, but there was no received theory of the kind. Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in answer to Fredegis (who is cited by Prof. Harris), asks, “What absurdity follows if the notion be adopted that the Holy Spirit not only inspired the prophets and apostles with the sense of their teachings, but also fashioned on their lips the very words themselves, bodily and outwardly (corporea verba extrinsecus in ora illorum)” (Agobard, Contra Fredegisum, c. 12).  [4.] By the schoolmen, and subsequently by the doctors of the Church in general, a distinction was made in inspiration between, revelatio and assistentia.

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

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

V. Literature. — Early treatises on the subject, of a general character, are those of Quenstedt, Carpzov, Weger, Lange, Le Clerc, Lowth, Lamothe, Clarke,Doddridge, etc., which rather belong to the province of “Introduction” (q.v.); more explict are the works of Bayly, Essay on Inspiration (London, 1707, 1708); Jaquelot, La Ve ite et l'Inspiration des livres du V. et N.T. (Rotterd. 1715); Calamy, Inspiration of Old and N.Test. (London, 1710); Martense, Christiana doctrinae de divina Sacrarum Litterarum inspir. vindicic (Jena, 1724); Klemm, Theopneust. Sacrorum Litt. asserta (Tub. 1743); Stosch, De duplici Apostoll. theopneustia, turn generali turn speciali (Guelpherb. 1754); Bullstedt, De vera S. S. inspirationis indole (Coburg, 1757 sq.); Teller, De inspir. divina Vatum Sacrorum (Helmst. 1762); also Diss. de Inspir. Script. Sac.judiciofornmando (Helmst. 1764); Tollner, Die Gottliche Eingebung der heiligen SchriJt untersucht (Mittau and Leipzig, 1772); Jablonsky, De Eo7r',evarai Scriptorum Sacrorum N.T. [in his Opusc. ed. te Water, 4:425-54); Wakefield, Essay on Inspiration (Lond. 1781); Meyer, De Inspiratione S. S. (Tr. ad Rh. 1784); Hegelmaier, De Theopneustia ejusqute statu in viris sanctis Libb. Sacc. auctoribus (Tub. 1784); Miller, Cum theopneustia Apostolorum nec osmniscientiams quasi aliquam, nec anamartesiam fuisse (Gott. 1789); Henckel, Inspirationem Evv. et Act.  sine ullo religionis damno negari posse dubitatum (Freft. ad V. 1793): the definite questions of the extent and character of inspiration, however, are specially discussed in the works of Moore, Plenary Inspiration of the N.T. (Lond. 1793); Jesse, Of the Learning and Inspiration of the Apostles (London, 1798); Findlay, The Divine Inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, etc. (Lond. 1803); Dick, Essay on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures (Glasgow, 1800; 4th edit. 1840); Sontag, Doctr. inspirationis ejusque ratio, hist. et ususpopularis (Heidelberg, 1810); Dullo, Ueber d. gottl. Eingebung des N.T. (Jena, 1816); H.Planck, Ueber Offenbarung u. Inspiration [opposed to Schleiermacher's views] (Gott. 1817); Rennel, Proofs of Inspiration [N.T. compared with Apocrypha] (Load. 1822); Parry, Inquiry into the Nature and Extent of the Inspiration of the Writers of the N.T. (2nd edit. London, 1822); Macleod, View of Inspiration [general statement of fact] (Glasg. 1827); Carson, Theories of Inspiration [review of Wilson, Pye Smith, and Dick] (Edib. 1830); Haldane, The Books of the O.T and N.T. proved to be canonical, and their Verbal Inspiration maintained and established, etc. [a brief partisan treatise] (5th ed. Edinb. 1853); Hinds, Bp., Proofs, Nature, and Extent of Inspiration (Oxford, 1831); Fraser, Essay on the Plenary and Verbal Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures [a popular view] (in New Family Library, vol. 2, Edinb. 1834); Henderson, Divine Inspiration [a calm and judicious treatise, endeavoring to reconcile the extreme theories, and therefore somewhat inconsistent with itself ] (London, 1836; 4th edit. 1852)'; Carson, Divine Inspiration [strictures on Henderson] (London, 1837); Gaussen, Theopneustie [a rhetorical rather than logical plea for the extreme view] (2nd ed. 1842; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1850; Boston, 1850); Jahn, Ad quosdam pertinent promiss. Sp. S. sec. N. Test. (Basle, 1841); Leblois, Sur l'Inspiration des premiers Chretiens (Strasburg, 1850); Carson, Inspiration [violent] (Dublin, 1854); Lee, Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures [an excellent work, making many good distinctions, and giving the history, but defective in arrangement and exactness] (Dublin, 1857, 2nd edit.); Wordsworth, Inspiration of Canon [apologetic] (London, 1848,1851; Philadelphia, 1854); Lord, Plenary Inspiration of the Scriptures [an extremist] (New York, 1858); Macnaught, Inspir. Infall. and Author of Scrip sort of somnambulic state, the inspired person receives and manifests the divine inspiration: this manifestation consists sometimes only in convulsive motions, or in broken sentences, which latter are generally invitations to repentance and amendment, or denunciations of some adversary. The congregations are governed by a chief and two elders,  and they hold occasional conferences together. They have no regular ministry, but all members, of both sexes, are required to contribute to the common edification by praying aloud in the assemblies; besides this, if an Inspired teacher is present, and feels inspired, he preaches; if not, he reads some passages of Scripture, or the recorded utterances of some Inspired members. They have also a particular collection of hymns. Their principal festivals are love-feasts, at which preaching is generally part of the order of exercises of the day. These festivals are announced long beforehand, but none take part in them except those who are personally invited to do so by the Inspired leaders. The week before a love-feast is always a season of especial fasting, penitence, and prayer, and the day preceding it is still more strictly observed. Prayer, singing, prophesying, and feet-washing always precede the love-feast, at which the persons invited partake of cake and wine. See M. Gobel, Gesch. c. wahren Inspirationsyem veinden von 1688- 1854 (in the Zeitschriftfur hist. Theologie, 1854); Schrockh, Kirchengeschichte s. d. Reformation, 8:401 sq.; Schlegel, Kirchengeschichte d. 18tel Jahrhunderts, 2, div. 2, 1047 sq.; Baumgarten, Geschichte d. Relig. Partheien, p. 1048 sq.

## Installare[[@Headword:Installare]]

             SEE INSTALLATION.

## Installation[[@Headword:Installation]]

             (Low Latin and stallum, a seat) is a name in some churches for the ceremonial act or process by which an ordained minister is formally put into possession of his office, and by which he is fully empowered not alone to exercise its functions, but to enjoy its honors and emoluments. The ceremonial form, as well as the name, differs according to the office which is conferred, as enthronization for a bishop, induction for a minister, etc. Installation in the English Church, however, properly regards only the office of a canon or prebendary. The word is also used generally for a formal introduction to any office. “Though technically distinguished in modern times from the act of ordination, it is virtually included in the ‘ordination' services whenever the minister is inducted into the pastoral office for the first time. But when, having been previously ordained, he forms another pastoral connection, the public and official induction is termed simply an ‘installation.' See Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Walcott,  Sacred Archceöl. p. 329 (for the use of the term as used in the English Church); Congregat. Quarterly, 1868, p. 340.

## Instinct[[@Headword:Instinct]]

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

## Institor, Heinrich[[@Headword:Institor, Heinrich]]

             a Dominican of the 16th century, is the author of Malleus Maleficarum: — Clypeus T.R. Ecclesiae Defensionis contra Pickardos et Waldenses: — De Plenaria Potestate Pontificis et Monarchiae: — Replica Adversus Sententiam Christum Nonnisi sub Conditione in Eucharistia Adorandum: — Sermones XXX de Eucharistia. See Echard, De Scriptoribus Ordinis Dominicanorum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Institutio[[@Headword:Institutio]]

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

## Institution[[@Headword:Institution]]

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

1. Those are called positive institutions or precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given, or discoverable by them, but which are observed merely because some superior has commanded them.

2. Moral are those, the reasons of which we see, and the duties of which arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command.

3. Human are generally applied to those inventions of men, or means of honoring God, which are not appointed by him, and which are numerous in the Church of Rome, and too many of them in Protestant churches. See Butler's Analogy, p. 214; Doddridge's Lect. lect. 158; Robinson's Claude, 1. 217; 2, 258; Burroughs, Disc. on Positive Institutions;' Bp. Hoadley's Plain Account, p. 3. INSTITUTION in Church law means the final and authoritative appointment to a church benefice-more especially a bishopric- by the person with whom such right of appointment ultimately rests. Thus, in the Roman Catholic Church-even after the election of a bishop by the chapter, or his nomination by the crown, when that right belongs to the crown-it is only the pope who confers institution. In English usage, institution is a conveyance of the cure of souls by the bishop, who, or whose deputy, reads the words of the institution, while the clerk kneels.  The institution vests the benefice in the clerk, for the purpose of spiritual duty, who thereupon becomes entitled to the profits thereof. But the title is not complete till induction (q.v.).

## Institution of a Christian Man[[@Headword:Institution of a Christian Man]]

             also called The Bishop's Book, is the name of a book containing an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave. Maria, Justification, and Purgatory, which was drawn up by a committee of prelates and divines of the English Church in 1537. “for a direction for the bishops and clergy,” and to be “an authoritative explanation of the doctrine of faith and manners,” and a sort of standard for the desk and the pulpit, or, as it itself expresses it, for the clergy “to govern themselves in the instruction of their flocks by this rule.” Some say that Stephen Poynet, bishop of Winchester, wrote the book himself, and that a committee of prelates and divines gave it their sanction. It was called forth at the time of the early reformatory ecclesiastical movements in England during the reign of Henry VIII. At the time of the publication of the “Institution of ‘a Christian Man” (printed in Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the Reign of Henry VIII, Oxf. 1825), the English Church had become alienated from the Church of Rome; at least king Henry had laid claim to his sovereignty over the Church in his dominions, which an act of Parliament in 1533 had secured him, and, with few dissentient voices, the clergy of the land had seconded the opinion of Parliament. In 1536 a convocation, called “the Southern Convocation,” published a manifesto, entitled “Articles to stablyshe Christen quietness, and unite amonge us, and to avoyde contentious opinions,” which are generally regarded as the starting-point of the English Reformation. “But, upon the whole, these articles breathed rather the animus of the Middle Ages. Thus they took, on the doctrine of justification, a course midway between the Romanists and the Lutherans. They had also paid reverence to some of the Romish superstitions, as the use of images, invocation of saints, and still held to the doctrine of purgatory, which was at this time beginning to encounter a determined opposition from the more radical reformers. To represent more truly the real desires and opinions of the English Church, the Bishops' Book was launched. It discussed at length the Romish superstitions which the Southern Convocation had sanctioned, and declared against a further adherence to them by the English people. They also held that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable  partly to the favor and indulgence of the Roman emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as' men originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus reoccupy the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages.” See Hardwick, Reformation, p. 202; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England, anno 1537.

## Instruction[[@Headword:Instruction]]

             SEE EDUCATION.

## Instrument [[@Headword:Instrument ]]

             (כְּלַי, keli', ὅπλον, general names for any implement, vessel, etc.). SEE MUSIC; SEE ARMOR.

## Instrumental Music[[@Headword:Instrumental Music]]

             SEE MUSIC.

## Instrumentum pacis[[@Headword:Instrumentum pacis]]

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

## Insufflation[[@Headword:Insufflation]]

             SEE EXORCIST.

## Insulani[[@Headword:Insulani]]

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

## Insult[[@Headword:Insult]]

             or such a treatment of another, in word or deed, as to express contempt, is not definitely taken cognizance of in the Mosaic law; only the reviling of superiors is forbidden (Exo 22:28), yet without any special penalty attached. The severity, however, with ‘which disrespect towards sacred persons was punished appears from 2Ki 2:22 sq. There also occurs mention (Psa 22:8; Psa 38:21; Lam 2:15; Mat 27:39) of gestures of malicious mockery (wagging the head, הֵנַיעִ ראֹשׁ). Insult by abusive words (Mat 5:22, ῥακά; SEE RACA ) or stroke (smiting on the cheek, Job 16:10; Mat 5:39; Joh 18:22; Joh 19:3; pulling the ears, spitting upon, Mat 27:30, etc.) was, in later law, punished by fine (Mishna, Baba Kammer, 8, 6; comp. Mat 5:22), as also in Roman law. For a marked public affront which Herod Agrippa I received at Alexandria, see Philo, 2, 522. SEE COURTESY.

## Intention[[@Headword:Intention]]

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

In the Roman Catholic Church the intention of the priest is held to be essential to the valid celebration of the sacraments. This the Council of Trent decreed in its 11th canon (Sess. 7): “If any one shall say that in ministers, while they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.”  The same principle, in the main, was advocated and set forth by popes Martin V and Eugenius IV in the early part of the last century. So abused has this principle generally become in the Roman Catholic Church, that by its consequences it must be declared to be greatly detrimental to the cause of the Christian religion. For inasmuch as the insincerity of the actor reduces the act to a mockery and a sinful trifling with sacred things, the Church of Rome, by this decision, “exposes the laity to doubt, hesitation, and insecurity whenever they receive a sacrament at the hand of a priest in whose piety and sincerity they have not full confidence. If a wicked priest, for instance, should baptize a child without an inward intention to baptize him, it would follow that the baptism was null and void for want of the intention.” The Church of England, to repudiate this perverse doctrine, in its 26th Article of Religion, declares, therefore, that the unworthiness of ministers does not hinder the effect of sacraments, “forasmuch as they do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission, [and therefore] we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such as by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men.” See Staunton, Eccles. Dict. p. 398; Blunt, Theol. Dict. 1, 351; and, for a moderate Roman account of Intention, Liebermann, Instit. Theol. (ed. 1861), 2, 386 sq.

## Intercalary Fruits[[@Headword:Intercalary Fruits]]

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

## Intercalary Month[[@Headword:Intercalary Month]]

             SEE CALENDAR.

## Intercession[[@Headword:Intercession]]

             (פָּנִע, ἔντευξις) is the act of interposition in behalf of another, to plead for him (Isa 53:12; Isa 59:16; 1Ti 2:1). SEE ADVOCATE.

## Intercession (2)[[@Headword:Intercession (2)]]

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

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

## Intercession Of Christ[[@Headword:Intercession Of Christ]]

             This refers, in a general sense, to any aid which he, as perpetual High priest, extends to those who approach God confiding in him (Heb 4:16; Heb 7:25-27). He is also represented as offering up the prayers and praises of his people, which become acceptable to God through him (Heb 13:15; 1Pe 2:5; Rev 8:3). Of the intercession of Christ we may observe, that it is righteous, for it is founded upon justice and truth (Heb 7:26; 1Jn 3:5), compassionate (Heb 2:17; Heb 5:8), perpetual (Heb 7:25), and efficacious (1Jn 2:1). SEE MEDIATOR.

## Intercession Of Saints[[@Headword:Intercession Of Saints]]

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

## Intercession Of The Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Intercession Of The Holy Ghost]]

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

## Intercessores or Interventores[[@Headword:Intercessores or Interventores]]

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

## Intercisi dies[[@Headword:Intercisi dies]]

             were days, among the ancient Romans, which were devoted partly to the worship of the gods, and partly to ordinary business.

## Interdict[[@Headword:Interdict]]

             (interdictum, sc. celebrationis divini officzi, a prohibition of religious offices) is an ecclesiastical censure or penalty in the Roman Catholic Church, consisting in the withdrawal of the administration of certain sacraments, of the celebration of public worship, and of the solemn burial service. There are three kinds of interdicts: local, which affect a particular place, and thus comprehend all, without distinction, who reside therein; personal, which only affect a person or persons, and which reach this person or persons, and these alone, no matter where found; and mixed, which affect both a place and its inhabitants, so that' the latter would be bound by the interdict even outside of its purely local limits. But, as the interdict is oftentimes inflicted on the clergy alone, it is always strictly interpreted, so that one imposed on a parish, etc., does not take effect also on the clergy, and vice versa (compare Ferraris, art. 2, 5). The interdict, like the ban (q.v.), may be inflicted by legal order (interdictumr a jure), or procured by ecclesiastical judges (ab homine). The reasons for inflicting this ecclesiastical penalty are various; most generally they are the abolition of Church immunities, disrespect towards ecclesiastical authority or commands, and the effects are generally the prohibition of administering the sacraments, of holding public worship, and the denial of Christian burial; yet various modifications: have been frequent. Thus Alexander III permitted in 1173 the administration of the sacrament of baptism to children, and that of penitence to the dying (c. 11, X. De sponsalibus, 4, 1; comp. c. 11, X. Depcenit. et remiss. 5, 38; c. 24, De sententia excomm. 6; 5, 11). Innocent III allowed' confirmation and preaching (c. 43, X. De sent. excomm. 5, 39, a. 1208), as also penitence, with some restrictions (c. 11, X. Deponit. 5, 38, a. 1214; comp. c.24, De sent. excomm. in 6), the  silent burial of the clergy (c. 11, X. cit. 5, 38), and to convents the observance of the canonical hours, without singing, and the reading of a low mass, which was in the following year extended also to the bishops (c. 25, X. De privilegiis, 5, 33, a. 1215). But to this was appended the condition that the parties under excommunication or interdict should not be present, that the doors of the churches should remain locked, and no bells be allowed to ring. Boniface VIII went further, and allowed the celebration of public worship with open doors, ringing of bells, and in the presence of the excommunicated parties on the occasions of the Nativity, Easter, Pentecost, and the Ascension of the Virgin. Yet such of the interdicted and excommunicated as did not come to the altar were to be excluded (c. 24, De sent. excomm. in 6 [5, 11]). Martin V and Eugene IV extended this to the whole octave of the Corpus Christi (Const. Ineffabile, an. 1429, and Const. Excellentissimum, an. 1433, in Bullar. Magnum, 1, 308, 323); and Leo X to the octave of the festival of the Holy Conception. There were, moreover, other special regulations made for the benefit of the Franciscans and other orders of monks (Ferraris, art. 6, no. 15). In the 25th Session of the Council of Trent (cap. 12, De regularibus) it was decided that the regulars generally were to observe the interdict, as had already been commanded by Clement V (c. 1, Clem. De sent. excomm. 5, 10, Concil.Vienn. 1311).

The right of pronouncing the interdict is vested in the pope, the provincial synod, the bishop, with the assent of the chapter, and even without it (c. 2, X. De his que fiunt a majori parte capituli, 3, 11, Celestin III, an. 1190; Clem. 1, De sent. exc. cit. Cone. Trid. cit. See Gonzalez Tellez, c. 5, X. De consuet. no. 4). The interdict can be withdrawn by any confessor when it is particular and personal, not reserved, but applying to minor points (c. 29, X. De sent. exc. 5, 39, Innocent III, anno 1199); other interdicts are to be withdrawn by those who pronounced them, their successors, delegates, or superiors (see Ferraris, article 8). The fundamental principles of the interdictare yet in vigor in the Roman Church (see Benedict XIV, De synod. diac. lib. 10:cap. 1, § 3 sq.), but it has not been exercised to its full extent since the 17th century. As late as 1606 Paul V pronounced it against the Republic of Venice (see Riegger, Diss. de panitentiis et penis eccl. Vienn. 1772, § 76; and Schmidt, Thesaurus juris eccl. 7, 172), and particular interdicts are still in frequent use, as, for instance, the interdictio ingressus in ecclesiam, the defense for laymen to enter the Church (c. 48, X. De sent. excomm. 5, 39, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 20, eod. in 6; 5, 11,  Boniface VIII, etc.). The Council of Trent (Sess. 6:cap. 1, in fin. de ref.) pronounced this punishment against the bishops and archbishops who neglected the command to reside in their diocese. To it belongs also the cessatio a divinis, touching the use of the bells and organ (c. 55, X. De appellat. 2, 28, Innocent III, an. 1213; c. 13, § 1, X. De officio judicis ord. 1, 31, Innocent III, an. 1215; c. 2, eod. in 6:and 1, 16, Gregor. X, an. 1274; c. 8, eod. Bonifac. VIII), as a public mourning of the Church (c. 18, De sent. excomm. in 6:1, ib. Bonifac.VIII).

History. — The time when the interdict was first introduced into the Church is not generally known; but it is usually traced to the early discipline of public penance, “by which penitents were for a time debarred from the privilege of presence at the celebration of the Eucharist.” Instances of it are met with in very early times (see c. 8, Song of Solomon 5, qu. 6 [Conc. Agath. anno 506] and 10, 11, Can 17, qu. 4 [Paenit. Rom.], etc. Comp. also Gonzales Tellez, cap. 5, X. De consuet. 1, 4, no. 19). But it was not until the Middle Ages, the days of superstition, when the mind was in a condition difficult for us of modern ideas fully to realize or to understand, that this ecclesiastical punishment came into general use as a weapon of the Church against all ecclesiastical and civil inroads. In 1125 Ivo of Chartre calls it yet (Epist. 94) “remedium insolitum, ob suam nimirum novitatem;” and at the Synod of Limoges in 1301, the following resolution was passed at the second session: “Nisi de pace acquieverint, ligate omnem terram Lemovicensem publica excommunicatione: eo videlicet modo, ut nemo, nisi clericus, aut pauper mendicans, aut peregrinus adveniens, aut infans a bimatu et infra in toto Lemovicino sepeliatur, nec in alium episcopatum ad sepeliendum portetur. Divinum officum per omnes ecclesias omnibus, et omnes proni in faciem preces pro tribulatione et pace fundant. Paenitentia et viaticum in exitu mortis tribuarur. Altaria per omnes ecclesias, sicut in Parasceve, nudentur; et cruces et ornamenta abscondantur, quia signum luctus et tristitiae omnibus est. Ad missas tantum, quas unusquisque sacerdotum januis ecclesiarum obseratis fecerit, altaria induantur, et iterum post missas nudentur. Nemo in ipsa excommunicatione uxorem ducat. Nemo alteri osculum det, nemo clericorum aut laicorum, vel habitantium vel transeuntium, in toto Lemovicino carnem comedat, neque alios cibos, quam illos, quibus in Quadragesima vesci licitum est. Nemo clericorum aut laicorum tondeatur, neque radatur, quousque districti principes, capita populorum, per omnia  sancto obdeiant concilio” (Mansi, Coll. Conciliorum, 19, 541; Du Fresne, s.v. Interdictum).

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

## Interest[[@Headword:Interest]]

             SEE URSURY.

## Interim [[@Headword:Interim ]]

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

1. THE INTERIM OF RATISBON (Regensburg). Numerous conferences had been held by both parties, i.e. the Romanists and the Protestants, after the formation of the “League of Smalkald” (1531), to bring about a reconciliation. As a literal Roman Catholic writer of our own days (Janus, Pope and Council, p. 369) says, “It was long before men (in Germany and generally on this side of the Alps) grasped the idea of the breach of Church communion becoming permanent. The general feeling was still so far Church-like that a really free council, independent of papal control, was confidently looked to for at once purifying and uniting the Church, though, of course, views differed as to the conditions of reunion, according to personal position and national sentiment.” A conference was finally appointed and held at Worms, under the leadership of Melancthon and Eckius, according to appointment, by Charles V, and afterwards removed to Ratisbon, where the diet met (1541). Here Pflug and Gropper figured prominently by the side of Eckius on the Roman Catholic side, and Bucer and Pistorius by the side of Melancthon. The Roman Catholics now conceded that the communion of both kinds could be administered to all; that the question of sacerdotal celibacy was of no vital importance, etc.;  but the Protestants were nevertheless afraid of some hidden plan, and only an apparent reconciliation was effected: it really settled no question at all, satisfied neither party, and finally, as Luther had predicted before the convocation, led only afterwards to much misunderstanding and mutual recrimination. “Let them go on,” said Luther, referring to the schemes of those who thought that the differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants might be made up by such conferences, ‘we shall not envy the success of their labors; they will be the first who could ever convert the devil and reconcile him to Christ… The scepter of the Lord admits of no bending and joining, but must remain straight and unchanged, the rule of faith and practice.” Charles V, determined to secure the ratification of the points of agreement entered into at Ratisbon by a national council, forbade the Protestants to argue, in the mean time, on the controverted points, or to dispose in any way of the property of the churches. They protested, however, and went on, regardless of the interim.

2. THE AUGSBURG INTERIM. After the duke of Alva, through the trechery of Maurice of Saxony, had broken the power of the Progestants at the battle of Muhlberg, and by the overthrow of the Smalkald league, the emperor had brought them helpless at his feet, Charles V, seeing that the pope had not acted in accordance with his wishes at the Council of Trent, decided to attempt by still other conferences to reunite the two cntending parties, or at least “to keep matters quiet until the final verdict of that ecumenical council which constantly vanished in the distance.” For that purpose he called the three divines, viz. Julius Pflug, bishup of Naumburg; Michael Helding, titular bishop of Sidon; and the Protestant John Agricola, preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, to agree upon a series of articles concerning the points of religion in dispute between the Catholics and Protestants. The controverted points were, the state of Adam before and after his fall; the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; the justification of sinners; charity and good works, the confidence we ought to have in God; that our sins are remitted; the Church and its true marks, its power, its authority, and ministers; the pope and bishops, the sacraments; the mass; the commemoration of saints; their intercession, and prayers for the dead. The result of their discussions was the agreement drawn up in twenty-six articles. These the emperor submitted to the pope for his approbation, and sent copies of them also to the electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg, and to the other evangelical princes. But both the pope and the German theologians refused to adhere to them. The emperor next had them revised  by two Dominican monks, who made several alterations, and they were then promulgated as an imperial constitution, called the “Interim,” wherein he declared that “it was his will that all his Catholic dominions should, for the future, inviolably observe the customs, statutes, and ordinances of the universal Church; and that those who had separated themselves from it should either reunite themselves to it, or at least conform to this constitution; and that all should quietly expect the decisions of the general council;” and it was published in the diet of Augustburg, May 15, 1548. To the Protestant clergy it granted, for the time being, the right of the matrimonial state, and to the Reformed laity communion of both kinds.

It was truly a standard of faith put forth by the emperor independent of Rome, as the pope refused to sanction it, and in the face of the bitter complaints that came to him that the power and property of the Church should be left in the hands of its present possessors, he showed the pope that he too, like Henry VIII, could regulate the consciences of his subjects, and prescribe their religious faith. The elector of Mentz, quite contrary to the wishes of the other members of the Diet, and of the people there represented, announced the acceptance of the interim by the states, and it was consequently declared law, and printed in Latin and in German. Both Protestants and Catholics began, however, violently to attack it; the Romanists complained of the concessions made to the Protestants, while the Protestant princes (John Frederick of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave John v. Küstrin, the elector Wolfgang v. Zweibrticken) declined introducing it in their states; the only princes who submitted to it were the elector of Brandenburg, the elector of the Palatinate, the count of Wiirtemberg, and the cities of Augsburg, Halle, etc. (the latter by compulsion).

III. THE LEIPZIG INTERIM. — The Lutheran theologians openly declared they would not receive the Augsburg interim, alleging that it re- established popery: some chose rather to quit their chairs and livings than to subscribe it. Calvin and several others wrote against it. On the other side, the emperor was so severe against those who refused to accept it, that he disfranchised the cities of Magdeburg and Constance for their opposition. Most important, however, for the Protestant cause, and impossible for Charles to pass unheeded, was the opposition against the Augsburg interim by Maurice of Saxony, who denied the right of the elector of Mentz to give himself the approval to an act that demanded the concurrence of the states directly and not indirectly. To fortify himself  more strongly in his position, Maurice entered into correspondence with Melancthon, and called a council of state and of prominent theologians at Leipzig and other cities. In the conference at Leipzig it was decided, Sept. 22, 1548, that the Augsburg interim could not be accepted. Yet, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the emperor, a compromise was effected. In a series of resolutions which were adopted, they admitted a great part of the Roman Catholic ceremonials, and tacitly acknowledged also the power of the popes and bishops, but yet well guarded (!) the creed of the Reformers. These resolves of the conference were published as the Leipzig Interim, Dec. 22, 1548.

Subsequently it was divided into a lesser and greater interim. The first was based on resolutions passed at the conference of Celle, and was published by an edict of the elector, and this ultimately became the basis of the greater Leipzig Interim. It was prepared by Melancthon, Eber, Bugenhagen, Major, and prince. George of Anhalt. It restored some Roman Catholic practices; directed that mass should be celebrated with ringing of bells, lighted tapers, and a decorated altar, accompanied by singing, and be performed in Latin by priests in canonicals; that the Hore canoniae and psalms should be sung according to the custom of each place; the old festivals of Mary, etc., were re-established, and meat forbidden on Fridays and fast-days, etc. These decisions, which were promulgated in March, 1549, met with much opposition in Saxony, yet they were strictly enforced, and such ministers as refused to submit to the interim were deposed, as, for instance, Flacius of Wittenberg. The latter then put himself at the head of the opposing party, called by the partisans of the interim Adiaphorists. SEE ADAPHORIC CONTROVERSY.

Another treacherous action of Maurice, which secured his services anew to the Reformers, undid all the work already accomplished by Charles V; “and while Henry II was winning, at the expense of the empire, the delusive title of conqueror, Charles found himself reduced to the hard necessity of restoring all that his crooked policy had for so many years been devoted to extorting.” In 1552 the interim was necessarily revoked, and, by the transaction of Passau, August 2,1552, full liberty of conscience secured to all the Lutheran states; and Sept. 21,1555, at the Diet of Augsburg, was finally confirmed the right of the states and cities of the Augsburg Confession (q.v.) “to enjoy the practices of their religion in peace.” Compare Menzel, Neue Geschichte, vol. 3; Robertson, Charles V (Harper's edit.), bk. 9:especially p. 377 sq.; and see Bieck, Ueber d. Interim (Leipz. 1727, 8vo); Hirch, Ueb. d. Interim (Lpz. 1753); Baumgarten, Gesch. d. Rel. Partheien, p. 1163 sq.; Schrbckh,  Kirchengesch. s. d. Rpf. 1, 592, 674 sq., 683, 686 sq.; Zeitschrift. hist. theol. 1868, p. 3 sq.; Brit. and For. Evang. Review, 1868, p. 631; Lea Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 432 sq.; Hardwick, Reformation (see Ind.); Pierer, Univ. Lex. s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Intermediate State[[@Headword:Intermediate State]]

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

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

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

I. The popular sentiment or belief of Christians--expressed rather in the form of hope than as a theory-appears to be that the righteous enter heaven immediately after they pass away from this world. Such passages as the Savior's declaration to the dying thief, “This day thou shalt be with me in Paradise,” and the parable of Dives and Lazarus, are thought especially to support this view; and hence believers have fearlessly cast themselves into the arms of death, expecting to awake the next moment in the full realities of everlasting glory.  Now we would not for all the world deprive dying saints of a particle of the consolation which the Gospel is designed to yield, \nor is it:any part of our present purpose to weaken anticipations of the future rest in the bosom of any, however sanguine and impatient. But the known truth that a long- probably immense-interval of time will elapse between the decease of Christians of the present age-and certainly of past centuries and the revival of their bodies at the general judgment, is sufficient to prove that they do not instantly pass from the Church militant to the New Jerusalem above. Let us calmly and logically consider what may be ascertained as to the experience and surroundings of the soul during this intermediate period. SEE IMMORTALITY.

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

II. The theory of a state of sleep, insensibility, or unconsciousness. It was taught as early as A.D. 248 by the Arabian Thetopsychites, whom Origen combated. It was thought to be held by pope John XXII, and was disapproved by the University of Paris and pope Benedict XII. It was revived by the Swiss Anabaptists under the name of Psychopannychia, and was opposed by Calvin. And in later times it has been started anew, in a form more or less distinct, by John Heyn, Wetstein, Sulzer, Reinhard, and Whately, and by a new sect in Iowa. The defenders of a state of unconsciousness produce such texts as Psa 17:15; 1Th 4:14. In opposition are cited 2Co 5:8; Php 1:23; Mat 17:3; Luk 16:23; Luk 23:43; Rev 6:9.

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

4. The scheme of a middle or intermediate place, or place of rest. This is a different idea from that of an intermediate state, meaning by the latter only an inferior degree of happiness apart from the yet unraised body. It is affirmed that judgment is not pronounced till the last day; but this is denied, a particular judgment passing on each individual, and his place being assigned him, upon his death (Act 1:25; Luk 16:23; Luk 23:43; 2Co 12:2; 2Co 12:4). It is said that no one is perfectly holy when he dies, but only such can enter heaven. In reply, it is contended, as in the Westminster Catechism, that there is a distinction made between being perfectly holy and perfectly blessed, the first taking place at death, the latter only at the resurrection (Heb 12:23). It is alleged that the Scriptures favor the notion (Joh 3:13; Joh 20:17; Act 2:34; Heb 11:39); to which it is replied that these texts are dubious, and neutralized by others positive and unequivocal (Job 14:12; 2Ki 2:11; Act 7:59; Rev 14:2-5; Rev 7:14). We proceed to render this theory more definite by proposing our own view of the subject.

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

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

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

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

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

2. In the second place, it follows that the soul can have no cognizance of the passage of time while thus disembodied. Time consists of the sequence of events, and all means of knowing the transpiration of these are excluded by the very supposition of the present case. Time, moreover, is measured by the alternations of natural objects, and these are also abnegated here. It is evidently impossible for the isolated spirit to be at all aware of the flight of hours, seasons, or ages.

To it “a thousand years are as one day” — both alike unappreciable. The only change it could experience would be the succession of its own ideas, and these if comparable for such a purpose with our present associations of thought, which are like chords played upon by every passing breeze of circumstance and touch of physical condition-furnish no fixed standard or definite mark to our own  consciousness. How seldom do we think of the lapse of time during our dreams, which afford the nearest parallel to the state we are considering; and how wide of a true estimate are we when we chance to compute the moments or imaginary hours in our somnolency. Some notable instances are on record of the egregious miscalculation of time by dreaming persons, showing that in sleep they have no accurate means of determining it, but that they protract or abbreviate it to suit the humor of the dream. Much more would this be true with the disembodied soul, which has even less opportunity or occasion to review its course of thoughts for such a purpose, or, indeed, to take any note of their rapidity or tediousness of succession. We conclude, therefore, that the intermediate state will pass to all its subjects as an instant, and that none will be aware of the length of the interval.

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

Some confirmation of this view may likewise be derived from the simultaneousness of the general judgment. We surely are not to suppose that any will remain cycles of ages in the other world, whether happy or miserable, without having their destiny as yet fixed, and their final doom awarded. To each individual's consciousness, doubtless, will be definitely  assigned, at the instant he is ushered into the presence of his Maker, the awards of his irrevocable fate, and this knowledge will form the basis of his joy or despair. The only object after this of a general gathering would be to make known to the universe a sentence that has already been anticipated to the parties chiefly interested. The Scriptural representations of the “last grand assize” are evidently scenic in their character, that is, pictures of what to those concerned shall seem to transpire substantially, but not necessarily literally thus. SEE JUDGMENT, GENERAL.

Be that as' it may, on our theory alone a universal assemblage would be more possible and significant: to each human being the hour of death is practically, although not actually, the day of judgment, for the two events are separated only by an inappreciable interval; and as the same is true of all his fellows, and as their several days of doom are also separated by an inappreciable interval, they are all reduced to every man's own apprehension to the same plane of time, and consequently may justly even with reference to individuals be depicted as judged together. The hour of Christ's three predicted comings- in vengeance on the Jews-in the article of death in the final scene thus, although really distinct events, become identical by more than a figure of speech, and he is justified in alluding to them all in the same breath.

3. In the third and last place, however, as above intimated, the intermediate state will not be a period of unconsciousness. This might be hastily inferred from the insulation of the spirit from all sources of external knowledge and impression. But it has still left to it the whole inner world of thought and feeling: memory is busy with the past, and hope is active with anticipations of the future; the direct comforts of the Holy Spirit also are by no means denied during this expectant period, and none can tell how greatly these and all the foregoing emotions may be intensified by the rapt state of the disembodied soul. Examples like those of Paul “caught up into the third heavens,” of Tennent in a prolonged fit of catalepsy, and of others in similar extraordinary states of spiritual elevation, might be cited to show how far such an abreption of bodily functions is calculated to enhance the perceptions of celestial verities; but these, it must be borne in mind, were really experiences in the flesh-although Pal seems doubtful whether he was not actually “out of the body,” and at least intimates that such mental exaltation would be possible if he were released from earth; they are, therefore, not strictly in point as proof. On the other hand, general observation and experiment show that all temporary collapse or extinction of the bodily functions — as by accident or disease affecting the brain or  nervous centers — is attended by suppression in the same degree of the mental faculties; but these, again, are symptoms occurring under the joint relations of soul and body, and therefore no sure indications of what might take place in a disembodied state. Accordingly, we fall back upon the position most agreeable to our native aspirations, and most conformable, as we think, to the teachings of revelation, that the soul, immediately after passing out of the body, enters upon a condition of conscious happiness or misery, according to its previous fitness and habits. In a word, we see no reason why, when set free from connection with the body, the spirit should do otherwise than continue to exercise the emotions and intellections which had already become customary with it. Until its reunion with the body, however-a space, as we have seen, of practically no account to itself, at least in point of duration-it can receive no new experience, and be subject to no external influences, unless they be purely spiritual. SEE HEAVEN.

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

## Interment[[@Headword:Interment]]

             SEE BURIAL.

## Internal Dignitaries[[@Headword:Internal Dignitaries]]

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

## Internuntius or Internuncio[[@Headword:Internuntius or Internuncio]]

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

## Interpretation, Biblical[[@Headword:Interpretation, Biblical]]

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

I. Definition and Distinctions. —

1. There is a very ancient and wide-spread belief that the knowledge of divine things in general, and of the divine will in particular, is by no means a common property of the whole human race, but only a prerogative of a few specially gifted and privileged individuals. It has been considered that this higher degree of knowledge has its source in light and instruction proceeding directly from God and that it can be imparted to others by communication to them a key to the signs of the divine will. Since, however, persons who in this manner have been indirectly taught, are initiated into divine secrets, and consequently appear as the confidants of Deity, they also enjoy, although instructed only through the medium of others, a more intimate communion with God, a more distinct perception of his thoughts, and consequently a mediate consciousness of Deity itself.

It therefore follows that persons thus either immediately or mediately instructed are supposed to be capable, by means of their divine illumination and their knowledge of the signs of the divine will, to impart to mankind the ardently desired knowledge of divine things and of the will of Deity. They are considered to be interpreters or explainers of the signs of the divine will, and, consequently, to be mediators between God and man. Divine illumination, and a communicable knowledge of the signs and expressions of the divine will, are thus supposed to be combined in one and the same person. SEE REVELATION.

2. The above general idea is the basis of the Hebrew נָבַיא, prophet. The prophet is a divinely-inspired seer, and, as such, he is an interpreter and preacher of the divine will. He may either be directly called by God, or have been prepared for his office in the schools of the prophets (comp.  Knobel, Der Prophetismus der Hebraer volstaddig dargestellt. Bresl. 1837, 1, 102 sq.; 2, 45 sq.). SEE SEER.

However, the being filled with the Holy Ghost was the most prominent feature in the Hebrew idea of a prophet. This is even implied in the usual appellation נביא, which means a person in the state of divine inspiration (not a predicter of future events). Prophetism ceased altogether as soon as Jehovah, according to the popular opinion, ceased to communicate his Spirit. SEE PROPHET.

3. The Hebrew notion of a נָבַיאappears among the Greeks to have been split into its two constituent parts of μάντις, from μαίνεσθαι, to rave (Plato, Phadrus, § 48, ed. Steph. p. 244, a. b.), and of ἐξηγητής, from ἐξηγεῖσθαι, to expound. However, the ideas of μἀντις and of ἐξηγητς῎ς could be combined in the same person. Compare Boissonnade, Anecdota Grceca, 1, 96, Λάμπων ἐζηγητής, μάντις γὰρ ῏ην καὶ χρησμοὺς ἐξηγεῖτο (compare Scholia in Aristophanes, Nubes, 336), and Arrian, Epictetus, 2, 7. Τὸν μάντιν τὸν ἐξηγούμενον τὰ σημεῖα; Plato, De Leibus, 9:p. 871, c., Μετ᾿ ἐξηγητῶν καὶ μάντεων; Euripides, Phsenisse, 5. 1018, ῾Ο μἀντις ἐξηγήσατο, and Iphigenia in Aulide, 1. 529. Plutarch (Vita Numce, cap. 11) places ἐξηγητής and προφήτης together; so also does Dionysius Halicarnassensis, 2, 73. The first two of these examples prove that ἐξηγηταί were, according to the Greeks, persons who possessed the gift of discovering the will of the Deity from certain appearances and of interpreting signs. Jul. Pollux (8, 124) says, Ε᾿ξηγηταὶ δὲ ἐκαλοῦντο οἱ τὰ περὶ τῶν διοσεμείων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἱερῶν διδάσκοντες. Harpocration says, and Suidas repeats after him, Ε᾿ξηγητής, ὁ ἐξηγούμενος τὰ ἱερά. Comp. Becker, Anecdota Greca, 1, 185, Ε᾿ξηγοῦνται οἱ ἔμπειροι.

Creuzer defines the ἐξηγηταί, in his Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Volker, 1, 15, as “persons whose high vocation it was to bring laymen into harmony with divine things. These ἐξηγηταί moved in a religious sphere (compare Herod. 1, 78, and Xenophon, Cyropaedia, 8, 3, 11). Even the Delphic Apollo, replying to those who sought his oracles, is called by Plato ἐξηγητής (Polit. 4, 448, b.). Plutarch mentions, in Vita Thesei, ὁσίων καὶ ἱερῶν ἐξηγηταί; compare also the above-quoted passage of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, and especially Ruhnken (ad e Timceum Lexicon, ed. Lugd. Bat. 1789, p. 189 sq.). The Scholiast on Sophocles (Ajax, 320) has ἐξήγησις ἐπὶ τῶν θείων, and the Scholiast on Electra (426) has the e definition ἐξήγησις διασάφησις θείων. It is in connection with this original signification of the word ἐξηγητής that the expounders of the law are styled ἐξηγηταί;  because the ancient law was derived from the gods, and the law-language had become unintelligible to the multitude. (Compare Lysias, 6, 10; Diodorus Siculus, 13:35; Ruhnken, as quoted above; the annotators on Pollux and Harpocration; and K. Fr. Hermann, Lehrbuch der Griechischen Staats-Alterthuiner, Marburg, 1836, § 104, note 4). In Athenueus and Plutarch there are mentioned books under the title ἐξηγητικά, which contained introductions to the right understanding of sacred signs. (Compare Valesius, ad Harpocrationem Lexicon, Lipsiae, 1824, 2, 462.)

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

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

The Romans obtained the interpretatio from the Etruscans (Cicero, De Dicinatione, 1, 2, and Ottfried Muller, Die Etrusker, 2, 8 sq.); but the above distinction was the cause that the interpretatio degenerated into a common art, which was exercised without inspiration, like a contemptible soothsaying, the rules of which were contained in writings. Cicero (De Divinatione, 1, 2) says: “Supposing that divination by raving was especially contained in the Sibylline verses, they appointed ten public interpreters of the same.”  The ideas of interperes and of interpretatio were not confined among the Romans to sacred subjects, which, as we have seen, was the case among the Greeks with the corresponding Greek terms. The words interpres and interpretatio were not only, as among the Greeks, applied to the explanation of the laws, but also, in general, to the explanation of whatever was obscure, and even to a mere intervention in the settlement of affairs; for instance, we find in Livy (21, 12) pacis interpres, denoting Alorcas, by whose instrumentality peace was offered. At an earlier period inteopretes meant only those persons by means of whom affairs between God and man were settled (comp. Virgil, Eneid, 10, 175, and Servius on this passage). The words interpretes and conjectores became convertible terms: “for which reason the interpreters of dreams and omens are called also conjecturers” (Quintil. Instit. 3, 6).

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

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

The Christians retained about the interpretation of their sacred writings the same expressions which had been current in reference to the interpretation of sacred subjects among the heathen. Hence arose the fact that the Greek Christians employed with predilection the words ἐξήγησις and ἐξηγητής in reference to the interpretation of the holy Scriptures. But the circumstance that St. Paul employs the term ἑρμηνεία γλωσσῶν for the interpretation of the γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (1Co 12:10; 1Co 14:26), greatly contributed to the use likewise of words belonging to the root ἑρμηνεύειν. According to Eusebius (Historia Ecclesiastica, 3:9), Paulus, bishop of Hierapolis wrote, as early as about A.D. 100, a work under the title of λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις, which means an interpretation of  the discourses of Jesus. Papias explained the religious contents of these discourses, which he had collected from oral and written traditions. He distinguished between the meaning of ἐξηγεῖσθαι and ἑρμηνεύειν, as appears from his observation (preserved by Eusebius in the place quoted above), in which he says concerning the λόγια of Matthew, written in Hebrew, ῾Ερμήνευσε δὲ αὐτα ὡς ἐδύνατο ἕκαστος, “But every one interpreted them according to his ability.”

In the Greek Church, ὁ ἐξηγητής and ἐξηγηταὶ τοῦ λόγου were the usual terms for teachers of Christianity. (See Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, 7:30, and Heinichen on this passage, note 21; Photius, Biblioth. Cod. p. 105; Cave, Hist. Liter. 1, 146). Origen called his commentary on the holy Scriptures ἐξηγητικά; and Procopius of Gaza wrote a work on several books of the Bible, entitled σχολαὶ ἐξηγητικαί. However, we find the word ἑρμηνεία employed as a synonyme of ἐξήγησις, especially among the inhabitants of Antioch. For instance, Gregorius Nyssenus says concerning Ephraem Syrus, Γραφὴν ὅλην ἀκριβῶς πρὸς λέξιν ἡρμήνευσεν (see Gregory of Nyssa, Vita Ephraini Syri, in Opera, Paris, 2, 1033). Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and others, wrote commentaries on the sacred Scriptures under the title of ἑρμηνεία (comp. A. H. Niemeyer, De Isidori Pelusiotce Vita, Scriptis, et Doctrina, Halwe, 1825, p. 207).

Among the Latin Christians the word interpres had a wider range than the corresponding Greek term, and the Latins had no precise term for the exposition of the Bible which exactly corresponded with the Greek. The interpretatio was applied only in the sense of OCCUPATION or ACT of an expositor of the Bible, but not in the sense of CONTENTS elicited from Biblical passages. The words tractare, tractator, and tractatus were in preference employed with respect to Biblical exposition, and the sense which it elicited. Together with these words there occur commentarius and expositio. In reference to the exegetical work of St. Hilary on Matthew, the codices fluctuate between commentarius and tractatus. St. Augustine's tractatus are well known; and this father frequently mentions the divinar um scripturarum tractatores. For instance, Retractationes, 1. 23. “Divinorum tractatores eloquiornm;” Sulpicius Severus, Dial. 1, 6,” Origines qui tractator sacrorum peritissimli habebatur.” Vincentius Lirinensis observes in his Comonitorium on 1Co 12:28 : “In the third place, teachers who are now called tractatores; whom the same apostle sometimes styles prophets, because by them the mysteries of the prophets are opened to the people” (comp. Dufresne, Glossarium' medice  et infinmce Latihitatis, s. vv. Tractator, Tractatus; and Baluze, ad Servat. Lupum., p. 479).

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

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

II. History, Methods, and Literature. —

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

The Jews, in the days of Jesus, employed for this purpose especially the typico-allegorical interpretation. The Jews of Palestine endeavored by means of this mode of interpretation especially to elicit the secrets of  futurity, which were said to be fully contained in the Old Testament. (See Wahner, Antiquitates Hebrcaorusm, Gottinge, 1743, 1, 341 sq.; Dopke, Hermeneutik der neutestamentlichen Schriftsteller, Leipzig, 1829, p. 88 sq., 164 sq.; Hirschfeld, Der Geist der Talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel. Berlin, 1840; compare Juvenal, Sat. 14, 103; Justin Martyr, Apol. 1, p. 52, 61; Bretschneider, Historisch-dogmatische Auslegung d. Neuen Testamentes, Leipzig, 1806, p. 35 sq.)

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

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

To these allegorical modes of interpretation was added a. third mode, which necessarily sprung up after the rise of the Catholico-apostolical Church, namely, the dogmatical or theologico-ecclesiastical. The followers of the Catholico-apostolical Church agreed that all apostles and all apostolical writings had an equal authority, because they were all under an equal guidance of the Holy Ghost. Hence it followed that they could not set forth Wither contradictory or different doctrines. A twofold expedient was adopted in order to effect harmony of interpretation. The one was of the apparent and relative kind, because it referred to subjects which appear incomprehensible only to the confined human understanding, but which are in perfect harmony in the divine thoughts. Justin (Dialogus cum Tryphone, c. 65) says: “Being quite certain that no Scripture contradicts the other, I will rather confess that I do not understand what is said therein.” St.  Chrysostom restricted this as follows (Homil. 3, c. 4, in Ephesians 2 ad Thessalonicenses): “In the divine writings everything is intelligible and plain, whatever is necessary is open” (compare Homil. 3, De Lazaro, and Athanasii Oratio contra gentes, in Opera, 1, 12).

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

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

The interpretation which, in spite of all ecclesiastical opposition, ought to be adopted as being the only true one, strictly adheres to the demands of general hermeneutics, to which it adds those particular hermeneutical rules which meet the requisites of particular cases. This has, in modern times, been styled the historico-grammatical mode of interpretation. This appellation has been chosen because the epithet grammatical seems to be too narrow and too much restricted to the mere verbal sense. It might be more correct to style it simply the historical interpretation, since the word “historical” comprehends everything that is requisite to be known about the language, the turn of mind, the individuality, etc., of an author in order to rightly understand his book. This method, the origin of which has been traced to Semler (Vorbereitung z. d. theol. Hermeneut. 1762), is liable,  however, to degenerate into Rationalism (Farrar, History of Free Thought, p. 22), unless guarded by the spirit of evangelical piety.

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

2. The allegorical, as well as the dogmatical mode of interpretation, presupposes the grammatical, which consequently forms the basis of the other two, so that neither the one nor the other can exist entirely without it. ‘Hence the grammatical mode of interpretation must have a historical precedence before the others. But history also proves that the Church has constantly endeavored to curtail the province of grammatical interpretation, to renounce it as much as possible, and to rise above it. If we follow, with the examining eye of a historical inquirer, the course in which these three modes of interpretation, in their mutual dependence upon each other, have generally been applied, it becomes evident that in opposition to the grammatical mode, the allegorical was first set up.  Subsequently, the allegorical was almost entirely supplanted by the dogmatical; but it started up with renewed vigor when the dogmatical mode rigorously confined the spiritual movement of the human intellect, as well as all religious sentiment, within the too narrow bounds of dogmatical despotism. The dogmatical mode of interpretation could only spring up after the Church, renouncing the original multiplicity of opinions, had agreed upon certain leading doctrines; after which time it grew, together with the Church, into a mighty tree, towering high above every surrounding object, and casting its shade over everything. The longing desire for light and warmth, of those who were spellbound under its shade, induced them to cultivate again the allegorical and the grammatical interpretation: but they were unable to bring the fruits of these modes to full maturity. Every new intellectual revolution, and every spiritual development of nations, gave a new impulse to grammatical interpretation. This impulse lasted until interpretation was again taken captive by the overwhelming ecclesiastical power, whose old formalities had regained strength, or which had been renovated under new forms. Grammatical interpretation, consequently, goes hand in hand with the principle of spiritual progress, and the dogmatical with the conservative principle. Finally, the allegorical interpretation is as an artificial aid subservient to the conservative principle, when, by its vigorous stability, the latter exercises a too unnatural pressure. This is confirmed by the history of all times and countries, so that we may confine ourselves to the following few illustrative observations.

The various tendencies of the first Christian period were combined in the second century, so that the principle of one general (Catholic) Church was gradually adopted by most parties. But now it became rather difficult to select, from the variety of doctrines prevalent in various sects, those by the application of which to Biblical interpretation a perfect harmony and systematical unity could be effected. ‘Nevertheless, the wants of science powerfully demanded a systematic arrangement of Biblical doctrines, even before- a general agreement upon dogmatical principles had been effected. The wants of science were especially felt among the Alexandrine Christians; and in Alexandria, where the allegorical interpretation had from ancient times been practiced. it offered the desired expedient which met the exigency of the Church. Hence it may naturally be explained why the Alexandrine theologians of the second and third century, particularly Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, interpreted allegorically, and why the  allegorical interpretation was perfected, and in vogue, even before the dogmatical came into existence. Origen, especially in his fourth book, De Principiis, treats on scriptural interpretation, using the following arguments: The holy Scriptures, inspired by God, form a harmonious whole, perfect in itself, without any defects and contradictions, and containing nothing that is insignificant and superfluous. The grammatical interpretation leads to obstacles and objections which, according to the quality just stated of the holy Scriptures, are inadmissible and impossible. Now, since the merely grammatical interpretation can neither remove nor overcome these objections, we must seek for an expedient beyond the boundaries of grammatical interpretation. The allegorical interpretation offers this expedient, and consequently is above the grammatical. Origen observes that man consists of body, soul, and spirit; and he distinguishes a triple sense of the holy Scriptures analogous to this division (De Princip. 4, 108; comp. Klausen, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes, Leipzig, 1841, p. 104 sq.).

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

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

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

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

After the beginning of the 18th century grammatical interpretation recovered its authority. It was then first reintroduced by the Arminians, and, in spite of constant attacks, towards the conclusion of that century, it decidedly prevailed among the German Protestants. It exercised a very beneficial influence, although it cannot be denied that manifold errors occurred in its application. During the last half century both Protestants and Roman Catholics have again curtailed the rights and invaded the province of grammatical interpretation by promoting (according to the general reaction of our times) the opposing claims of dogmatical and mystical interpretation. Comp. J. Rosenmüller, Historiae Interpretationis Librorum sacrorum in Ecclesia Christiana, Lipsine, 1795-1814, 5 vols.; Van Mildert, An Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation, in Eight Sermons, etc. (Oxford, 1815); Meyer, Geschichte der Schrifterklarung seit der Wiederherstellung der Wissenschaften (Göttingen, 1802-9, 5 vols.); Simon, Histoire Critique des principaux Commentateurs du Nouv. Test. (Rotterdam, 1693); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, Handbuch fur die Literatur der Biblischen Kritik und Exegese (Gott. L797,1800, 4 vols.).  3. In accordance with the various notions concerning Biblical interpretation which we have stated, there have been produced Biblical hermeneutics of very different kinds; for instance, in the earlier period we might mention that of the Donatist Ticonius, who wrote about the fourth century his Regule ad investigandam et inveniendam intelligentisam Scripturarum septem; Augustinus, De Doctrinat Christiana, lib. 1, 3; Isidorus Hispalensis, Senteni. 419 sq.; Santis Pagnini (who died in 1541), Isagoga ad imysticos Sacrce Scripturce sensus. libri octodecim (Colon. 1540); Sixti Senensis (who died 1599), Bibliotheca Sancta (Venetiis, 1566. Of this work, which has frequently been reprinted, there belongs to our present subject only Libertertius, Artem exponendi Sancta Scripta Catholicis Expositoribus aptissimis Reg. ulis et Exemplis ostendens.) At a later period the Roman Catholics added to these the works of Goldhagen (Mainz, 1765), Bellarmine, Martianay, Calmet, and, more recently, See Muller's Hermeneutica Sacra (1799); Mayr's Institutio Interp. Sacsri (1789); Jahl's Enchiridion Hermen. (Vienna, 1812); Arigler's Hermeneutica Generalis (Vienna, 1813); Unterkircher's Hermeneutica Biblica (1831); Ranolder, Herm. Bibl. Principia Rationalia (Fiinf Kirchen, 1838); Schnittler, Grundlinien der Hermeneutik (Ratisbon, 1844); Glaire's Hermeneutica Sacra (1840).

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

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

Since the middle of the last century it has been usual to treat on the Old- Testament hermeneutics and on those of the New Testament in separate works: for instance, Meyer, Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten Testamentes (Lübeck, 1799); Pareau, Institutio Intempretis Veteris Testamenti (Trajecti, 1822); Ernesti, Institutio Interpretis Novi Testamenti (Lipsise, 1761, ed. 5ta. curante Ammon, 1809; translated into English by  Terrot, Edinburgh, 1833); Morus, Super Hermeneutica Novi Testamenti ccroases academica (ed. Eichstadt, Lipsise, 1797-1802, in two volumes, but not completed); Keil, Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamientes, nach Grundsitzen derl gramimatisch-historischen Interpretation (Leipzig, 1810; the same work in Latin, Lipsise, 1811);

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

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

## Interregnum[[@Headword:Interregnum]]

             The interregnum from the time of the execution of Charles I to the accession of Charles II to the throne of England is one of the most important periods in the ecclesiastical history of that country. It was during this period that the Episcopal Church, “which had been reared by the wealth and power of the state, and cemented with the tears and blood of dissentients,” was hurled to the ground, and Presbyterianism, and for a time even Congregationalism, gained the ascendency. But, to the justice of the latter, it must be said that the Congregationalists, or, rather, the Independents, never actually sought to establish their religion-as the religion of the state, while Presbyterianism struggled hard to enforce uniformity to her creed. Stoughton says (in his Eccles. Hist. of England since the Restoration, 1, 49), “It was with Presbyterianism thus situated, rather than with Independency, or any other ecclesiastical systems, that Episcopacy came first into competition and conflict after the king's (Charles II) return.” Some writers deny the possibility of an inter' regnum in the English government as it then existed, because, say they, “there can be legally no interregnum in a hereditary monarchy like that of England,”  and hold that the reign of Charles II is “always computed in legal language as commencing at the execution of Charles I.” See Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters (2nd ed. Lond. 1839, 1, 68 sq. SEE ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; SEE INDESSIDENTS; SEE PRESBYTERIANS. (J. H.W.)

## Interrogationes Marie[[@Headword:Interrogationes Marie]]

             an apocryphal work. SEE PSEUDOGRAPH.

## Interstitia Temporum[[@Headword:Interstitia Temporum]]

             The Council of Sardica established the principle “Potest per has promotiones (i.e. to consecrate), quae habebant utiqueprolixum tempus, probari, qua fide sit, qua modestia, qua gravitate et verecundia, et si dignus fuerit probatus, divino sacerdotio illustretur, quia conveniens non est, nec ratio vel disciplina patitur, ut temere et leviter ordinetur episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus… sed hi, quorumper lonygums tempus examinata sit vita et merita fuerint comprobata.” Consequently every member of the clergy was obliged to spend a preparatory interval (interstitium) before he could be promoted from a lower to a higher order (ordo) (Dist. 59, c. 2). This principle was also observed concerning the consecration for the lower orders of the priesthood while special ecclesiastical functions were attached to them, but, as their earlier character changed, the discipline also became more lax as regards the time of probation (see Dist. 77, c. 2, 3, 9). After the consecration to these lower offices had come to be considered a mere formality for the transition to higher ordines, the observation of these probations was also neglected. The Council of Trent attempted to restore the old customs concerning the lower degrees of the priesthood (c. 17, Sess. 23, De Reform.), and stated expressly that “per temporum interstitia, nisi aliud episcopo expedire magis videretur, conferantur, ut… in unoquoque munere juxta praescriptum episcopi se exerceant” (c. 11, etc.); yet this had but little or no effect, and it is even usual in some Roman Catholic countries to confer at once the tonsure and all the lower orders. The Council of Trent decided also that between the lower consecration and the higher, and between each of these, there should be an interval of one year, “unisi necessitas aut ecclesie utilitas aliud exposcat” (c. 11, 13, 14, etc.), but that “duo sacri ordines non eodem die, etiam regularibus, conferantur, privilegiis ac indultis quibusvis concessis non obstantibus quibuscunque” (c. 13, etc.; compare also c. 13, 15, X. De temp. ord. 1, 11; c. 2, X. De eo qui furtiv. 5, 30). These years of interval are computed, not  according to the calendar, but according to the Church year. With regard to the right of dispensation conceded to the bishops by the Council of Trent (c. 11, cit.), the Congregatio Concil decided that the simultaneous administration of the ordines minores and the subdeaconship is a punishable offence (No. 1, ad c. 11, cit. in the edition of Schulte and Richter). See Thomassen, Vet. et nov. eccl. discipl. 1, 2, c. 35, 36; Van Espen, Jus eccl. univers. 1, 1, c. 2; 2, 9, c. 5; Phillips, Kirchenrecht, 1, 648 sq.; Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 6:707.

## Intervals[[@Headword:Intervals]]

             SEE INTERSTITIA

## Interventores[[@Headword:Interventores]]

             SEE INTERCESSORES.

## Inthronization[[@Headword:Inthronization]]

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

## Intinction[[@Headword:Intinction]]

             is a name for one of the three modes in which the sacrament is administered to the laity' f the Eastern Church (comp. Neale, Introd. East. Church, p. 525), viz., by breaking the consecrated bread into the consecrated wine, and giving to each communicant the two elements together in a spoon, to prevent the possibility of a loss of either element. Some Greek liturgical writers assert that the practice of intinction was introduced by Chrysostom himself (which Neale approves), but the traditional evidence adduced does not well support this assertion; and the fact, which seems to be pretty well established, that the two elements were of old administered by two persons, and not by one only, as is done at present, makes it doubtful whether their admixture for communion was  ever the ordinary practice. Bona (Rerum Liturg. II, 18:3), however, says that it was forbidden by Julius I (A.D. 337-352), whose decree, as given by Gratian (Distinct. 2, c. 7), speaks of it as a practice not warranted by the Gospel, in which Christ is represented as giving first his body and then his blood' to the apostles; and, if this decree is authentic, it goes to prove that the practice was known during Chrysostom's time. The third Council of Braga (A.D. 675) decreed against it in their first canon in the identical words used by Julius I: “Illud, quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc probatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit; seorsum enim panis et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur.

Nam intinctum panem aliis Christum non praebuisse legimus excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem proditorem ostenderet.” Micrologus (c. 19) asserts that the practice contradicted the primitive canon of the Roman liturgy, but this certainly cannot go to prove the time of its introduction into the Eastern Church. In the 11th century it was forbidden by pope Urban II (A.D. 1088- 1099), except in cases of necessity; and his successor, Pascal II, forbade it altogether, and ordered in cases where difficulty of swallowing the solid element occurred, to administer the fluid element alone. Bona, however, quotes from Ivo of Chartres about this time a canon of a Council of Tours, in which priests are ordered to keep the reserved oblation “intincta in sanguine Christi, ut veraciter Presbyter possit dicere infirmo, Corpus, et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi proficiat tibi in remissionem peccatorum et vitam seternam.” The Convocation of Canterbury (A.D. 1175) expressed itself opposed to the practice of intinction in the following plain language: “Inhibemus ne quis quasi pro complemento communionis intinctam alicui Eucharistiam tradat.” But from the word coplementum the practice forbidden seems to have been as much the consumption of the superabundant elements by the laity (directed in one of the modern rubrics of the Church of England) as that of intinction. There can be no doubt, however, that the Western Church always stood committed against the practice, though some think that traces of it can be found, e.g. in ‘the ancient Irish Visitation Office, written about the 8th century, and which was published by Sir William Bentham (comp. Hart, Eccles. Records, Introd. 14). SEE CONCOMITANT.

## Intolerance[[@Headword:Intolerance]]

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

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

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

## Intorcetta, Prosper[[@Headword:Intorcetta, Prosper]]

             a Roman Catholic Sicilian who went to China as a Jesuit missionary, was born at Piazza in 1625. He had first studied law, but, believing it to be his duty to serve the Church, he joined the order of the Jesuits, and prepared for the missionary field in China.: Here he encountered many obstacles, but, notwithstanding, succeeded in making many converts. Persecuted by the Chinese, he courageously pushed his work forward, and became one of the greatest of the Jesuitical missionaries to that country. He died Oct. 3,  1696. His works evince a careful and continued study of the language of the country in which he aimed to establish his peculiar religious creed; and it might be well for Protestant missionaries sent to Asiatic and other heathen fields of missionary work to imitate the great zeal which has animated so many of the missionaries of the Romish Church, and which has secured them oftentimes greater prominence than the Protestant laborers. He wrote Taihio (or “the great study of Confucius and of his disciple Tseu- sse”), edited, with a Latin translation, by Father Ignace de Costa (1662): — Tchoung-young (or “Invariability in the intermediate course”); one of the four books of Confucianism, preceded by a life of Confucius: Conjitcii Vita (Goa, 1669, small fol).): — Lunyu (“the book of Confucius's philosophical discussions”) (without place or date, 1 vol. small fol.): — Testimonium de Cultu Sinensi (Lyon, 1700, 8vo): — Compendiosa Narrat. dello Stato della Missione Chinese, coniciando dall' anno 1581, sino al 1669 (Rome, 1671 or 1672, 8vo). There also remains still in MS. a complete paraphrase of-the four books of Confucius. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 25, 931.

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

## Introduction, Biblical[[@Headword:Introduction, Biblical]]

             is now the technical designation for works which aim to furnish a general view of such subjects and questions as are preliminary to a proper exposition of the sacred books, the corresponding branch of Biblical science being often styled “ISAGOGICS,” in a strict sense. — The word “introduction” being of rather vague signification, there was also formerly no definite idea attached to the expression “Biblical Introduction.” In works on this' subject (as-in Home's Introduction) might be found contents belonging to geography, antiquities, interpretation, natural  history, and other branches of knowledge. Even the usual contents of Biblical introductions were so unconnected that Schleiermacher, in his Kurze Darstellung des Theologischen Studiums, justly calls it ein Mancherlei; that is, a farrago or omnium-gatherum. Biblical introduction was usually described as consisting o' the various branches of preparatory knowledge requisite for viewing and treating the Bible correctly. It was distinguished from Biblical history and archaeology by being less intimately connected with what is usually called history. It comprised treatises on the origin of the Bible, on the original languages, on the translations, and on the history of the sacred text, and was divided into general and special introduction. An endeavor to remove this vagueness by furnishing a firm definition of Biblical introduction was made by Dr. Credner (in his Einleitung, noticed below).

He defined Biblical introduction to be the history of the Bible, and divided it into the following parts:

1. The history of the separate Biblical books;

2, the history of the collection of these books, or of the canon;

3, the history of the spread of these books, or of the translations of it;

4, the history of the preservation-of the text;

5, the history of the interpretation of it.

The same historical idea has been advocated by Havernick (in his Einleit.), and more particularly by Hupfeld (Begrif' u. Methode der bibl. Einl. 1844). This view, however, has not generally been acquiesced in by Biblical scholars, being regarded as too limited and special a treatment, inasmuch as the end in view is to furnish a solution of such questions as arise upon the Bible as a book, yet excluding such preparatory sciences in general as philology, archaeology, and exegesis, the first two of which rather relate to all ancient writings, and the last to passages in detail. By common consent, treatises on Biblical introduction have now usually come to embrace the field covered by the articles on the several books as given in this Cyclopaedia, and the topics legitimately included in this department of Biblical science may briefly be summed up under the following heads, which may, however, sometimes require to be differently arranged, or even combined: 1, Authorship; 2, date; 3, place; 4, inspiration; 5, contents; 6, style; 7, peculiar difficulties-of the several books, with the literature and commentaries appended. In this way the old division of general and special introduction is preserved only so far that some treatises are on all the books of the Old or New Testament in order, while others take up a single book only the latter usually as prolegomena to a separate commentary; and the wider topics formerly discussed are relegated to their appropriate and separate spheres, e.g. in addition to Archaeology (including Geography, Chronology, History, and  Antiquities proper), Lexicology (including radical and comparative philology, and synonyms), and Grammar (including all the peculiarities of Hebraistic and Hellenistic phraseology, poetical modes of expression, rhetorical traits. etc.) — the following more especially: the Canon, Criticism, Inspiration, and Interpretation (q.v. severally). With' these prefatory distinctions, we proceed to give a sketch of the historical development of this department of Biblical Science, with some criticisms upon the several works in which it has been evolved. In these remarks we especially include formal treatises upon the subject at large, besides those found in commentaries; see also Bleek's Introd. to the O.T. (Lond. 1869), 1, 5 sq.

The Greek word εἰσαγωγή, in the sense of an introduction to a science, occurs only in later Greek, and was first used, to denote an introduction to the right understanding of the Bible, by Adrian, a Greek who probably lived in the 5th century after Christ. Α᾿δριάνου είσαγωγὴ τῆς γραφῆς is a small book, the object of which is to assist readers who are unacquainted with Biblical phraseology in rightly understanding peculiar words and expressions. It was first edited by David Hoschel, under the title of Adriani Isagoge in Sacram Scripturam Grcece cumi Scholiis (Augustse Vindobonae, 1602, 4to), and was reprinted in the Critici Sacri (London ed. vol. 8; Frankfort edit. vol. 6). Before Adrian, the want of similar works had already been felt, and books of a corresponding tendency were in circulation, but they did not bear the title of εἰσαγωγή. Melito of Sardis, who lived in the latter half of the 2nd century, wrote a book under the title ἡ κλεῖς, being a key both to the Old and to the New Testament. The so- called Λέξεις, which were written at a later period, are books of a similar description. Some of these Λέξεις have been printed, in Matthew's Novum Testamentum Graeca, and in Boissonade's Anecdota Graeca (vol. 3, Paris, 1831). These are merely linguistic introductions; but there was soon felt the want of works which might solve other questions, such as, for instance, what are the principles which should guide us in Biblical interpretation? The Donatist Ticonius wrote, about the year 380, Regulae ad investigandanm et inveniendam Intelligentiam Scripturarum Septem. St. Augustine, in his work De Doctrin Christiana (3, 302), says concerning these seven rules that the author's intention was by means of them to open the secret sense of Holy Writ, “as if by a key.” There arose also a question concerning the extent of Holy Writ-that is to say, what belonged, and what did not belong to Holy Writ; and also respecting the contents of the  separate Biblical books, and the order in which they should follow each other, etc. About A.D. 550, Cassiodorus wrote his Imstitutiones Divinae. He mentions in this work, under the name of Introductores Divinae Scripturae, five authors who had been engaged in Biblical investigations, and in his tenth chapter speaks of them thus: “Let us eagerly return to the guides to Holy Writ; that is to say, to the Donatist Ticonius, to St. Augustine on Christian doctrine, to Adrian, Eucherius, and Junillus, whom I have sedulously collected, in order that works of a similar purport might be combined in one volume.” Henceforward the title Introductio in Scripturam Sacrum was established, and remained current for all works in which were solved questions introductory to the study of the Bible. In the Western or Latin Church, during a thousand years, scarcely any addition was made to the collection of Cassiodorus, while in the Eastern or Greek Church only two works written during this long period deserve to be mentioned, both bearing the title Σύνοψις τῆς θεῖας γραφῆς. One of these works is falsely ascribed to Athanasius, and the other as falsely to Chrysostom.

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

The work of the Dominican friar Sixtus of Sienna, Bibliotheca Sancta ex precipuis Catholice Ecclesice auctoribus collecta, et in octo libros digesta (Venetiis, 1566; frequently reprinted), is of greater importance, although it is manifestly written under the influence of the Inquisition, which had just been restored, and is perceptibly shackled by the decrees of the Council of Trent; but Sixtus furnished also a list of books to be used by a true Catholic Christian for the right understanding of Holy Writ, as well as the principles which should guide a Roman Catholic in criticism and interpretation. The decrees of the Council of Trent prevented the Roman Catholics from moving freely in the field of Biblical investigation, while the Protestants zealously carried out their researches in various directions. The Illyrian, Matthias Flacius, in his Clavis Scripturea Sacrce, seu de Sermone Sacrarum Literarums (Basle, 1567, in folio), furnished an excellent work on Biblical Hermeneutics; but it was surpassed by the Prolegomena of Brian Walton, which belong to his celebrated Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (Lond. 1657, six vols. fol.). These Prolegomena contain much that will always be accounted valuable and necessary for the true criticism of the  sacred text. They have been published separately, with notes, by archdeacon Wrangham (1528, 2 vols. 8vo). Thus we have seen that excellent works were produced on isolated portions of Biblical introduction, but they were not equaled in merit by the works in which it was attempted to furnish a whole system of Biblical introduction. The following Biblical introductions are among the ‘best of those which were published about that period: Rivetus (1627); Michaelis Waltheri Oficina Biblica noviter adaperta, etc. (Lipsiae, first published in 1636); Abraham Calovii Criticus Sacer Biblicus, etc. (Vitembergae, 1643); Hottinger, Thesaur. Philologicus, seu Clavis Script. Sac. (Tiguri, 1649); Heidegger. Enchiridion Biblicum iepoyivl7ovtciv (Tiguri, 1681); Leusden, a Dutchman, published a work entitled Philologus Hebraeus, etc. (Utrecht, 1656); and Phiololgus Hebr. — Graecis Generalis (Utrecht, 1670); Pfeiffer (Ultraj. 1704); Van Til (1720-22); Du Pin (1701); Calmet (1720); Moldenhauer (1744); Bbrner (1753); Goldhagen (1765-8); Wagner (1795). Most of these works have frequently been reprinted.

The dogmatical zeal of the Protestants was greatly excited by the work of Louis Capelle, a reformed divine and learned professor at Saumur, which appeared under the title of Ludovici Cappelli Critica Sacra; sire de vaiis quce in veteris Testamenti libris occurrunt lectionibus libri sex (Parisiis, 1650). A learned Roman Catholic and priest of the Oratory, Richard Simon, rightly perceived, from the dogmatical bile stirred up by Capelle, that Biblical criticism was the most effective weapon to be employed against the Protestantism which had grown cold and stiff in dogmatics. He therefore devoted his critical knowledge of the Bible to the service of the Roman Catholic Church, and endeavored to inflict a deathblow upon Protestantism. The result, however, was the production of Simon's excellent work on Biblical criticism, which became the basis on which the science of Biblical introduction was raised. Simon was the first who correctly, separated the criticism of the Old Testament from that of the New. His works on Biblical introduction appeared under the following titles: Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament (Paris, 1678). This work was inaccurately reprinted at Amsterdam by Elzevir in 1679, and subsequently in many other bad piratical editions. Among these the most complete was that printed, together with several polemical treatises occasioned by this work, at Rotterdam, in 1685, 4to:- Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament (Rotterdam, 1689): — Histoire Critique des Versions du Nouveau Testament (Rotterdam, 1690):- Histoire Critique des principaux  Commentateurs du Nouveau Testament (Rotterd. 1693). By these excellent critical works Simon established a claim upon the gratitude of all real friends of truth; but lie was thanked by none of the prevailing parties in the Christian Church. The Protestants saw in Simon only an enemy of their Church, not the thorough investigator and friend of truth. To the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, Simon's works appeared to be destructive, because they demonstrated their ecclesiastical decrees to be arbitrary and unhistorical. The Histoire Critique du Nieux Testament was suppressed by the Roman Catholics in Paris immediately after its publication, and in Protestant countries, also, it was forbidden to be reprinted. Nevertheless, the linguistic and truly scientific researches of Pocock; the Oriental school in the Netherlands; the unsurpassed work of Humphry Hody, De Bibliorunm Textibus Originalibus Versionibus, etc. (Oxoniae, 1705, folio); the excellent criticism of Mill, in his Novum Testamentums Grmcumn cum Lectionibus Variantibus (Oxoniae, 1707, folio), which was soon followed by Wetstein's Novsum Testamnentum Graecums editionis receptum, cum Lectionibus Variantibus (Amstelodami, 175152, folio), and by which even Bengel was convinced, in spite of his ecclesiastical orthodoxy (comp. Bengelii Apparatus Criticus Novi Testamensti, p. 634 sq.); the Biblical works by H. Michaeli, especially his Biblia Hebraica ex a anuscriptis et impressis Codicibus (Halae, 1720), and Kennicott's Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum cum varisis Lectionibus (Oxon. 1776), and the revival of classical philology-all this gradually led to results which coincided with Simon's criticism, and showed the enormous difference between historical truth and the arbitrary ecclesiastical opinions which were still prevalent in the works on Biblical introduction by Pritius, Blackwall, Carpiov, Van Til, Moldenhauer, and others. J. D. Michaelis mildly endeavored to reconcile the Church with historical truth, but has been rewarded by the anathemas of the ecclesiastical party, who have pronounced him a heretic. By their ecclesiastical persecutors, Richard Simon was falsely described to be a disciple of the pantheistical Spinoza, and Michaelis as a follower of both Simon and Spinoza. However, the mediating endeavors of Michaelis gradually prevailed. His Einleitung in die Gottlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes (Gottingen, 1750, 8vo) was greatly improved in later editions, and the fourth (1788, 2 vols. 4to) was translated and essentially augmented by Herbert Marsh, afterwards bishop of Peterborough, under the title Introduction to the New Testament, etc. (Cambridge, 17911801, 4 vols. 8vo). Michaelis commenced also an introduction to the Old Testament, under the title Einleitung in die Gottlichen Schriften des AIten Bundes  (Hamburg, 1787). Ed. Harwood's New Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament (London, 1767-71; translated into German by Schulz, Halle, 1770-73, 3 vols.) contains so many heterogeneous materials that it scarcely belongs to the science of introduction.

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

J. G. Eichhorn, who died at Göttingen in 1827, was formed in the school of Michaelis at Göttingen, and was inspired by Herder's poetical views of the East in general, and of the literature of the ancient Hebrews in particular. Eichhorn commenced his Introduction when the times were inclined to give up the Bible altogether as a production of priest craft inapplicable to the present period. He endeavored to bring the contents of the Bible into harmony with modern modes of thinking, to explain, and to recommend them. He sought, by means of hypotheses, to furnish a clew to their origin, without sufficiently regarding strict historical criticism. Eichhorn's Einleitung in das Alte Testament was first published at Leipsic in 1780-83, in three volumes. The fifth edition was published at Göttingen, 1820-24, in five volumes. His Einleitung in das Neue Testament was first published at Leipzig (1804-27, 5 vols.). The earlier volumes have been republished. The external treatment of the materials, the style, aim, and many separate portions of both works, are masterly ‘and excellent; but, with regard to linguistic and historical research, they are feeble, and overwhelmed with hypotheses.  Leonhardt Bertholdt was a very diligent but uncritical compiler. He made a considerable step backwards in the science of introduction. not only by reuniting the Old and Now Testament into one whole, but by even intermixing the separate writings with each other, in his work entitled Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sammtliche kanonische und apocryphische Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testamentes (Erlang. 1812- 19, 6 vols.).

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

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

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

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

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

The Roman Catholics also have, in modern times, written on Biblical introduction, although the unchangeable decrees of the Council of Trent hinder all free, critical, and scientific treatment of the subject. The Roman Catholics can treat Biblical introduction only in a polemical and apologetical manner, and are obliged to keep up the attention of their readers by-introducing learned archaeological researches, which conceal the want of free movement. This latter mode was adopted by J. Jahn (who died at Vienna in 1816) in his Einleitung in die gottlichen Bücher des alten Bundes (Vienna, 1793, 2 vols., and 1802, 3 vols.), and in his Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti in epitonewi redacta (Viennae, 1805). This work has been republished by F. Ackermann, in what are asserted to be the third and fourth editions, under the title of Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti, usibus academicis accommodata (Viennae, 1825 and 1839). But these so-called new editions are full of alterations and mutilations, which remove every free expression of Jahn, who belonged to the liberal period of the emperor Joseph. J. L. Hug's Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Stuttgart and Tübing. 1800, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847) surpasses Jahn's work in ability, and has obtained much credit among Protestants by its learned explanations, although these frequently swerve from the point in question. Hug's work has been translated into English by the Rev. D. G. Wait, LL.D.; but this translation is much surpassed by that  of Fosdick, published in the United States, and enriched by the addenda of Moses Stuart. The polemical and apologetical style prevails in the work of J. G. Herbst, Ristorisch-kritische Einleitung. in die Schriften des Alten Testamentes (completed and edited after the death of the author by Welte, Carlsruhe, 1840); and in L'Introduction Historique et Critique aux Livres de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, by J. B. Glaire (Paris, 1839, 4 vols.). The work of the excellent Feilmoser, who died in 1831, Einleitung in die Biicher des Neuen Bundes (2nd ed. Tübingen, 1830), forsakes the position of a true Roman Catholic, inasmuch as it is distinguished by a noble ingenuousness and candor. The same remark in a great measure applies to the still later work of Scholz, Einl. in l. heil. Schriften d. A. und N.T. (vol. 1 general introd. Cologne, 1845). Among the best Roman Catholic contributions to this branch of Biblical literature are the works of Reusch, Lehrb. der Einleitung in dos A.T. (Freib. 3rd ed. 1868), and Langen, Grundriss der Einleitung in das N.T. (Freib. 1868).

In Great Britain, besides the above works of Horne and Hamilton, we may especially name the following as introductory in their character. Collier's Sacred Interpreter (1746, 2 vols. 8vo) was one of the earliest publications of this kind. It went through several editions, and was translated into German in 1750. It relates both to the Old and New Testament, and is described by bishop Marsh as “a good popular preparation for the study of the holy Scriptures.” Lardner's History of the Apostles and Evangelists (1756-57, 3 vols. 8vo) is described by the same critic as an admirable introduction to the New Testament. “It is a storehouse of literary information, collected with equal industry and fidelity.” From this work, from the English translation of Michaelis's Introduction (1761), and from Dr. Owen's Observations on the Gospels (1764), Dr. Percy, bishop of Dromore, compiled a useful manual, called A Key to the New Testament, which has gone through many editions, and is much in request among the candidates for ordination in the Established Church. The Key to the Old Testament (1790), by Dr. Gray, afterwards bishop of Bristol, was written in imitation of Percy's compilation; but it is a much more elaborate performance than the Key to the New Testament. It is a compilation from a great variety of works, references to which are given at the foot of each page. Bishop Marsh speaks of it as “a very useful publication for students of divinity, who will find at one view what must otherwise be collected from many writers.” It is now, however, almost entirely behind the times. Dr. Harwood's Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New  Testament (1767, 1771,2 vols. 8vo), although noteworthy in this connection, is not properly an introduction to the New Testament, in the usual and proper sense of the term. It does not describe the books of the New Testament, but is a collection of dissertations relative partly to the character of the sacred writers, Jewish history and customs, and to such parts of heathen antiquities as have reference to the New Testament. The first volume of bishop Tomline's Elements of Christian Theology contains an introduction both to the Old and to the New Testament, and has been published in a separate form. It is suited to its purpose as a manual for students in divinity; but the standard of present attainment cannot be very high if, as Marsh states, “it may be read with advantage by the most experienced divine.”

The latest and most important works in this department are the following: Hengstenberg, Beitrdye zur Einleitung ins A. B. (Berlin, 1831); Hertwig, Tabellen z. Einleitung ins N.T. [a useful compilation] (Berl. 1849; 3rd ed. 1865); Maier (Roman Catholic), Einleitung in d. Schriften des N.T. (Freib. 1852); Keil, Lehrbuch der Historisch Kritischen Einleitung ins Alte Test. (Frankf. and Erlang. 1853 [a highly judicious work in most respects]; translated in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1870, 2 vols.); Davidson, Introd. to the O.T. [a different work from that contained in Home above, and strongly Rationalistic] (London. 1862-3,3 vols. 8vo); Davidson, Introd. to the N.T. [an excellent, though rather non-committal work] (Lond. 1848-50, 3 vols. 8vo; last edit. 1868 [more strongly inclining to Rationalism]); Scholten (decidedly Rationalistic), Hist. Krit. Einl. ins N.T. (Lpz. 1853, 1856); Bleek, Einleitung in d. A.T. (Berlin, 1860 [moderately Rationalistic]; translated into English, Lond. 1869, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, Einleit. in d. N.T. (Berl. 1862, 1865; translated into English, Edinburgh, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Weber, Kurzgef. Einl. in d. Schrifi. A. und N.T. (Nordl. 1867, 8vo). Less generally known are the following: Haneberg, Versuch e. Gesch. d. bibl. offebarung, als Einleitung ins A. und N.T. (Regensb. 1850); Prins, Handbook to de Kennis v. d. heil. Schriften ed. o.e. U. Verbonds (Rotterd. 1851-52, 2 vol,.); Bauer (G. L.), Entw. e. krit. Einl. in d. Schrift. d. A. T. (Nürnb. 1794, 1801, 1806); Ackermann, Introduct. in Libros Vet. Feed. (Vien. 1825); Schmidt, Hist. — krit. Einleitung ins N.T. (Giessen, 1804, 2 vols.); Schneckenburger, Beitr. z. Enl. ins NM T. (Stuttg. 1832); Neudecker, Lehrbuch d. hist. krit. Einleit. in N.T. (Lpz. 1840); Roman Catholic: Reithmayr, Einl. 1. d. kanonisch. Bich. (Regensb. 1852). For other works, see Walch, Biblictheca Theolog. 3:31 sq.; 4:196  sq.; Danz, Universal Worterb. s.v. Bibel; Darling, Cyclopcedia Bibliographica, 1, 11 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. Einleitung; Lange's Commentary (American ed.), 1, 62; compare British and For. Evang. Review, October, 1861; Deutsche Zeitsch.f. christl. Wissensch. April, 1861; Revue Chret. 1869, p. 745; Hauck, Theol. Jahresber. 1868, 4:759. SEE SCRIPTURES, HOLY.

## Introibo[[@Headword:Introibo]]

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

## Introit[[@Headword:Introit]]

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

(1.) regular, that sung daily;

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

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

## Intrusion[[@Headword:Intrusion]]

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

## Intuition[[@Headword:Intuition]]

             SEE ILLUMINATION; SEE INSTINCT; SEE SPIRITUALISM.

## Intuition Of God[[@Headword:Intuition Of God]]

             SEE GOD.

## Invention of the Cross[[@Headword:Invention of the Cross]]

             is the name of a festival in the Latin and Greek churches, celebrated May 3, in memory of the invention of the cross said to have been miraculously discovered at Jerusalem by Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine the Great, in 326. The legend of it runs as follows: Helena, being admonished in a dream to search for the cross of Christ at Jerusalem, took a journey thither with that intent; and having employed laborers to dig at Golgotha, after opening the ground very deep (for vast heaps of rubbish had purposely been thrown there by the spiteful Jews or heathens), she found three crosses, which she presently concluded were the crosses of our Saviour and the two thieves who were crucified with him. But, being at a loss to know which was the cross of Christ, she ordered them all three to be applied to a dead person. Two of them, the story says, had no effect; but the third raised the carcass to life, which was an evident sign to Helena that that was the cross she looked for. As soon as this was known, every one was for getting a piece of the cross, insomuch that in Paulinus's time (who, being a scholar of St. Ambrose, and bishop of Nola, flourished about the year 420) there was much more of the relics of the cross than there was of the original wood. Whereupon that father says “it was miraculously increased; it very kindly afforded wood to men's importunate desires without any loss of its substance.”

Dr. Schaff comments on it thus: “The legend is at best faintly implied in Eusebius, in a letter of Constantine to the bishop Macarius of Jerusalem ( Vita Const. 3, 30-a passage which Gieseler overlooked though in 3, 25, where it should be expected, it is entirely unnoticed, as Gieseler correctly observes), and does not appear till several decennia later, first in Cyril of Jerusalem (whose Epist. ad Constantiusm of 351, however, is considered by Gieseler and others, on critical and theological grounds, a much later production), then, with good agreement as to the main fact, in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus of Nola, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other fathers. With all these witnesses the fact is still hardly credible, and has against it particularly the following considerations: (1.) The place of the. crucifixion was desecrated under the  emperor Hadrian by heathen temples and statues, besides being filled up and defaced beyond recognition. (2.) There is no clear testimony of a contemporary. (3.) The pilgrim from Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 333, and in a sill extant itinerarium, (Vetera Rom. itinieraria, ed. P. Wesseling, p. 593) enumerates all the sacred things of the holy city, knows nothing of the holy cross or its invention (comp. Gieseler, 1, 2,279, note 37; Edinb. ed. 2, 36). This miracle contributed very much to the increase of the superstitious use of crosses and crucifixes. Cyril of Jerusalem remarks that about 380 the splinters of the holy cross filled the whole world, and yet, according to the account of the devout but credulous Paulinus of Nola (Epist. 31, al. 11) (whom we mentioned above), the original remained in Jerusalem undiminished-a continual miracle!” (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 2, 450; compare particularly the minute investigation of this legend by Isaac Taylor, The Invention of the Cross and the Miracles therewith connected, in Ancient Christianity, 2, 277-315; Wheatley, Common Prayer, p. 61 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archceöl. p. 351). SEE CROSS. (J. H. W.)

## Investiture[[@Headword:Investiture]]

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

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

1. By the liberality of the northern nations, the Church of Rome had gradually attained considerable wealth, both personal and real. “The Carlovingian and Saxon emperors, the kings of England and Leon, had vied with their predecessors in bestowing on her lavish benefactions, and the clergy were, in consequence, no strangers to wealth. Many churches possessed seven or eight thousand manses; one with two thousand passed for indifferently rich (comp. Hallam, Middle Ages, 2, pt. 1, ch. 7, p. 142,  small English edition). Of the lands possessed by the clergy, the greater part might be of little value at the time they had been given perhaps consisting of wild and deserted tracts of country; but they were capable of cultivation and improvement, and as civilization and population increased they became a source of gain and profit.” Nay, this accumulation of lands in the hands of the clergy progressed so rapidly that it naturally excited the jealousy of the sovereigns. These provocations- were still further sharpened by another great source of clerical enrichment, viz. the payment of tithes, which seems to have received a legal sanction in the 9th century, but which in the 12th century had become universal. Still other revenues were derived from the free donations and offerings of the laity. “Some made oblations to the Church before entering on military expeditions; bequests were made by others in the terrors of dissolution.” Indeed, it became at last a pious custom to assign a portion of the property of a deceased person to the clergy for their distribution among the poor and the needy. But by degrees crafty Romanists learned to rank their churches among the poor, “‘and as it was believed that the deceased would regard them with special favor, they absorbed the lion's share of the alms, until the other poor were forgotten altogether.” Thus what began as a pious custom the Church gradually so distorted until it all flowed into her coffers, and was finally made a compulsory tribute. But, as if all these sources of income were not yet sufficient to meet the wants of an indolent clergy, dependent wholly for their support upon a superstitious and ignorant class, in the Middle Ages as well as in our own day, the penances were added, and, by being made canonical, were imposed upon repentant offenders; and acts of lawlessness, which it ought to have taken more than an ordinary lifetime to discharge, were allowed to be committed for money payments. “One day's fasting might be redeemed with a penny; a year's fasting with thirty shillings, or with freeing a slave that was worth that money (one of the few good things that the Church of the Middle Ages is guilty of). Many, in a glow of zeal, vowed to go on a crusade, but, when the first ardor had cooled down, were glad to purchase exemption. Many, to atone for their sins, set out on pilgrimages to well-known shrines; and, as the clergy had not failed to inculcate that no atonement could be so acceptable to Heaven as liberal presents, large offerings were presented to such churches by the remorse of repentance. At Rome, in the year of jubilee, two priests stood with rakes in their hands sweeping the uncounted gold and silver from the altars.” No wonder, then, that the Church and' her officers the bishops, as well as all the clergy, with possessions so vast, and  resources so unbounded and fertile, became the objects of suspicion to temporal princes, and objects of envy to the nobles.

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

For nearly two centuries the practice had continued without exciting scandal or resistance, when the Church began to raise angry and frequent complaints against the assumption of this right by the lay suzerains. “On the part of the suzerains it was replied that they did not claim to grant by this rite the spiritual powers of the office, their function being solely to grant possession of its temporalities, and of the temporal rank thereto annexed. But the Church party urged that the ceremonial in itself involved the granting of spiritual powers, insomuch that, in order to prevent the clergy from electing to a see when vacant, it was the practice of the emperors to take possession of the crosier and ring until it should be their own pleasure to grant investiture to their favorites.” The disfavor in which the practice had long been held by the Church was first expressed by Clement II (see Stenzel, Gesch. Deutschl. u. d. Jiankischen Kaiser, pt. 1, 117; 2, 130), but its ‘most energetic opponent it really first found in the person of Gregory VII, who, having in the year 1074 enacted most stringent measures for the repression of simony, proceeded, in the beginning of the year 1075, to condemn, under excommunication, the practice of investiture, as almost necessarily connected with simony, or leading to it. “The prohibition was couched in the most imperious and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastic who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him-whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry), until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained-from all communion in the favor of St. Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the state. In the empire (then under Henry IV) it annulled the precarious power of the sovereign over almost half his subjects.

All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counselors, the leaders in the diets and national assemblies, became to a great degree independent of the crown; the emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates  were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was no fealty there could be no treason. Every benefice, on the other hand, thus dissevered from the crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offences the dignity might be forfeited; and as the estates and endowments were now inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property, and became that of the Church and of God the pope might be, in fact, the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world” (Milman, Lat. Christianity, 3:416-417). These proceedings of the pope the kings could not, of course, possibly permit without a practical abdication of all their powers, and hence arose the conflicts of investiture which resulted so triumphantly for the papacy, not only in rising to a supremacy over the princes of the earth, but drawing into their own hands all civil government, and which enabled some of the incumbents of the papal see, e.g. Innocent III, to aspire to be the supreme disposers of the Christian world, with all its belongings (see Reichel, p. 348). Some of the sovereigns, such as Philip of France and William of England, paid no attention whatever to the pope's mandate, and the latter, satisfied that they would not actively oppose him, was quite willing to let them alone; but far otherwise was his conduct towards the emperor Henry IV, whom he sought by every possible exertion to compel to submit to these decisions. For this the licentious and ambitious character of Henry had given him good cause. But for a time he failed to make any impression on the emperor, who paid no regard to the threats of Gregory VII, but continued to nominate not only to German, but also Italian bishoprics. Other causes widened the breach between the emperor and the pope. SEE GREGORY VII.

After Hildebrand's (Gregory VII) death, the rivalry for the papal throne assuaged for a time the controversy on investiture; each papal party, anxious to secure the greatest number of, and most powerful adherents, willingly made all possible concessions. But when Urban II, elected and supported by the Hildebrandian party, ascended the papal throne, the controversy was renewed by his declaration “Nullum jus laicis in clericos esse volumus et censemus,” and the subject was even brought before the Council of Clermont (1095). By canon 15 of this council clergymen were forbidden to accept any ecclesiastical office from a layman; the 16th canon applies this especially to kings and other civil authorities; canon 17 forbade bishops and priests binding themselves by feudal oaths to either kings or other laymen; and canon 18 threatened every one who, after two warnings, continued in these forbidden relations, with deprivation of  all office and power. Yet Urban found more difficulty than he had expected in bringing the princes to second him in his views, and he did not succeed in enforcing these decisions even in Italy, where Roger of Sicily stoutly defended the rights of the civil authorities.

Urban, however, evaded the difficulty by naming Roger, to whom he was under many obligations, his legate in Sicily. The death of this pope, in 1099, by no means extinguished the opposition, but, instead, the contest became more earnest, and continued during the most of the 11th century. In the beginning of the 12th century it assumed a new form under Pascal II, whose name, of all popes, is most prominently connected with the question of investitures both in England and Germany. Pascal II had ascended the papal throne with the intention of following in the footsteps of his predecessors; but he lacked the strength of character necessary for determined action. “In England, William the Conqueror had maintained his supremacy over the Church with an iron arm. Thus no one was allowed to acknowledge the pope, when chosen, except by the king's permission; no one might receive letters from Rome unless they had been previously shown to him for approval. The archbishop was not permitted to frame any canon, although with the assistance of the bishop of the realm, unless it had been previously sanctioned by the sovereign. Nor was any bishop allowed to excommunicate a baron or minister of the crown on any charge, without having first obtained the king's consent. The same policy was pursued by his son William Rufus, without any difficulties being raised on the part of the popes. They had too many reasons for conciliating the friendship of the Normans in Italy to venture to oppose their wishes in England.” Nor was it otherwise now when archbishop Anselm came forward, determined to execute the papal decisions concerning the investitures, and King Henry I felt his prerogatives invaded, and Anselm alone had to bear the whole brunt of Henry's indignation. SEE ANSELM.

In 1107, an agreement which had been entered into between the king and the archbishop was finally proclaimed with great solemnity at a synod convened for this purpose. “By it Henry, whilst surrendering an unnecessary ceremony, retained a substantial power; and Anselm's scruples were set at rest by a letter from Paschal, in which he freed those who had received law investitures from the penalties pronounced by his predecessor…Still more fortunate than the English kings were the kings of Castile, who, by directly yielding when Urban's decree was first published, obtained from him an absolute privilege of nomination to all bishoprics in their dominions-a privilege which they have since retained by virtue of a particular indulgence renewed by the  pope for the life of each prince” (Reichel, p. 363;. see Hallam, Middle Ages, 2, pt. 1, ch. 7, 190).

But it was in Germany that the struggle about investitures was waged most fiercely, and that it also continued longest. Taking advantage of the political troubles which were agitating the country, Paschal used every exertion to detach the Church entirely from the control of the state. “Not only had Paschal II begun his course by denouncing lay investiture as strongly as his predecessor Urban II, but he had also followed the tactics of Urban.” He not only put Henry IV a second time under the ban, but even committed one of the darkest crimes in the annals of history. He estranged from Henry the affection of those to whose love and consideration he was entitled by the most sacred of laws. Two of the sons of Henry IV were incited to rebellion against their own natural father (1101, 1104), which brought the emperor to an untimely grave of broken heart (1106).

Paschal now thought, of course, that he had secured for himself the obedience of Germany, and with pride he announced that henceforth the Church would begin to enjoy anew her liberty indeed, for death had removed, and was fast removing, those who opposed her success (Mansi, 1. c. p. 1209; Muratori, Scriptores rerum Italic. III, 1, 363); he even caused the laws on investiture to be reasserted by the councils of Troyes, Benevento (1108), and Lateran (1100). But for once Paschal II had made his reckoning without his host. His boast, alas, how empty “He had not to wait long before he discovered its vainness; for Henry V was no sooner in undisputed possession of the throne than he maintained as stoutly as his father had done his own right to invest bishops.” Strengthened in his opposition by the example of England, and of France also, he interpreted the actions of the councils as threats at his power, and after a vain endeavor to bring the pope to acknowledge his right in a conference at Chalons, he resorted to arms. At the head of a vast army he marched to Italy, and so terrified the pope that he obtained a very favorable compact without the least difficulty (Feb. 9, 1111). But the bishops refused to comply with it, and Henry hesitated not to force a favorable conclusion by imprisoning the pope and his cardinals. By a second treaty, which was now compacted (April 8, 1111), Pascal II actually agreed to surrender all the possessions and royalties with which the Church had been endowed, and which alone had formed the subject of claim on the part of the emperor. To seal the compact more firmly, the pope divided the host with the emperor, and, after coronation, Henry returned to Germany, satisfied that Rome had for  once been brought low (see Stenzel, pt. 1, p. 632 sq.).

This treaty, however, never had any practical effect, for the Hildebrandian party disapproved of the pope's concessions, and “nothing remained for Paschal, weak and vacillating Paschal, but to annul the grant, and to assemble a council in the Lateran, and to plead before it that the agreement had been concluded under the pressure of circumstances, in order to save the cardinals and the city of Rome; that it was beyond his power to ‘surrender any of the liberties and rights of the Church; that it was for the assembly to examine the agreement, and pronounce thereupon; but that for himself lie would adhere to his oath, and undertake nothing personally against Henry,” i.e. poor wretched Paschal had sworn to a compact which he felt he could not break himself, but for which, none the less determined to abrogate, he sought a pretext to surrender his authority into the hands of his inferiors, that-they might execute the wishes of his heart, which he dared not openly espouse as a pope. The action of the pope, however, in accordance with his own wishes, was repudiated in a Lateran council in 1112 (Mansi, t. 21, p. 49 sq.), which even put the emperor again under the ban. Unfortunately, Henry had in the mean time made himself many enemies at home by his course concerning the investitures, and the excommunication ‘still further increased his difficulties.; yet he succeeded in overcoming them all at the time when the papal see least expected it, and his whole power was then directed against the latter. Henry re-entered Italy, seized Rome, and the pope, compelled to flee, died at last in banishment, as by his policy he had well deserved (1118).

Gelasius II was the next successor to the papal throne; but as he lived only a short time (111), the glory of concluding the long-protracted struggle was reserved for Calixtus II, but not before one preliminary contract had been concluded and as soon violated, nor before the utterance of a sentence of excommunication and dethronement on Henry V, at the great synod at Rheims (Labbe, 12). It was now agreed that every investiture should be retained, and each bishopric restored to its former incumbent, but that those belonging to the Church should be governed according to the canons, and the secular ones by the civil laws (Mansi, t. 21, p. 244; Stenzel, p. 690). Upon a second consideration, however, they relented and the question of the oath soon created new pretexts for the struggle between them, and, in a synod of Rheims (1119), Calixtus put the emperor under the ban, and deposed him (Mansi, 1. c., p. 250). In the mean time, archbishop Adalbert, of Mentz, created troubles in Germany. Calixtus strengthened his position in Rome, and even succeeded in taking the anti-  pope, Gregory VIII, whom the emperor had opposed to him, prisoner; yet the public sentiment of Germany was strong enough to compel the papal party finally to adopt the course which Ivo of Chartres and the monk Hugo of Fleurv had commanded. “It was an intermediate course between the extreme views of the Gregorian party on the one hand, and the secularizing tendencies of their opponents on the other. It combated the Gregorian position that it was a degradation for the priesthood to own itself subject to any lay authority, and held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Caesar that which is Cesar's. It therefore maintained that the king ought not to invest the candidate bishop with staff and ring, these being the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and, as such, belonging to the archbishop; but it allowed homage to be done' to the emperor, and the use of some other symbol for bestowing the temporalities.” The celebrated concordat of Worms, Sept. 1122 (Mansi, 1. c. p. 273 sq.), finally settled the question to the satisfaction of all parties, and the Lateran Council of 1123 gave its full approval (comp. Mansi, l. c. p. 277). The emperor agreed to give up the form of investiture with the ring and pastoral staff, to grant to the clergy the right of free elections, and to restore all the possessions of the Church of Rome which had been seized either by himself or by his father; while the pope, on his part, consented that the elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his official, but with a right of appeal to the provincial synod: that investiture might be given by the emperor, but only by the touch of the scepter; and that the bishops and other church dignitaries should faithfully discharge all the feudal duties which belonged to their principality (see Montag. p. 436 sq.; Stenzel, p. 704). Lothair III, Henry's successor, rendered these conditions still more advantageous to the Roman see by substituting a more general profession for the feudal oath (see J. D. Olenschlager, Erlau. terung d. gildenen Bulle, Frankfort, 1766; Urkundenbuch, p. 19).

This measure, to some extent, at least, allayed the ill will which the hierarchical party bore to the Concordat of Worms. The pope had in reality secured but few actual advantages by the concordat. yet the freedom of election obtained by it in the place of the influence exercised over them by the emperor was sure in due time to be of great advantage to the papacy. It certainly had considerable effect in restraining one of the greatest abuses of the Middle Ages, if not in eradicating altogether the real evil of simony and corrupt promotion of unworthy candidates for ecclesiastical offices; and although, even as late as the 12th century, we find instances of the emperor's interference in the election of  German bishops, and even of his direct appointments to such offices (see Sugenheim, Staatsleben d. Klerus im Mittelalter, Berlin, 1839, pt. 1, p. 153), these instances are, after. all, only few in number, and disappear altogether after the times of Otto IV and Frederick II. Civil interference in ecclesiastical appointments ceased also in France, England, and Spain; but in Naples, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden, the kings continued to appoint bishops until the 13th century (Sugenheim,p. 197).

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

## Invisibility[[@Headword:Invisibility]]

             an attribute ascribed to God in the Scriptures. For example, Paul (1Ti 1:17) calls him "the king eternal, immortal, invisible." Jesus says (Joh 1:18) “No man hath seen God at any time." He is therefore the invisible God.

## Invisible Church[[@Headword:Invisible Church]]

             SEE CHURCH.

## Invisibles[[@Headword:Invisibles]]

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

## Invitatores[[@Headword:Invitatores]]

             SEE INVITATORY.

## Invitatory [[@Headword:Invitatory ]]

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

“come, let us worship God our King;

O come, let us worship and fall down before Christ our King and God;

O come, let us worship before Christ himself, our King and God;”

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

## Invocation of Angels[[@Headword:Invocation of Angels]]

             or the act of addressing prayers to angels, especially to the angel-guardian, prevails in the Roman and the Greek churches, as well as in all the different Eastern churches. They hold that angels are sharers of the divine nature,  though in a somewhat subordinate measure. In the same manner they also permit the invocation of saints (q.v.) even, and designate this worship under the technical term of δουλεία, in distinction from the worship of God himself, which they term λατρεία. See Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 1, 141, 142, 338 sq. SEE ANGELS; SEE VENERATION.

## Invocation of Saints[[@Headword:Invocation of Saints]]

             a form of idolatry prevailing in the Roman, the Greek, and the different Eastern churches. They ignore the doctrine to which the Protestants tenaciously cling, that the rendering of divine worship to one Infinite Being must of necessity exclude the idea of rendering divine worship, no matter how modified and excused, to any other being, dependent upon and created by the Supreme Being. They also deny that the invocation of the created, instead of the Creator, does in any wise trench upon the honor due only to God, and that it is, as we assert, irreconcilable with Scripture, “which holds him forth as the sole object of worship, and the only fountain of mercy.”

They cannot, of course, disprove these truths from Scripture, neither can they furnish any authority from the holy book for a practice unknown to the early Church, and expressly condemned by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 481) and by the early fathers. The few passages which they frequently cite they themselves claim only to imply an intercommunion of the two worlds (as Mat 13:3; Luk 14:17; Exo 23:13), and they are therefore obliged to have recourse to tradition. To this end they cite some of the Church fathers, such as Origen (Opp. 2, 273), Cyprian (Ep. 60, Dodwell's edition), Basil (Opp. 2, 155), Gregory Nazianzen (Opp. 1, 288), Gregory of Nyssa (2, 1017), Ambrose (2, 200), Chrysostom (4, 449), and especially the liturgies of the different ancient churches of Roman, Greek, Syrian, and even Egyptian rite. But, while these testimonies are generally credited, it must be remembered that they are only unscriptural additions, and that they originated after the infusion into the Church system of Alexandrian Neoplatonism and Oriental  Magianism, which left its traces even in the most orthodox form of Christian worship, and creed also, up to the 4th and 5th centuries, a period in the history of the Christian Church when heresies were, to use a common phrase, almost the order of the day. Nay, even the Roman Catholic Church admits that the worship of saints was carried to an excess not only in this age, but especially in the medieval period.

The worship of saints and of the Virgin Mary then took the place of the worship of Christ, the only legal intercessor between God and man, and thus virtually ignored the mediatorship of Christ. It is true some of the more enlightened and less bigoted of the Romanists claim that the saints are only invoked, “not for the purpose of obtaining mercy or grace from themselves directly, but in order to ask their prayers or intercession with God on our behalf (see Bellarmine, Controversice de Sanctorum Beatitudine, lib. 1, cap. 17). But as we have already stated in our article on the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, we repeat also here, that it is not for us to examine only the intent of the Romish liturgy, but also what her communicants understand it to mean. Here lies the greatest difficulty, to say the least, against the introduction of a mode of worship wholly unauthorized by the word inspired by God to serve as a guide in all things. It brings home again not only the question of the immaculate conception of Mary, but even the infallibility theory of the vicar of Rome.

Protestants are unwilling to take any authority except the word of God; they refuse to acknowledge as infallible any one except the Infinite Being himself. It was this view that inaugurated the Reformation, however much it may have been hastened by the sale of indulgences (see Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, 2, § 257). “The Church of Rome is justly and scripturally charged with idolatry in the worship, adoration, and invocation which she addresses to saints and angels. Idolatry, in the scriptural application of the term, is of two sorts. and consists (1) either in giving the honor due to the one true God, as maker and governor of the world, to any subordinate being, (2) or in giving the honor due to Christ, as the sole mediator between God and man, to any subordinate mediator. The former is the idolatry forbidden by the Jewish law, and by that of nature. The latter is Christian idolatry, properly so called, and is the abomination condemned in severe terms by the Gospel. This species of idolatry is, without doubt, chargeable on any Christian Church that shall adopt, in its religious addresses, another mediator besides Jesus Christ. But the Church of Rome, not merely in the private writings of her divines, but in the solemn forms of her ritual, publicly professes, and by her canons and councils authoritatively enjoins, the worship of saints and  angels,' under the idea of mediators or intercessors; not, indeed, in exclusion' of Christ as the one or chief mediator, but in manifest defiance of his sole mediatorship. This charge is truly and justly brought against her, as she now stands, and hath stood for many ages, and cannot by any subterfuge be evaded. Therefore she must be content to have the imputation of daemon-worship, or anti-Christian idolatry, still adhering to her” (Elliott).

As a regular doctrine, the invocation of saints is taught in a canon Touching the Invocation, Veneration, and on Relics of Saints and sacred Images, issued by the Council of Trent in its 25th session. It reads as follows: “The holy synod enjoins on all bishops, and others sustaining the office and charge of teaching, that, according to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times (!) of the Christian religion, and according to the consent of the holy fathers, and- to the decrees of sacred councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently touching the intercession and invocation of saints, the honor paid to relics, and the lawful use of images: teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help for obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Savior; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular is idolatry; or that it is repugnant to the Word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the one mediator between God and amen, Jesus Christ; or that! it is foolish to supplicate, orally or inwardly, those who reign in heaven.

Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ, which were the living members of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are by him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which [bodies] many benefits are bestowed by God on men; so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and doth now also condemn them. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of  the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be awarded them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to. be worshipped;. or that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown unto them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear. And this, by the decrees of councils, and especially of the second synod of Nicaea, has been ordained against the opponents of images. And the bishops shall carefully teach this: that, by means of the histories of the mysteries of our redemption, depicted by paintings or other representations, the people are instructed, and strengthened in remembering and continually reflecting on the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and gifts which have been bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles of God through the means of the saints, and their salutary example, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so for these things they may give God thanks; may order their own life and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema.”

Most ridiculous is the defense which Ffoulkes (Christendom's Divisions, 1, § 86) advances in behalf of this species of idolatry, while yet in communion with the Romish Church; and his friends of the High-Church party of England and our own country may do well to read it before they carry much farther the laughable affectations which they term ‘; devotions.” While defending the gross forgeries of Pius V in the missal and breviary of the Church, sometimes designated by Romanists as “revisions,” on the invocation of saints and of Mary, he says, “They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church. .. His Holy. Spirit communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument, had taught them that the saints reigning with Christ, and his blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them did they ask their prayers; and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret of his success to his brother or friend, till he in turn was encouraged to ask. Then another, and an. other, as the secret was passed  about from house to hamlet, and from hamlet to town, and from one country to another, till at length it had spread over Christendom.” If this was the way in which the invocation of saints was practiced, to authorize its admission in the litany by Pius V in the 16th century, and its affirmation as a doctrine by the Council of Trent, then why adduce the Church fathers of the early age, and the practices of some Christian churches of an age when the Church of Christ was so greatly corrupted and overrun by innovation? The Protestants also believe in saints. They believe in imitating the noble character exemplified in their life while on earth, which is a very different thing from invoking them to intercede in Christ's stead before the throne of God the Father. See Marheineke, Symbolik, 3, 439; Freeman, Claggett, and Whitby, in Gibson's Preservative, 7; Dublin Rev. April, 1853; Pusey, Rule of Elaith, p. 55 sq.; Huss (John), De Mysterio Antichristi, c. 23; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 34, 614 sq.; Elliott, Delineation of Romanism, p. 753 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v. SEE IMAGES; SEE SAINTS. (J. H.W.)

## Invocation of the Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Invocation of the Holy Ghost]]

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

## Invocations[[@Headword:Invocations]]

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

## Invocavit[[@Headword:Invocavit]]

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

## Iona[[@Headword:Iona]]

             (formerly loua), one of the most famous of the Hebrides. It is about three miles long, and varies in breadth from a mile to a mile and a half. In 1861 it had a population of 264. Its remarkable fertility was regarded as miraculous in the Dark Ages, and no doubt led to its early occupation. Dunii, the highest point on the island, is 330 feet above the sea-level. Its history begins in the year 563, when St. Columba (q.v.), leaving the shores of Ireland, landed upon Iona with twelve disciples. Having obtained a grant, of the island, as well from his kinsman Conall, the son of Comghall,  king of the Scots, as from Bruidi, the son of Melchon, king of the Picts, he built upon it a monastery, which was long regarded as the mother-church of the Picts. and was venerated not only among the Scots of Britain and Ireland, but among the Angles of the north of England, who owed their conversion to the self-denying missionaries of Iona. From the 6th to the. 17th century, the island was most generally called , I, Ii, Ia, Io, Eo, Hy, Hi, Hii, Hie, Hu, Y or Yi — that is, simply, “the Island;” or (on Columba's account) Icolmikill, I-Columb-Kille, or Hii-Colum-Kille — that is, “the Island of Columbia of the Church.” From the end of the 6th to the end of the 8th century Iona was scarcely second to any monastery in the British Isles; but the fierce and heathen Norsemen burned it in 795, and again in 802. Its “family” (as the monks were called) of sixty-eight persons were martyred in 806. A second martyrdom, in 825, is the subject of a contemporary Latin poem by Walafridus Strabus, abbot of the German monastery of Reichenau, in the Lake of Constance. On the Christmas evening of 986 the island was again wasted by the Norsemen, who slew the abbot and fifteen of his monks.

Towards the end of the next century the monastery was repaired by St. Margaret, the queen of king Malcolm Canmore. It was visited in 1097 by king Magnus the Barefooted, of Norway, being at that time a part of that kingdom, and so fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Man and the archbishop of Drontheim. In 1203 the bishops of the north of Ireland-disputed the authority of the Manx bishop, pulled down a monastery which he had begun to build in the island, and placed the abbey under the rule of an Irish abbot of Derry. The Scottish Church had long claimed jurisdiction in Iona, and before the end of the 13th century the island fell under the rule of the Scottish king. Its abbey was now peopled by Clugniac monks; and a nunnery of Austin canonesses was planted on its shores. Towards the end of the 15th century it became the seat of the Scottish bishop of the Isles, the abbey church being his cathedral, and the monks his chapter. No building now remains on the island which can claim to have sheltered St. Columba or his disciples. The most ancient ruins are the Laithrichean, or Foundations, in a little bay to the west of Port-a-Churraich; the Cobhan Cuildich, or Culdees' Cell, in a hollow between Dunii and Dunbhuirg; the rath or hill-fort of Dunbhuirg; and the Gleann-an-Teampull, or Glen of the Church, in the middle of the island, believed to be the site of the monastery which the Irish bishops destroyed in 1203. St. Oran's Chapel, now the oldest church in the island, may probably be of the latter part of the 11th century. St. Mary's Nunnery is perhaps a century later. The Cathedral, or  St. Mary's Church, seems to have been built chiefly in the early part of the 13th century. It has a choir, with a sacristy on the north side, and chapels on the south side; north and south transepts; a central tower about seventy- five feet high, and a nave. An inscription on one of the columns of the choir appears to denote that it was the work of an Irish ecclesiastic who died in 1202. On the north of the cathedral are the chapter-house and other remains of the conventual or monastic buildings. In the “Reilig Oran”-so called, it is supposed, from St. Oran, a kinsman of St. Columba, the first who found a grave in it-were buried Ecgfrid, king of Northumbria, in 684; Godred, king of the Isles, in 1188; and Haco Ospac, king of the Isles, in 1228. No monuments of these princes now remain. The oldest of the many tombstones on the island are two with Irish inscriptions, one of them, it is believed being the monument of a bishop of Connor who died at Iona in 1174. — Chambers, Cyclop. 5, 619; Duke of Argyll, in Good Words, Sept. 1, 1869, p. 614 sq.; Princeton Rep. 1867, p. 1-22. SEE COLUMBA.

## Ionia[[@Headword:Ionia]]

             It has been suggested that in 1Ma 8:8, for the existing reading χώραν τὴν Ι᾿νδικὴν καὶ Μήδειαν, “India and Media.” should be read χ.τ. Ι᾿ωνίαν καὶ Μυσίαν, “Ionia and Mysia,” on the ground that to include India and Media within the domain of. Antiochus III is to contradict directly the voice of history, which confines that monarch's possessions to this side the Taurus range (Livy, Hist. 37:56; 38:38). SEE INDIA.

This alteration is purely conjectural, as there is no MS. authority for it; and it is not easy to see, supposing it to be the correct reading, how the error in the text could have arisen. Michaelis supposes that, by a mistake on the part of the translator, מדוwas read for מסי, and הדוor הנדוfor הנטי, and that the nations intended are the Mysians and the Ε᾿νετοί (Homr, II. 2, 580) of Paphlagonia; but this is still more improbable than the former conjecture; and, besides, not only was Paphlagonia not within the domain of Antiochus but the Enetians did not at the time exist (Strabo, 12:8). Perhaps the conjectural emendation above mentioned may be adopted on the ground of its internal probability, as the only alternative seems to be to suppose gross geographical and historical ignorance on the part of the author. It is followed by Luther (who puts “Ionien” in the text), Drusius, Grotius, Houbigant, etc. Adopting the reading Ionia, the district referred to is that bordering on the AEgean Sea from Phocaea to Miletus. Its original inhabitants were Greeks, but in later times a large Jewish element was  found in the population (Josephus, Ant. 16, 2, 3). Ionia, with its islands, was celebrated for its twelve, afterwards thirteen cities; five of which — Ephesus, Smyrna, Miletus, Chios, and Samos are conspicuous in the N.T. SEE ASIA MINOR. Under the Roman dominion the name Ionia remained, but its towns were distributed politically under other provinces. Ptolemy ranks them in Asia Proper, while Strabo (14, 631), Pliny (I. N. 5, 31), and Mela (1, 17) speak of Ionia as a distinct territory. In the account which Josephus gives (Ant. 16, 2, 3) of the appeal of the Jews in Ionia to Agrippa for exemption from certain oppressions to which they were exposed, the ancient name of the country is retained. He speaks of πολὺ πλῆθος Ι᾿ουδαίων as inhabiting its cities. SEE JAVAN.

## Ionic Order[[@Headword:Ionic Order]]

             SEE ARCHITECTURE.

## Ionic Philosophy[[@Headword:Ionic Philosophy]]

             SEE PHILOSOPHY (GREEK).

## Ipabog[[@Headword:Ipabog]]

             in Slavonic mythology, was an idol of the Wends, brought to light by recent antiquaries, probably worshipped on Rugen as a god of hunting.

## Iperen, Joshua van[[@Headword:Iperen, Joshua van]]

             a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Middelburg, Feb. 23, 1726. He was descended from an old and respectable Flemish family. — His studies, in which he evinced very superior mental endowments, were pursued first at Groningen, and afterwards at Leyden, where he was permitted to enjoy the instructions and friendship of the celebrated professors A. Schultens and T. Hemsterhuys. In 1749 he was called to the pastoral charge of Lillo. Here he labored with zeal and fidelity for sixteen years. In 1752 he was made doctor of philosophy, and in 1766 was called to Veere where he remained ten years. Several of the most noted literary, scientific, and poetic societies successively elected him to membership. Zealand also appointed him a member of the commission to which was entrusted the work of preparing a new poetic version of the Book of Psalms. He took an important part in the performance of this duty. The work was approved in 1773, and still continues in use in the Reformed Church of Holland. It possesses a high degree of poetic merit. His income, both at Lillo and Veere, was small, which, with a numerous family to support, was the source of many trials  and perplexities. Accepting an appointment as preacher in Batavia, in the Dutch East India possessions, he went thither in 1778, accompanied by his wife and five children. He was cordially received, and an agreeable field of labor was opened to him. He labored here with redoubled zeal and fidelity, but the climate was adverse to his health, and in 1780, after the; short space of two years, he rested from his labors on earth. A philological essay, dedicated to the Holland Society of Sciences, and published in 1755, was regarded as highly creditable to him in a linguistic point of view, and also as evincing a philosophical spirit. His History of Church Psalmody, published in 1777, is said to exhibit extensive historical knowledge, combined with good taste. He seems to have excelled in various departments of knowledge. See B. Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, 2, 190; H. Bouman, Geschiedenis der Geldersche Hoogeschool, 2, 190. (J. P.W.)

## Iperius, Joannes[[@Headword:Iperius, Joannes]]

             (surnamed "the Long"), a Benedictine abbot of St. Bertin, was a native of Ypres, Belgium, and died in 1383. He is the author of a History or Chronicon of his monastery, from the year 590 to 1294. It has been inserted, under the title of Chronica, sive Historia Monasterii S. Bertini, in the Thesaurus Novus Anecdotorum, etc., 3:446 sq. (1717). He also wrote a  life of Erkembod, published in the Acta Sanctorum, under April 12. See Andre, Bibl. Belg. 2:669 (1739); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religienses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Iphedeiah[[@Headword:Iphedeiah]]

             (Heb. Yiphdeyah', יַפְדְּיָה, set free by Jehovah; Sept. Ι᾿εφαδία), one of the “sons” of Shashak, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:25). B.C. post 1612 and ante 588.

## Ir[[@Headword:Ir]]

             (Heb. id. עַיר. a city; Sept. ῎Ωρ v.r. ᾿Ωρά, Vulg. Hir), the father of Shuppim (Shupham) and Huppim (Hupham), of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 7:12); probably identical with one of the sons of Benjamin (Gen 46:21), and therefore not (as often supposed) the same with Iri (1Ch 7:7). SEE BENJAMIN; also comp. SEE IR-NAHASH, SEE IR-SHEMIESH, etc.

## Ir-Nahash[[@Headword:Ir-Nahash]]

             Deir Ndakhkhds, the probable representative of this site, lying one and a half miles northeast from Beit-Jibrin, is merely described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:275), as "a ruined birkeh [pool], and a cave with two hundred and fifty niches [for burial]."

## Ir-ha-Heres[[@Headword:Ir-ha-Heres]]

             in the A. Vers. “THE CITY OF DESTRUCTION” (עַיר הִהֶרֶס, Ir-ha- he'res, v.r. Ir-ha-che'res, עַיר הִחֶרֶס; Sept. Α᾿χερές, Vulg. Civitas Solis), the name or appellation of a city in Egypt, mentioned only in Isa 19:18. The reading הֶרֶס, Heres, is that of most MSS., the Syr., Aq., and Theod.; the other reading, חֶרֶס, Cheres, is supported by the Sept., but only in form, by Symm., who has πόλις ἡλίου, and the Vulg. Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 391, a; 522) prefers the latter reading. There are various explanations; we shall first take those that treat it as a proper name, then those that suppose it to be an appellation used by the prophet to denote the future of the city.

1. “The city of the Sun,” a translation of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, generally called in the Bible On, the Hebrew form of its civil name AN, SEE ON, and once Beth-shemesh, “the house of the sune” (Jer 43:13), a more literal translation than this supposed one of the sacred name. SEE BETH-SHEMESH. This explanation, however, is highly improbable, for we find elsewhere both the sacred and the civil names of Heliopolis, so that a third name, merely a variety of the Hebrew rendering of the sacred name, is very unlikely. The name Beth-shemesh is, moreover, a more literal translation in its first word of the Egyptian name than this supposed one. It may be remarked, however, as to the last part of the word, that one of the towns in Palestine called Beth-shemesh, a town of the Levites on the borders of Judah and Dan, was not far from a Mount Heres, הִראּחֶרֶס(Jdg 1:35), so that the two names, as applied to the sun as an object of worship, might probably be interchangeable. SEE HERES.

2. “The city ‘Heres,” a transcription in the last part of the word of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, HA-RA, “the abode (liter. “house”) of the sun.” This explanation, however, would necessitate the omission of the article.

3. Jerome supposes חרסto be equivalent to חרש, “a potsherd,” and to be a name of the town called by the Greeks Ostracine, Ο᾿στρακινη (‘earthen”). Akin with this is the view of others (see Alexander ad loc.), who suppose that reference is made to Tacpanes, the brick-kilns of which are mentioned by Jer 43:9.

4. “A city preserved,” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be preserved. Gesenius, who proposes this construction, if the last half of the word be not part of the name of the place, compares the Arabic charasa, “he guarded, kept, preserved,” etc. It may be remarked that the word HERES or HRES, in ancient Egyptian, probably signifies “a guardian.” This rendering of Gesenius is, however, merely conjectural, and has hardly been adopted by any other leading interpreter.

5. The ordinary rendering, “a city destroyed,” lit. “a city of destruction;” in the A.V. “the city of destruction,” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be destroyed, according to Isaiah's idiom. Some maintain that the prophet refers to five great and noted cities of Egypt when he says, “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the  language of Canaan;” but they cannot agree as to what these cities are. Others suppose that by five a round number is meant; while others think that some proportional number is referred to-five out of 20,000, or five out of 1000.

Calvin interprets the passage as meaning five out of six-five professing the true religion, and one rejecting it; and that one is hence called “City of destruction,” which is not its proper name, but a description indicative of its doom. Egypt and Ethiopia were then either under a joint rule or under an Ethiopian sovereign. We can, therefore, understand the connection of the three subjects comprised in this and the adjoining chapters. Chap. 18 is a prophecy against the Ethiopians, 19 is the Burden of Egypt, and 20, delivered in the year of the capture of Ashdod by Tartan, the general of Sargon, predicts the leading captive of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, probably the garrison of that great stronghold. as a warning to the Israelites who trusted in them for aid. Chap. 18 ends with an indication of the time to which it refers, speaking of the Ethiopians-as we understand the passage-as sending “a present” “to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion” (Isa 18:7). If this be taken in a proper and not a tropical sense, it would refer to the conversion of Ethiopians by the preaching of the law while the Temple yet stood. That such had been the case before the Gospel was preached is evident from the instance of the eunuch of queen Candace, whom Philip met on his return homeward from worshipping at Jerusalem, and converted to Christianity (Act 8:26-39).

The Burden of Egypt seems to point to the times of the Persian and Greek dominions over that country. The civil war agrees with the troubles of the Dodecarchy, then we read of a time of bitter oppression by “a cruel lord and [or “even”] a fierce king,” probably pointing to the Persian conquests and rule, and specially to Cambyses, or Cambyses and Ochus, and then of the drying of the sea (the Red Sea; compare Isa 11:15), and the river, and canals, of the destruction of the water-plants, and of the misery of the fishers and workers in linen. The princes and counselors are to lose their wisdom and the people to be filled with fear, all which calamities seem td have begun in the desolation of the Persian rule.

It is not easy to understand what follows as to the dread of the land of Judah which the Egyptians should feel, immediately preceding the mention of the subject of the article: “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called Ir- ha-heres. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt; for  they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressors, and he shall send them a savior, and a great one, and he shall deliver them” (Isa 19:18-20).

The partial or entire conversion of Egypt is prophesied in the next two verses (Isa 19:21-22). The time of the Greek dominion, following the Persian rule, may here be pointed to. There was then a great influx of Jewish settlers, and as we know of a Jewish town, Onion, and a great Jewish population at Alexandria, we may suppose that there were other large settlements. These would “speak the language of Canaan,” at first literally, afterwards in their retaining the religion and customs of their fathers. The altar would well correspond to the temple built by Onias; the pillar, to the synagogue of Alexandria, the latter on the northern and western borders of Egypt. In this case Alexander would be the deliverer. We do not know, however, that at this period there was any recognition of the true God on the part of the Egyptians. If the prophecy is to be understood in a proper sense, we can, however, see no other time to which it applies and must suppose that Ir-ha- heres was one of the cities partly or wholly inhabited by the Jews in Egypt: of these, Onion was the most important, and to it the rendering, “One shall be called a city of destruction,” would apply, since it was destroyed by Titus, while Alexandria, and perhaps the other cities, yet stand. If the prophecy is to be taken tropically, the best reading and rendering are matters of verbal criticism. SEE ISAIAH.

## Ir-ham-Melach[[@Headword:Ir-ham-Melach]]

             (עַיר הִמֵּלַח, city of the salt, so called prob. from the salt rocks still found in that vicinity; Sept. ἡ πόλις τῶν ἁλῶν,Vulg. civitas salis, Auth. Vers. “City of Salt”), a city in the Desert of Judah, mentioned between Nibshan and En-gedi (Jos 15:62); probably situated near the south-western part of the Dead Sea. Compare the “Valley of Salt” (2Sa 8:13; Psa 60:2).

## Ir-hat-Temarim[[@Headword:Ir-hat-Temarim]]

             (עַיר הִתְּמָרַים, city of the palms, so called prob. from a palm grove in its neighborhood; Sept. πόλις φοινίκων, or ἡ πόλις τῶν φοινίκων, Vulg. civitas palmarum, Auth. Vers. “city of palmtrees”), a place near or identical with JERICHO (Deu 34:3; Jdg 1:16; Jdg 3:13; 2Ch 28:15), which now, however, is utterly destitute of palm- trees.

## Ir-nahash[[@Headword:Ir-nahash]]

             [many Ir'nahash] (Heb. Ir-Nachash', עַיר נָתָשׁ, serpent city; Sept. πόλις Ναᾶς, Vulig. urbs Naas, Auth. Vers. margin, “city of Nahash”), a place founded (rebuilt) by Tehinnah, the son of Eshton, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:12). Schwarz (Palest. p. 116) thinks it the present Dir- Nachas, one mile east of Beth-Jibrin; prob. the same marked (perh. inaccurately) Dar-Hakhas on Zimmerman's map, a short distance north- east of Beit-Jibrin. Van de Velde likewise identifies it with “Deir-Nakhaz,  a village with ancient remains east of Beit-Jibrin” (Memoir, p. 322). SEE NAHASH.

## Ir-shemesh[[@Headword:Ir-shemesh]]

             (Heb. id. עַיר שֶׁמֶשׁ, in pause שׁ מֶשׁ עַיר, city of the sun; Sept. πόλις Σάμες, Vulg. Hirsemes, id est civitas solis), a town on the border of Dan, mentioned between Eshtaol and Shaalabbin (Jos 19:41); probably the same as the BETH-SHEMIESH SEE BETH-SHEMIESH (q.v.) of Jos 15:10.

## Ira[[@Headword:Ira]]

             (Heb. Ira', עַירָא, citizen, otherwise watchful; Sept Ι᾿ράς, Ι᾿ρά, ᾿Ωραί, Εἰρά), the name of three of David's favorite officers.

1. Son of Ikkesh, a Tekoite, and one of David's thirty famous warriors (2Sa 23:26; 1Ch 11:28). He was afterwards placed in command of the sixth regiment of his troops (1Ch 27:9). B.C. 1046-1014.

2. A Jethrite, another of David's thirty chief heroes (2Sa 23:38; 1Ch 11:40). B.C. 1046.

 3. A Jairite and priest (כֹּהֵן, A.V. “chief ruler”), i.e. royal chaplain (2Sa 20:26). B.C. cir. 1022. As he was not of the sacerdotal family, the Rabbins hold that he was only one of David's cabinet. See JAIR.

## Irad[[@Headword:Irad]]

             (Heb. frad', עַירָד, perh. runner; Sept. Γαϊδάδ, apparently by erroneously reading עַידָד;V Joseph. Ι᾿αρέδης, Ant. 1, 3, 4; Vulg. Is-ad), one of the antediluvian patriarchs, of the Cainite line, son of Enoch and father of Mehujael (Gen 4:18). B.C. considerably post 4045.

## Iram[[@Headword:Iram]]

             (Heb. Ira-m', עַירָם, citizen, otherwise watchful; Sept. ᾿Ηράμ, but Ζαφωίν in Gen 36:43; Vulg. Ifiraim), the last-named of the Edomite phylarchs in Mount Seir, apparently contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen 36:43; 1Ch 1:54). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618. SEE IDUMIEA.

## Ireland[[@Headword:Ireland]]

             the more western of the two principal islands of which the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is composed, between lat. 510 25' and 550 23' N., and long. 6° 20' and 100 20' W. Area, 32,513 sq. miles.

At the time when the island became known to the Greeks and the Romans its inhabitants were Celts. Of Celtic origin is the original name of Erin, which means “West Side,” and was changed by the Greeks into Ierne, and by the Romans, who made no endeavors to subjugate the island, into Hibernia. During the whole period of the rule of the Romans over Brittany the history of Ireland is enveloped in profound obscurity. According to later chronicles, Ireland is said to have had in the 3rd century five states, Momonia, Connacia, Lagenia, Ultonia, and Modia (Meath). As the people were akin to the Celts of Scotland, Ireland was, until the 4th century, often called Great Scotland (Scotia major). Christianity appears to have been brought to Ireland at al early time, perhaps as early as the 2nd century. A reference to Ireland is, in particular, found in the words of Tertullian, who says that parts of the British Islands which had ‘never been visited by the Romans were subject to Christ. In the 4th century a number of churches and schools are mentioned, and even before the 4th century missionaries went out from Ireland. Celestius; the friend and colaborer of Pelagius, was,  according to Jerome, an Irishman, and the son of Christian parents. That the Irish had received their Christianity not from Rome, but from the East, is shown by their aversion against the institutions of the Church of Rome.

The first Roman missionary, who about 430 was sent to Ireland by pope Coelestius, was not well received, and had soon to return to Scotland. Two years later (432), the Scotch monk St. Patrick (q.v.) arrived in Ireland. He had spent his youth in Ireland as a slave, and had subsequently lived for some time in Gaul. With great zeal he preached Christianity throughout Ireland, converted several, and was, in particular, active for the establishment of convents, so that Ireland was called the island of the Saints. He settled finally as bishop of Armagh, which see thus received metropolitan power over all Ireland. According to some writers (Wiltsch, Kirchl. Statistik, 2, 48), Ireland was, however, without its own archbishop, being, until the 12th century, subject to the archbishop of Canterbury; according to others, pope Eugene, as early as 625, appointed four metropolitan sees at Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. Certain it is that the permanent division of Ireland into the four ecclesiastical provinces of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam took place about 1150 (according to Moroni in 1152, at the Council of Mellefont; according to Wiltsch in 1155). From this time the primacy of Armagh over all the sees of Ireland was generally recognized. The first bishops for a long time maintained their independence with regard to Rome. In the 7th century Rome endeavored to induce the Irish churches to conform themselves with regard to the celebration of Easter to the practice of the Roman Church instead of following, as heretofore, the rite of the Eastern churches.

The Irish made a long resistance, until, in 717, the monks in Iona (q.v.) were on this account either expelled or coerced into submission. Most of the Irish churches then submitted; yet, as late as the 12th century, some monks were found who adhered to the Eastern practice of celebrating Easter. In the 9th century the Irish Church was considerably disturbed by the invasions of the Northmen, who destroyed many churches, and burned manuscripts and convents. These invasions were followed by a period of anarchy, during which the moral condition of the Irish clergy greatly degenerated. The complaints of Rome at this time referred chiefly to the peculiar ecclesiastical practices of the Irish the marriage of the clergy, the administration of baptism without chrisma, and the use of their own liturgy. The legates of the popes finally succeeded in obtaining the entire submission of the Irish Church to the Church of Rome about the middle of the 12th century, which until then is believed to have been without auricular confession, sacrifice of the mass,  and indulgences, and to have celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. In 1155 a bull of pope Hadrian IV allowed king Henry II of England to subject Ireland, the king, in his turn, promising the pope to protect the papal privileges. In 1172, a synod at Cashel regulated the ecclesiastical affairs in accordance with the wishes of Rome. During the time of the following kings of the house of Plantagenet the clergy were in a deplorable condition: the bishops carried the sword, and lived with their clergy in open and secret sins. The monks, who were very different from what they had been in former times, traversed the country as troublesome beggars, molesting the priests as well as the laity.

When Henry VIII undertook to make himself the head of the Church in his dominions he met in Ireland with a violent opposition. The opposition was the more popular as it was intimated that henceforth only such priests as understood the English language would be appointed. The Englishman, George Brown, who was appointed bishop of Dublin, met, therefore, in spite of his earnest and incessant labors in behalf of the Reformation, with but little success. The English liturgy was introduced in 1551, under Edward VI, but the order to hold divine service in the English language seems not to have been executed. The germs of Protestantism were wholly destroyed under' the government of Mary. The people were not prepared for the Reformation, and the clergy were not as corrupt as in many other countries. Moreover, there were among the ministers who had been sent to Ireland as Protestant missionaries many adventurers, who, by disreputable conduct, strengthened the aversion of the people to Protestantism.

Under the government of Elizabeth, an order was issued in 1560 to introduce the general use of the English liturgy and of the English language at divine service. Some years later, however, concessions appear to have been made in favor of the old Irish language. In 1602 the first translation of the New Testament into the Irish language by William Daniel appeared, but the translation of the whole Bible was not finished until 1665. The persistent endeavors of the English government to extirpate the native language established a close union between the Irish nationality and the Church of Rome. The excitement against England greatly increased when Elizabeth showed a design to confiscate the whole property of the Roman Catholic Church in behalf of the Protestant clergy. A number of revolts consequently occurred, which found a vigorous support on the part of the pope and the Spanish court.

A plan submitted by the English lord lieutenant, Sir John Perrot, for thoroughly Anglicizing Ireland, was rejected  as being too expensive, and thus England was compelled to maintain at a heavy expense a large military force in Ireland. In 1595 the chieftain Hugh O'Niele, whom Elizabeth had made earl of Tyrone, placed himself at the head of a powerful insurrection, which was mainly supported by Irish soldiers who had returned from military service in foreign countries. The earl of Essex, with an army of 22,000 men, was unable to quell the insurrection; but his successor, lord Mountjoy, was more successful, and pacified the whole island. In 1601 the Irish again rose, aided by Spanish troops under Aquila and Ocampo; but the combined forces of Ocampo and O'Niele were, on Dec. 24,1601, totally defeated by Mountjoy near Kinsale. The Spaniards left Ireland in January, 1602, and O'Niele made peace with the English. At the death of Elizabeth the whole of Ireland was under English rule. As a large number of Irish had perished in this conflict, 600,000 acres of land were confiscated in favor of English colonists. In view of the close alliance between the Church of Rome and the native Irish, the government of Elizabeth proceeded with equal severity against both: the public exercise of the Catholic religion was totally forbidden, and every inhabitant, under penalty of twelve pence, was commanded to be present at divine service celebrated in the Anglican churches. Decrees like this provoked a general dissatisfaction, which was carefully fomented by the Jesuits of the University of Douay, in the Netherlands (now belonging to France).

On the accession of James I to the English throne the papal party was very powerful: it expelled the Protestant ministers from many' places, and re-established the service of the Catholic Church. These attempts were forcibly suppressed, and new insurrections consequently were caused, all of which proved of short duration. In order to break the power of the Catholic chieftains, the government of James, following the example of queen Elizabeth, was especially intent upon wresting from them their landed property. Whoever was unable to prove, by means of a bill of feoffment, his title to his property, lost it. Thus, in the northern part of Ireland alone, about 800,000 acres were confiscated by the crown, which sold them to English speculators and to Scottish colonists, who founded the town of Londonderry. From this time dates the predominance of Protestantism in Ulster the northern province of Ireland. At the same time, however, many most beneficent measures were taken for improving the social condition of the people. The English law supplanted the previous lawlessness; all inhabitants were declared to be free citizens, and the country was divided into parishes. In 1615 an Irish National Parliament was called to sanction these measures. In consequence of the interference  of the government, there were among the 226 members of the lower house only 101 Catholics, while the upper house, consisting of 50 members, consisted almost entirely of Protestants. The Catholics were, moreover, excluded from the public offices, because most of them refused (hence their name “Recusants”) to take the oath of supremacy, which designated the king of England as head of the Church: At the beginning of the reign of Charles I the Anglican Church was nevertheless in a deplorable condition.

Many churches were destroyed, the bishoprics impoverished, the clergy ignorant, indolent, and impoverished. A convocation called in 1634 adopted the 39 articles of the Church of England, and retained the 104 articles of the Irish Church which had been adopted by the Parliament of 1615. The constitution of the Church of Ireland was defined in 100 canons, which were of a somewhat more liberal character than the 141 canons of the Church of England. The Roman Catholics were generally allowed to celebrate divine service in private houses, and many priests who had fled returned. At the same time the Irish nationality continued to be persecuted, and a number of new confiscations were added to the old ones. On Oct. 23,1644, a bloody insurrection broke out under the leadership of Roger More, O'Neale, and lord Maguire, the descendants of former chieftains. Within a few days from 40,000 to 50,000 Protestant Englishmen were murdered (according to other accounts the number of killed amounted to only 6000), and an equally large number is said to have perished while trying to flee. The enraged Parliament ordered the confiscation of two and a half million acres of land, but, in consequence of its conflict with the king, was unable to achieve anything.

The king's lieutenant, the marquis of Ormond, concluded peace with the Catholic Irish, who received the promise of religious toleration, and, in return, furnished to the king an army against the Parliament. When after the execution of the king, Ormond tried to gain the support of the Catholic Irish for the prince of Wales as king Charles II, the English Parliament sent an army of 10,000 men under Cromwell to Ireland, which conquered the whole island. The Catholics were punished with the utmost severity; all their landed property, about 5,000,000 acres, confiscated; about 20,000 Irish sold as slaves to the West Indies, and 40,000 others compelled to flee to Spain and France. The celebration of Catholic service was forbidden, and all Catholic priests ordered to quit Ireland within twenty days. The restoration of royalty caused no important changes in the condition of the people. Religious persecution ceased by order of Charles II, but the Protestants remained in possession of the confiscated property. The accession of the Catholic  James II filled the Irish Catholics with the greatest hopes, and when, after his expulsion, he landed, at the beginning of 1689, with a French army of 5000 men, he was received by the Catholics with enthusiasm. His army in a short time numbered more than 38,000 men, and he succeeded in capturing all the fortified places except Enniskillen and Londonderry. Large numbers of Protestants had to leave the country because their lives and property were no longer secure. Soon, however, the victories of William III over the Catholic party on the Boyne River, near Drogheda (July 1, 1690), and near Aughrim (July 13, 1691), completed the subjugation of Ireland. The peace concluded with the British general Ginkel at the surrender of Limerick promised to the Irish the free exercise of their religion as they had possessed it under Charles II. While James II had deprived 2400 Protestant landowners of their estates, now more than 12,000 Irishmen who had fought for James voluntarily went into exile. A resolution of the English Parliament ordered a new confiscation of 1,060,000 acres, which were distributed among the Protestants, who began to organize themselves into Orange societies. A number of rigorous and cruel penal laws were passed in order to extirpate the national spirit and the Roman Catholic Church.

Bishops and other high dignitaries were exiled; the priests were confined to their own counties; all instruction in the Catholic religion and its public exercise were forbidden; the Catholic Irishmen were not allowed to own horses of higher value than £5, or to marry Protestants, and were excluded from all public offices. The irritation produced by these laws was still' increased when the English Parliament, by imposing high duties on the exports from Ireland, dealt a heavy blow to the commerce and prosperity of the island, and when, in 1727, it deprived the Catholic Irish of the franchise. These harsh measures soon led to the establishment of several secret societies, as the “Defenders,” the “Whiteboys” (about 1760), so called from the white shirts which they threw over their other clothes when at night they attacked unpopular landlords and their officers; and the “Hearts of Oak” (about 1763). During the American War of Independence, the Irish, under the pretext that the French might avail themselves of the withdrawal of most of the British troops to invade their island, formed a volunteer army, which, in the course of two years, increased to 50,000 men. Monster petitions numerously signed by Irish Protestants also, demanded the abolition of the penal laws, the restoration of the Irish Parliament, reform of the rotten electoral law, and relief of Irish commerce. Fear of a general insurrection induced the Parliament to mitigate the penal laws, and to allow the Catholics to establish schools, to own landed  property, and to exercise their religious worship. The onerous tithes which the Catholics had to pay to the Protestant clergy soon led to the establishment of another secret society, the “Right Boys,” who, by means of oaths and threatened vengeance, endeavored to intimidate the Catholics from paying tithes.

A still more dangerous movement was called forth by the outbreak of the French Revolution. The league of “United Irishmen,” which, in November 1791, was formed at Dublin by former members of the volunteer army, endeavored, in union with the French convent, to make Ireland an independent republic. When the Catholics, at a meeting in Dublin in 1792, demanded equal rights with Protestants, the British Parliament abolished several penal laws, and gave to the Catholics the right of becoming attorneys-at-law and of marrying Protestants. In 1793 the law was abolished which fined the Catholics for, neglecting to attend the Protestant Church on Sunday; at the same time they were admitted to several lower public offices, and received the right to vote. The United Irishmen, nevertheless, assumed a threatening attitude, and a French corps of 25,000 men, under general Hoche, landed in Ireland. The latter had, however, to leave again in December 1796, and a new insurrection, which broke out in May 1798, was unsuccessful. In 1800 the Irish Parliament, bribed by the English Parliament, consented to the legislative union of Ireland with Great Britain, and in the next year the first united Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland assembled. The union of the two parliaments involved the union of the Anglican churches in the two countries, which now received the name of the United Church of England and Ireland. Several further concessions were, however, about this time made to the Catholics. In 1795 a Catholic theological seminary had been established at Maynooth, as the British government hoped that if the Catholic priests were educated upon British territory they would be less hostile to British rule. The rules against convents were also moderated, and at the close of the 18th century the Dominican order alone had in Ireland about forty- three convents. In 1805 the “Catholic Association” was formed to secure the complete political emancipation of the Catholics. It soon became the center of all political movements in Ireland, and, as the Orange lodges began likewise to be revived, frequent disturbances between Catholics and Protestants took place.

In 1825 both associations were dissolved by the British government; but the Catholic association was at once reorganized by O'Connell, and gained considerable influence upon the elections. The unceasing agitation of O'Connell, aided by the-moral support of the Liberal party in England, finally succeeded in inducing the British ministry to lay  before Parliament a bill of emancipation, which passed after violent debates, and was signed by George IV on April 13, 1829. The oath which the members of Parliament had to take was so changed that Catholics also could take it. At the same time they obtained access to all public offices, with the only exception of that of lord chancellor. This victory encouraged the Catholics to demand further concessions; in particular, the abolition of the tithes paid to the Protestant clergy, and the repeal of the legislative' union between Great Britain and Ireland. To that end O'Connell organized the “Repeal Association,” to which the ministry of earl Grey opposed in 1833 the Irish Coercion Bill, which authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to forbid mass meetings and to proclaim martial law. When the liberal ministry of Melbourne rescinded the Coercion Bill and began to pursue a conciliatory policy towards Ireland, O'Connell dissolved the Repeal Association. Earl Mulgrave, since 1835 lord lieutenant of Ireland, filled the most important offices with Catholics, and in 1836 suppressed all the Orange lodges. In 1838 the British Parliament adopted the Tithe Bill. When, in August, 1841, the government fell again into the hands of the Tories, O'Connell renewed the repeal agitation so violently that in 1843 he was arrested and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, a sentence which was, however, annulled by the Court of Peers. The repeal agitation ended suddenly by the death of O'Connell in 1847, because no competent successor in the leadership of the party could be found. It was followed by the ascendency of the more radical Young Ireland party, which did not, like O'Connell, court an alliance with the Catholic Church, but preferred to it an outspoken sympathy with the radical Republicans of France, and is on that account not so much interwoven with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland as the movements of O'Connell.

The ultramontane doctrines taught in the seminary of Maynooth called forth an agitation in Protestant England for a repeal of the annual subsidy which that seminary received from the British government. New offence was given to the bishops and the ultramontane party by the establishment of three undenominational “Queen's Colleges.” The bishops' unanimously denounced the colleges as “godless,” and warned all Catholic parents against them; they could, however, not prevent that ever from the beginning the majority of the students in these colleges were children of Catholic parents. The disregard of the episcopal orders showed a decline of priestly influence upon a considerable portion of the Catholic Irishmen. This decline of priestly influence became still more apparent when, during  the civil war in the United States, the Fenian organization was formed for the express purpose of making Ireland an independent republic. As it was chiefly directed against English rule in Ireland, the new organization, like all its predecessors, had to direct its attacks prominently against the Established Church of Ireland, and thus appeared to have to some extent an anti-Protestant character; but, being a secret society, it was excommunicated by the pope, and denounced by all the Irish bishops. The general sympathy with which it nevertheless met among the Catholic Irishmen. both of Ireland and the United States is therefore a clear proof that the Catholics of Ireland no longer obey the orders of their bishops as blindly as formerly.

The Established Church of Ireland, regarding itself as the legitimate successor of the medieval Catholic Church, and taking possession of all her dioceses, parishes, and Church property, retained for a long time the same diocesan and parochial divisions as the Roman Catholic Church. As late as 1833 the Church, notwithstanding its small membership, had 4 archbishoprics and 18 bishoprics: namely, Armagh, with 5 bishoprics; Dublin, with 4 bishoprics; Tuam, with 4 bishoprics; and Cashel, with 5 bishoprics. The income of these 22 archbishops and bishops was estimated at from £130,000 to £185,000. In 1833 the first decisive step was taken towards reducing the odious prerogatives of the Established Church.

The number of archbishoprics was reduced to two, Armagh and Dublin, and the number of bishoprics to ten, five for each archbishopric. As the income was very unequally distributed, all the benefices yielding more than £200 had a tax of from ten to fifteen per cent imposed upon them, the proceeds of which were employed for church building, raising the income of poor clergymen, and other ecclesiastical purposes. In 1868, the English House of Commons, on motion of Mr. Gladstone, resolved to disestablish the Church of Ireland. The proposition was rejected by the House of Lords. Public opinion expressed itself, however, so strongly against the continuance of the privileges of the Irish Church, that the report of the royal commissioners on the revenues and condition of the Church of Ireland (dated July 27, 1868) recommended important reductions as to the benefices of the Irish Church. This report, a volume of more than 600 pages, is replete with interesting information, and is one of the best sources of information concerning the condition of the Church at this time. It states that the total revenue of the Church from all sources was at this time £613,984; 1319 benefices half a Church population of over forty persons,  and extending to 5000 and upwards.

Four bishoprics were suggested for abolition, namely, Meath, Killaloe, Cashel, and Kilmore. The commissioners were in favor of leaving one archbishopric only, that of Armagh. All bishops were to receive £3000 a year income, and an additional £500 when attending Parliament. The primate was to get £6000, and the archbishop of Dublin, if continued, £5000. The abolition of all cathedrals and deaneries except eight was recommended. With a view to rearrangement of benefices, it was proposed that ecclesiastical commissioners should have extended powers to suppress or unite benefices. All benefices not having a Protestant population of forty were to be suppressed. The estates of all capitular bodies and of the bishoprics abolished were to be vested in ecclesiastical commissioners, and the surplus of all property vested in them to be applicable at their discretion to augmentation of benefices. The ecclesiastical commission was to be modified by the introduction of three unpaid laymen and two paid commissioners, one appointed by tile crown, the other by the primate. The management of all lands was to be taken out of the hands of ecclesiastical persons and placed in those of the ecclesiastical commissioners. Mr. Gladstone having become, towards the close of the year i868, prime minister, introduced in March 1869, a new bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. It passed a second reading in the House of Commons, after a long and excited debate, by a vote of 368 to 250, showing a majority in favor of the passage of 118; and in the House of Lords by a majority of 33 in a house of 300 members.

The amendments adopted by the House of Lords were nearly all rejected by the Commons, and on July 26 it received the royal assent. The bill, which contains sixty clauses, is entitled “A bill to put an end to the establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect to the royal College of Maynooth.” The disestablishment was to be total, but was not to take place until Jan. 1, 1870, when the ecclesiastical courts were to be abolished, the ecclesiastical laws to cease to have any authority, the bishops to be no longer peers of Parliament, and all ecclesiastical corporations in the country to be dissolved. The disendowment was technically and legally to be total and immediate.

Provision was made for winding up the ecclesiastical commission. and the constitution of a new commission, composed of ten members, in which the whole property of the Irish Church was to be vested from the day the measure received the royal assent. A distinction was made between public endowments (valued at £15,500,000), including everything in the nature of  a state grant or revenue, which were to be resumed by the state, and private endowments (valued at £500,000), which were defined as money contributed from private sources since 1660, which were to be restored to the disestablished Church. Provision was made for compensation to vested interests, including those connected with Maynooth College and the Presbyterians who were in receipt of the regium donum. Among these interests, the largest in the aggregate were those of incumbents, to each of whom was secured during his life, provided he continued to discharge the duties of his benefice, the amount to which he was entitled, deducting the amount he might have paid for curates, or the interest might, under certain circumstances, be commuted, upon his application for a life annuity.

Other personal interests provided for were those of curates, permanent and temporary, and lay compensations, including claims of parish clerks and sextons. The amount of the Maynooth grant and the reg ium donum was to be valued at fourteen years' purchase, and a capital sum equal to it handed over to the respective representatives of the Presbyterians and of the Roman Catholics. The aggregate of the payments would amount to about £8,000,000, leaving about £7,500,000, placing an annual income of about £30,000,000 at the disposal of Parliament. This was to be appropriated “mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, but in such a way as not to interfere with the obligation imposed upon property by the poor laws,” A constitution for the disestablished Church was adopted by a General Convention, held in Dublin in 1870.

The Church will be governed by a General Synod, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Delegates. The House of Bishops has the right of veto, and their veto prevails also at the next synod; but seven bishops must agree upon a veto to make it valid. The bishops will be elected by the Diocesan Convention, but the House of Bishops will in all cases be the court of selection when the Diocesan Synod does not elect by a majority of two thirds of each order a clergyman to fill the vacant see, The primate (archbishop of Armagh) shall be elected by the Bench of Bishops out of their own number. The property of the Church is to be vested in a “Representative Church Body,” which is to be permanent. It is to be composed of three classes: the exoficio, or archbishops and bishops; the elected members, who are to consist of one clerical and two lay representatives for each diocese; and the co-opted members, who are to consist of persons equal in number to such dioceses, and to be elected by the ex-offcio and representative members. The elected members are to retire in the proportion of one third by rotation. The Convention also  adopted a resolution against the introduction of the ritualistic practices which have crept into the Established Church of England.

The following table shows the population connected with the Anglican Church, according to the official census of 1881, in each of the counties, together with the number of Roman Catholics, and the population of other religious denominations in each:

CountiesTotalRoman CatholicsProtestant Episcopal -iansPresbyteri- ansMetho- distsAll Other Deno mina- tionsLeinster1,279,1901,095,459157,62212,6336,7126,764Munster1,513,5581,244,87668,3523,7944,4212,467Ulster1,739,542831,784377,936466,10734,49429,221Connaught817,197779,76931,7602,9692,042657Total5,159,8393,951,888635,670485,50347,66939,109The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is governed by four archbishops, whose sees are in Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and twenty-four bishops; they are all nominated by the pope, generally out of a list of three names submitted to him by the parish priests and chapter of the vacant diocese, and reported on by the archbishops and bishops of the province. In case of expected incapacity from age or infirmity, the bishop names a coadjutor, who is usually confirmed by the pope, with the right of succession. In many of the dioceses a: chapter and cathedral corps have been revived, the dean being appointed by the cardinal protector at Rome. The diocesan dignitaries are the vicars-general, of whom there are one, two, or three, according to the extent of the diocese, who have special disciplinary and other powers; vicars-forane, whose functions are more restricted; the archdeacon, and the parish priests or incumbents. All of these, as well as the curates, are appointed by the bishop. The whole of the clergy are supported solely by the voluntary contributions of their flocks.

The episcopal emoluments arise from the mensal parish or two, the incumbency of which is retained by the bishop, from marriage licenses, and from the cathedraticum, an annual sum, varying from £2 to £10, paid by each incumbent in the diocese. The 2425 civil parishes in Ireland are amalgamated into 1073 ecclesiastical parishes or unions, being 445 livings less than in the Anglican Church. The incomes of the parish priests arise  from fees on marriages, baptisms, and deaths, on Easter and Christmas dues, and from incidental voluntary contributions either in money or labor. The number of priests in Ireland in 1853 was 2291 (of whom 1222 were educated at Maynooth College); in 1889 it was 3353. The curates of the- parish priests form more than a half of the whole clerical strength; and scattered through the cities and towns are 70 or 80 communities of priests of various religious orders or rules, hence called Regulars, who minister in their own churches, and, though without parochial jurisdiction, greatly aid the secular clergy. All the places of public worship are built by subscriptions, legacies, and collections. There are numerous monasteries and convents; the latter are supported partly by sums, usually from £300 to £500, paid by those who take the vows in them, and partly by the fees for the education of the daughters of respectable Roman Catholics. Various communities of monks and nuns also devote themselves to the gratuitous education of the children of the poor.

Candidates for the priesthood, formerly under the necessity of obtaining their education in continental colleges, are now educated at home. The principal clerical college is that of Maynooth, which was founded in 1795 as Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth. The Irish Parliament made to it an annual grant of £14,000; the English Parliament sanctioned the grant, but reduced it to ,£8927, out of which the professors and 480 students were supported. The Irish lord Dunboyne founded 20 more scholarships. In 1845, the government, under the administration of Sir Robert Peel. raised the annual grant to £26,000; more recently this sum was again raised to £38,000. In 1869, when the Anglican Church was disestablished, a capital sum equal to the amount of the Maynooth grant, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic University at Dublin was established at a synodal meeting of the Catholic bishops held on May 18, 1854.

At a conference held in 1863 the bishops resolved to enlarge the university, and to erect a new building at the cost of £100,000. There are, besides, the Catholic colleges of St. Patrick, Carlow; St. Jarlath, Tuam; St. John's, Waterford; St. Peter's, Wexford; St. Colman's, Fermoy; St. Patrick's, Armagh; St. Patrick's, Thurles; St. Kvran's, Kilkenny; St. Mel, Longford; All Hallows (devoted exclusively to prepare priests for foreign missions), and Clonliffe, Dublin, all supported by voluntary contributions.

There are also for the education of Irish priests two colleges in Rome, the Irish College and the College of St. Isidor, and one in Paris. The number of  religious communities of men has decreased during the last hundred years. The Dominicans, at the time of Benedict XIV, had 29 houses, in 1890 only 13 houses, with about 50 monks'; the Augustinies had formerly 28, now 11 convents; the Carmelites have 19 houses, formerly 167; the Jesuits 5 colleges, 1 home and 70 members; the Lazarists, Passionists, and Redemptorists 2 houses each; the brothers of the Christian Schools have a large number of institutions.

The following is a statistical summary of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in 1889:

The first Presbytery in Ireland was formed at Carrickfergus in 1642, and gave rise to the Synod of Ulster. The Presbyterian Synod of Munster was formed about 1660. The Presbytery of Antrim separated from the Synod of Ulster in 1727, and the Remonstrant Synod in 1829. A number of seceders formed themselves into the Secession Synod of Ireland about 1780. In 1840, the General and Secession Synoods, having united, assumed the name of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising, in 1888, 600 congregations, arranged under 37 presbyteries. The ministers were supported by voluntary contributions, the rents of seats and pews, and the interest of the regium dosnum, or royal gift. This was first granted in 1672 by Charles II, and in 1869 26 (first class) ministers received from the state £92 6s. 2nd. each, and 551 (second class) £69 4s. 8d. each per annum. As the ministers in the first class died, their successors only received the latter amount. The regiums donum. as annual grant, was abolished by the Irish Church Bill, but a capital sum equal to the amount of the donum, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Presbyterian body. The total sum for regium donum voted by Parliament for the year ending March 31,1869, was £40,547. The minutes of the General Assembly for 1869 state that in the year ending March 31 there were 628 ministers (besides 51 licentiates and ordained ministers without charge), 560 congregations, and 262 manses. The seat rents produced £38,011; the stipends paid to ministers, £37,853; raised for building or repairing churches, manses, and schools, £17,830; Sabbath collections, £13,575; mission collections, £12,124; other charitable collections, £6,835. The Congregational Debt was £37,167.

The Presbyterians lave the General Assembly's College at Belfast, and Magee College at Londonderry. The latter was opened Oct. 10,1865. In  the year 1846, Mrs. Magee, widow of the late Rev. William Magee, Presbyterian minister of Lurgan, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near the city of Londonderry. The citizens of Derry subscribed upwards of £5000 towards the erection of the building, which cost about £10,000. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 to the chair of natural philosophy and mathematics, and £250 for five years towards the general expenses of the college.

Remonstrant Synod of Ulster. — This synod was formed in May, 1830, in consequence of the separation of seventeen ministers, with their congregations, from the General Synod of Ulster, on the ground that, contrary to its usages and code of discipline, it required from. its members in 1827 and 1828 submission to certain doctrinal tests and overtures of human invention. There are 4 presbyteries and 27 congregations in this synod.

The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, consisting of 4 presbyteries and 25 congregations, is unconnected with the General Assembly. It did not participate in the regium donum.

United Presbytery or Synod of Munster. — This body was formed in 1809 by the junction of the Southern Presbytery of Dublin with the Presbytery of Munster, and is one of the three non-subscribing Presbyterian bodies of Ireland, the other two being the Presbytery of Antrim (now consisting of 11 congregations) and the Remonstrant Synod of Ulster. A few years ago these three bodies united to form the “General Non-subscribing Presbyterian Association of Ireland,” for the promotion of their common principles, the right of private judgment, and non-subscription to creeds and confessions of faith. The General Association meets triennially for these objects, while the three bodies of which it is composed retain their respective names and independent existence, being governed by their own rules and regulations.

The Irish Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Great Britain numbered in 1869 19,659 members, 627 members on trial, and 174 ministers. The president of the British Conference is also president of the Irish Conference. The Primitive Methodist Society (also called Church Methodists) numbered in 1869 8763 members in Ireland. They regard  themselves as belonging to the Anglican Church. According to the census of 1881, the total Methodist population of Ireland amounted to 47,669. There were also, according to the same census, 4532 Independents, 4327 Baptists, 3695 Friends, 18,798 belonging to other sects, and 453 Jews.

The commissioners of public instruction and the census commissioners return the numbers in the principal religious denominations, and their percentage of the general population have been as follows:

Profession18611881Decrease between 1861 and 1881Increase between 1861 and 1881NumberPercentNumber%NumberNumberIrish Church693,35711.9635,67012.357,687Roman Catholics4,505,26577.73,951,88876.6553,379Presbyterians523,2919.0485,5039.437,788Methodists45,3990.847,6690.92270Other Denomina-tions31,6550.638,6560.87001Jews39345360Total5,798,967100.05,159,839100.648,8529331The census commissioners of 1861, in their report on religion and education (p. 5). remark that “the Wesleyan Methodists, by a peculiarity of their constitution, although frequenting places of worship distinct from those of the Established Church, very generally declined to be reckoned as dissenters, and were therefore included (by the commissioners of public instruction of 1834) among the members of the Established Church.”

Between the years 1834 and 1861 the Roman Catholic population showed a decline of 1,930,975 persons-the difference between 6,436,060 in 1834 and 4,505,265 in 1861-or nearly a third of what was their entire number in 1834; and, distributing this loss over the original dioceses (as given in the list of Anglican dioceses), as in the case of the Established Church, we find that it has to be divided among thirty out of the thirty-two, the only exceptions being the dioceses of Dublin and Connor, in both of which the number of Roman Catholics is something in excess of what it was in 1834. The total Roman Catholic population of the thirty dioceses in which it is found to have declined was 5,949,509 in 1834, and 4,005,104 in 1861,  showing a loss of 1,944,405, or nearly a third of the former population. In 1834 the number of Presbyterians in Ireland was returned as 643,058, and in 1861 it had fallen to 523,291, exhibiting a reduction of 119,767, or rather less than a fifth of their number in 1834. This reduction distributes itself over ten of the thirty-two (original Anglican) dioceses those, namely, of Achonry, Armagh, Clogher, Connor, Derry, Down, Dromore, Kilfenora, Kilmore, and Raphoe, the total Presbyterian population of which amounted in 1834 to 637.784, and in 1861 to 505,196, showing a reduction of 132,588, or 20.8 per cent of the original numbers. In twenty-two dioceses the Presbyterians have very considerably increased, their gross population having been only 5274 in 1834, and 18,095 in 1861, showing an increase of 243.1 per cent. The proportion per cent of the members of the Established Church to the general population had risen since 1834 in twenty-one out of the thirty-two dioceses, had remained stationary in two, and fallen in nine.

In 1831 the grants of public money for the education of the poor were entrusted to the charge of the lord lieutenant, to be expended on the instruction of the children of every religious denomination, under the superintendence of commissioners appointed by the crown, and named “The Commissioners of National Education.” The principles on which the commissioners act are, that the schools shall be open alike to Christians of every denomination; that no pupil shall be required to attend at any religious exercise, or to receive any religious instruction which his parents or guardians do not approve, and that sufficient opportunity shall be afforded to the pupils of each religious persuasion to receive separately, at appointed times, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians think proper. In 1845 the commissioners were incorporated under the name of “The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland,” with power to hold lands to the yearly value of £40,000, to purchase goods and chattels, to receive gifts and bequests to that amount, to erect and maintain schools where and as many as they shall think proper, to grant leases for three lives or thirty-one years, to sue and to be sued by their corporate name in all courts, and to have a common seal, a power being vested in the lord lieutenant to fill up vacancies, to appoint additional members, provided the total number does not exceed twenty, and to remove members at his pleasure.

The following return gives the number of schools and pupils at different periods, and the amount of parliamentary grants annually voted for their maintenance:

YearSchoolPupilsParliam. GrantsYearSchoolsPupilsParliam. Grants1840197823,560L50,00018605632804,000L270,7221845342643284475,00018656372922,084325,58318504321480623120,00018686586967,563360,19518555124535905215,200188075901,083,020727,366The religious denomination of the children who, on Dec. 31, 1888, were on the rolls of the national schools, was as follows:

Irish ChurchRoman CatholicPresbyteri ansOther Denom.TotalUlster76,684185,462113,0288,647383,821Munster7,481279,774595583288,433Leinster12,576204,7861,397553219,312Connaught5,477185,035609333191,454Ireland102,218855,057115,62910,1161,083,02 0Percent9.479.010.70.9See Herzog, Allgen. Real-Encyklop. 7, 63; Wiggers, Kirchliche Geogr. u. Statistik; Neher, Kirchl. Geogr. 2u. Statistik, 2, 1 sq.; Thom, Irish Almanac; Porter, Comp. Annal. eccl. Hib. (Rom. 1690); Warseus, Hibernial Sacra. (Duibl. 117); Lanigan, Eccl. Hist. of Ireland (Dubl.1829).

## Ireland, Council of[[@Headword:Ireland, Council of]]

             (Conciliunm Ilibernicum), a title of four different councils. The first of these was held about 456. By this council were published thirty-four canons under St. Patrick's name, and two other bishops, Auxililus and Jeserinus (or Iserinus). From the 6th of these canons it is evident that the priests, deacons and other clergy (to whom they are addressed) were married (comp. Wilkins, Conc. 1, 2). Another council was held about the same time, or shortly after, also said to have been presided over by St. Patrick; but for this assertion no evidence exists, and there is not only no possibility of determining the presiding officer, but even the place and date where and when it convened are very doubtful, except that the mention of a heathen population in Canon 2 makes it certain that it cannot have been much later than the council above alluded to. By this council, which, for  convenience sake, we may call the 2nd, 32 canons were published, the 7th of which forbids “to re-baptize any who have received the outward form, by whomsoever administered, since the iniquity of the sower infects not the seed itself.” A third council was held in 684, according to Mansi, who adds that the canons of this and other councils held about this time form together the code known as the “Irish Code” (part of it is given in the Spicilegisum of D'Achery, 1, 491). Another council was held about 1097, but its enactments are of but little importance. See Landon, Manual of Councils, p. 267 sq.; Labbe, 10:613; Wilkins, Concil. 1,4, 374. (J. H.W.)

## Ireland, John, D.D[[@Headword:Ireland, John, D.D]]

             an eminent English divine, was born at Ashburton, Devonshire, in 1761. He matriculated at Oxford as Bible clerk of Oriel College in 1780, and afterwards became successively vicar of Croydon, Surrey, in 1793, prebendary of Westminster in 1802, dean of Westminster and rector of Islip in 1816. He died in 1842. He was one of the earlier writers for the Quarterly Review, and founded four scholarships, an exhibition, and a professorship at Oxford. His principal works are, Five Discourses, with notes (Lond. 1796, 8vo): — Vindcicie regice; or, a defence of the kingly office (Lond. 2nd ed. 1797, 8vo): — Nitice sacrae; or, an inquiry into the scriptural doctrine of marriage and divorce (Lond. 1821, 8vo): — Pagaism and Christianity compared (Lond. 1809, 8vo):--The Plaque of Marseilles in the year 1720 (Lond. 1834, 4to). — Darling, Cyclop. Bib. (. 5., Allibone, Dict. of Authors, 1, 933.

## Ireland, William[[@Headword:Ireland, William]]

             a missionary, was born near Oswestry, Shropshire, England. He graduated from Illinois College in 1845, from Andover Theological Seminary in 1848, and the same year left for Zululand. During the first thirteen years he was stationed at Ifumi. In 1855 he was appointed to take charge of the boys' seminary at Adams, and for seventeen years continued his work there. He died in Boston, Massachusetts, October 12, 1888.

## Irenaeus[[@Headword:Irenaeus]]

             (Elprilvaio), one of the most distinguished of the early Church fathers, standing, with his disciple Hippolytus, “both of Greek education, but both belonging, in their ecclesiastical relations and labors, to the West,” at the head of the old Catholic controversialists, and called by Theodoret; “the Light of the Western Church,” was bishop of Lyons, in France, during the latter half of the 2nd century.

1. Life. — Of the personal history of Irenseus, especially in his youth, but little is known. The dates of his birth are very variably given by different critics. Thus Dodwell places it about A.D. 97, Grabe about 108, Tillemont about 120, Du Pin about 140. Most of the latest students of the Church fathers incline to put it between the years 120 and 140. The place of his birth, also, is not definitely known. It is probable, however, from his very  early acquaintance with Polycarp, the illustrious bishop of Smyrna, of which he himself tells us (3, 3, 4; comp. Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. p. 191, Bohn's edition), that he was born somewhere in Asia Minor; and some have assigned the city of Smyrna as his native place. Harvey, one of the editors of his works, however, thinks that Irenaeus was born in Syria, and that he came to Smyrna while yet very young; was there attracted by the teaching of bishop Polycarp, and became at once one of his most ardent disciples. “Through this link he still was connected with the Johanneani age. The spirit of his preceptor passed over to him.”

Addressing a former friend of his own, Florinuis, who had lapsed to Valentinianism, whom he earnestly endeavored to bring back to the Church, he bears witness to this connection in the following words: “These opinions, Florinuis, that I may speak in mild terms, are not part of sound doctrine; these opinions are not consonant with the Church, and involve their votaries in the utmost impiety; these opinions even the heretics beyond the Church's pale have never ventured to broach; these opinions those presbyters who preceded us, and who were conversant with the apostles, ) did not hand down to thee. For, while I was yet a boy, I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, distinguishing thyself in the royal court, and endeavoring to gain his approbation.

For I have a more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time than of recent events (inasmuch as the experiences of childhood, keeping pace with the growth of the soul, become incorporated with it), so that I can even describe the place where the blessed Polycarp used to sit and discourse his going out and his coming in, his general mode of life and personal appearance, together with the discourses which he delivered to the people; also how he would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; and how he would call their words to remembrance… What I heard from him, that wrote I not on paper, but in my heart, and, by the grace of God, I constantly bring it fresh to my mind.” It is not known at what time Ireneus removed to Gaul, but it is supposed by some that he accompanied Photinus (whom he afterwards succeeded as bishop) on his mission to Gaul to establish churches at Lyons and Vienne. So much is certain, that he was a presbyter at Lyons under Marcus Aurelius, according to Eusebius (ut sup. p. 171; compare p. 157), and was sent by his people to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome (A.D. 176-192), as a mediator in the Montanistic disputes.

While yet on this mission Photinus suffered martyrdom, and Ireneus was elected as his successor (about A.D. 177). He at once returned and zealously devoted himself, by tongue and pen, for the upbuilding of the Christian Church, so greatly  suffering at this time in Further Gaul from the persecutions of the heathen government. He is supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under Septimius Severus, A.D. 202; but the ‘silence of Tertullian and Eusebius, and most of the early Church fathers, makes this point very doubtful. “Ireneus was the leading representative of the Asiatic Johannaan school in the second half of the 2nd century, the champion of catholic orthodoxy against Gnostic heresy, and the mediator between the Eastern and Western churches. He united a learned Greek education and philosophical penetration with practical wisdom and moderation, and a just sense of the simple essentials in Christianity. We plainly trace in him the influence of the spirit of John. The true way to God,' says he, in opposition to the false Gnosis, ‘is love. It is better to be willing to know nothing but Jesus Christ the crucified, than to fall into ungodliness through our curious questions and paltry subtleties.' He was an enemy of all error and schism, and, on the whole, the most orthodox of the ante-Nicene fathers, except in eschatology. Here, with Papias and most of his contemporaries, he maintained the millenarian views which were subsequently abandoned by the Catholic Church” (Schaff, Ch. Hist. 1, 488, 489). Irenaeus's death is commemorated in the Roman Church, June 28.

II. Writings of Irenaeus. — His writings, which are very extended, covering, — in their translation into English, so far as now known, between six and seven hundred pages of the “Ante-Nicene Library” of the Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, are perhaps the most valuable relic of early Christian antiquity. But ‘their preciousness bears no proportion to their bulk.” “Indeed,” says a writer in the Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. (Jan. 1869, p. 2), “it would be possible to compress into a very few pages all the statements of fact that can be deemed really valuable to us at the present day.” Yet the same writer adds (p. 4) that the work of Irenaeus is to us “invaluable for the light it sheds on the views which prevailed in the primitive Church respecting many most important points.” Especially valuable, and the most important of all the writings of Irenaeus, is his work ῎Ελεγχος καὶ ἀνατροπὴ τῆς ψευδονύμου γνώσεως, generally published under the Latin title De Refutatione et Eversione Falsce Scientice (“A Refutation and Subversion of Knowledge falsely so called”), and more commonly even under the shorter title of Adversus Icpreses (“Against Heresies”). This work, which was mainly directed against the Gnostic error of that day, was composed during the pontificate of Eleutherus, and “is at once the polemic theological masterpiece of the ante  Nicene age, and the richest mine of information respecting the Gnostics, particularly the Valentinian heresy, and the Church doctrine of that age” (Schaff). The work is divided into five books. The first of these contains a minute description of the tenets of the various heretical sects, with occasional brief remarks in illustration of their absurdity, and in confirmation of the truth to which they were opposed. In his second book, Ireneus proceeds to a more complete demolition of those heresies which he has ‘already explained, and argues at great length against them, on grounds principally of reason. The three remaining books set forth more directly the true doctrines of relation, as-being in utter antagonism with the views held by the Gnostic teachers. “In the course of this argument many passages of Scripture are quoted and commented on; many interesting statements are made, bearing on the rule of faith; and much important light is shed on the doctrines held, as well as the practices observed by the Church of the 2nd century.”

As an introduction to the study which he describes, and with which he manifestly had taken great pains to make himself familiar, and as an expose and refutation of them, for which the great learning of the writer, acknowledged by nearly all his critics, fortunately coupled with a firm grasp of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, especially fitted him, this work is truly invaluable. And though it must be admitted that on some points Irenaeus has put forth very strange opinions, it cannot be denied that, upon the whole, his Adversus Ifaereses “contains a vast amount of sound and valuable exposition of Scripture in opposition to the fanciful systems of interpretation which prevailed in his day.” The Adyerssus licereses was written in Greek, but it is unfortunately now no longer extant in the original. The English translator of it for Clark's (Edinburgh) edition says that “it has come down to us only in an ancient Latin version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Hippolytus and Epiphanius.” The text, both of the Latin and of the Greek, as far as extant, is often most uncertain, and this has made it a difficult task for translation into English. In all only three MSS. of it are known to exist at present; but there is reason to believe that Erasmus, who printed the first edition of it (1526), had others at hand in his preparation of the work for the press. The Latin version, spoken of above as the only complete version of it, was, according to Dodwell (Dissertt. Iren. 5, 9,10), prepared in the 4th century; but it is known that Tertullian in his day, used the same version, and it is highly probable, therefore, that it was made even as early as the beginning of the 3rd century. It is certainly to be deplored that the  other codices which Erasmus must have used have not come down to us,' or that they are, at least, not known to us, for they might, perhaps, enable us to determine more definitely his meaning in many passages now quite obscure to us in their barbaric Latin. From 1526, when Erasmus printed his first edition, to 1571, several editions were produced. But all these had depended on the ancient barbarous Latin versions, and were moreover defective towards the end by five entire chapters. These latter w-ere first supplied in print by Prof. Fuardentinls, of Paris, in an edition of 1575, which was reprinted in six successive editions Gallasius, a minister of Geneva, also had in 1570 supplied the Latin with the first portions of the Greek text from Epiphanius.

In 1702, Grabe, a Prussian, resident in England, published an edition at Oxford, which contained considerable additions to the Greek text, besides some fragments. But the first really valuable edition was that by the Benedictine Massuet (Paris, 1712; Venice, 1724, 2 vols. fol.), since (1857) added to the Migne edition of the fathers, of which, very unfortunately, all the stereotype plates have lately been destroyed by fire. Another edition, containing the additions which have been- made to the Greek text from the recently discovered Philosophoumisena of Hippolytus, and thirty-two fragments of a Syriac version of the Greek text of Irenmus, culled from the Nitrian collection of Syriac MSS in the British Museum, all of which in several instances rectify the readings of the barbarous Latin version, was prepared by Wigan Harxey, at Cambridge, in 1837, under the title So Irencei Episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinmque adversus Haereses, and may be considered the best now extant. It is also enriched with an introduction of great length, which supplies much valuable information on the sources and phenomena of Gnosticism, and the life and writings of Irenasus. It furthermore contains notes, which display great research and erudition, and are especially deserving of notice on account of the hypothesis which the writer seeks to establish, that Irenaeus understood Syriac, and that the version of the Scriptures used by him was in the Syriac.

An attempt has also been made by H. W. J. Thiersch (in the Stucdien is. Krifiken, 1845) to translate the Latin version of the first four chapters of the third book back into the original, in order to lead to a better understanding of Irenaeus's meaning. Objections to the genuineness of this work of Irenaeus were of course made by the so-called “liberal” German theologians, as it is one of the “historic links associating the Christianity of the present day with that of our Lord's apostles and disciples,” and a work on which “we depend for satisfactory evidence respecting the-canon of the New Testament” (see  below, under “Doctrines of Irenaeus, Froude's attack against Irenaeus as a witness for the Gospels). They were made first by Semler, but were “so thoroughly refuted,” says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1, 489, foot-note), “by Chr. G. F. Walch (De Asuthentia librolrum Irenaei, 1774), that Mohler and Stieren might have spared themselves the trouble.?”

Besides Adversus Haereses, Irenaeus also wrote, according to Eusebius, “several letters against those who at Rome corrupted the doctrine of the Church: one to Blastus, concerning schism; another to Florinuis (already alluded to), concerning the monarchy, or to prove that God is not the author of evil; and concerning the number eight;” but these are all lost to us with the exception of a few fragments. Eusebius also mentions “a discourse of Irenaeus against the Gentiles, entitled περὶ ἐπιστήμης (Concerning Knowledge); another inscribed to a brother named Marcianus, being a demonstration of the apostolical preaching; and a little book of sundry disputations;” but these, also, are mainly lost to us. Pfaff, in 1715, discovered at Turin four mare Greek fragments, which he attributed to Irenaeus as their author. The genuineness of these has been called in question by some Roman divines, “though,” says Dr Schaff, “without sufficient reason.” These four fragments treat

(1) of true knowledge (Γνῶσις ἀληθινή) “which consists, not in the true solution of subtle questions, but in divine wisdom and the imitation of Christ;”

(2) on the Eucharist;

(3) on the duty of toleration in subordinate points of difference with reference to the Easter difficulties;

(4) on the object of the incarnation, “which is stated to be the purging away of sin, and the final annihilation of all evil.” An edition containing the Prolegomena to the earlier editions, and also the disputations of Maffei and Pfaff on the fragments- of Irenaeus just mentioned, was published by H. Stieren under the title S. Irencei Episcopi Lugdun. quae super sunt omnia (Lips. 1853, 2 vols.).

II. Doctrines. — We have already said that the writings of Irenaeus are invaluable to us as an index of the views which the primitive Church of Christ held on many very important points that have become matters of controversy between the different branches of the Christian Church up to  our own day. In this, of course, we shall be mainly dependent upon his extensive work against Heretics, or the Gnostics; and though some of his views, especially on the millennium, may not have our approval, we must none the less commend the whole work for the fervent piety which constantly impresses us in the perusal of it.

1. God and Creation. — The doctrine of the unity of God as the eternal, almighty, omnipresent, just, and holy creator and upholder of all things, which the Christian Church inherited from Judaism, was one which the early Christian writers were especially called upon to vindicate against the absurd polytheism of the pagans, and particularly against the dualism of the Gnostics. Accordingly we find most of the creeds of the first centuries, especially the Apostles' and the Nicene, begin with the confession of faith in God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of the visible and the invisible. In like manner, “with the defense of this fundamental doctrine laid down in the very first chapters of the Bible, Irenaeus opens his refutation of the Gnostic heresies, saying, in the language of Justin Martyr, that he would not have believed the Lord himself if he had announced any other God than the Creator. He repudiates everything like an a priori construction of the idea of God, and bases his knowledge wholly on revelation and Christian experience.” So also on the doctrine of creation, Irenaeus, and with him Tertullian, “most firmly rejected the hylozoic and demiurgic views of paganism and Gnosticism, and taught, according to the book of Genesis (comp. Psa 33:9; Psa 148:5; Joh 1:3), that God made the world, including matter, not, of course, out of any material, but out of nothing, or, to express it positively, out of his free, almighty will by his word. This free will of God, a will of love, is the supreme, absolutely unconditioned and all-conditioning cause and final reason of all existence, precluding every idea of physical force or of emanation. Every creature, since it proceeds from the good and holy God, is in itself, as to its essence, good (comp. Gen 1:31). Evil, therefore, is not an original and substantial entity, but a corruption of nature, and hence can be destroyed by the power of redemption. Without a correct doctrine of creation there can be no true doctrine of redemption, as all the Gnostic systems show.”

2. Person of Christ. — On the relation which Christ sustained to the Father also, the views of Iremeus are important, because he is, after Polycarp, “the most faithful representative of the Johannean school.” He certainly ‘keeps more within the limits of the simple Biblical statements,” and in the simpler way of the Western fathers, among whom he may-be counted,  notwithstanding his early Greek training. “He ventures no such bold speculations as the Alexandrians, but is more sound, and much nearer the Nicene standard. He likewise uses the terms λόγος and Son of God interchangeably, and concedes the distinction, made also by the Valentinians, between the inward and the uttered word, in reference to man, but contests the application of it to God, who is above all antitheses, absolutely simple and unchangeable, and in whom before and after, thinking and speaking, coincide. He repudiates also every speculative or a priori attempt to explain the derivation of the Son from the Father; this he holds to be an incomprehensible mystery. He is content to define the actual distinction between Father and Son by saying that the former is God revealing himself; the latter, God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other is the actual, appearing revelation itself. Hence he calls the Father the invisible of the Son, and the Son the visible of the Father. He discriminates most rigidly the conceptions of generation and of creation.

The Son, though begotten of the Father, is still, like him, distinguished from the created world, as increate, without beginning, and eternal-all plainly showing that Irenaeus is much nearer the Nicene dogma of the substantial identity of the Son with the Father than Justin and the Alexandrians. If, as he does in several passages, he still subordinates the Son to the Father, he is certainly inconsistent, and that for want of an accurate distinction between the eternal Logos and the actual Christ. The λόγος ἄσαρκος and the λόγος ἔνσαρκος, expressions like My Father is greater than I,' which apply only to the Christ of history, he refers also, like Justin and Origen, to the eternal Word. On the other hand, he has been charged with leaning in the opposite direction towards the Sabellian and Patripassian views, but unjustly, as Duncker, in his monograph Die Christologie des heilig. Irenaeus (p. 50 sq.), has unanswerably shown. Apart from his frequent want of precision, he steers in general, with sure Biblical and churchly tact, equally clear of both extremes, and asserts alike the essential unity and the eternal personal distinction of the Father and the Son. The incarnation of the Logos he ably discusses, viewing it both as a restoration and redemption from sin and death, and as the completion of the revelation of God and of the creation of man. In the latter view, as finisher, Christ is the perfect Son of man, in whom the likeness of man to God, the similitudo Dei, regarded as moral duty, in distinction from the imago Dei, as an essential property, becomes for the first time fully real. According to this, the incarnation would be grounded in the original plan of God for the education of mankind, and independent of the fall; it would  have taken place even without the fall, though in some other form. Yet Irenaeus does not expressly say this; speculation on abstract possibilities was foreign to his realistic cast of mind” (Dr. Schaff, 1, § 77, 78).

We now pass to a consideration of Irenaeus's views on the doctrine of Christ's humanity. Here, again, his first task is to refute Gnostic Docetists. “Christ,” he contends against them, “must be a man, like us, if he would redeem us from corruption and make us perfect. As sin and death came into the world by a man, so they could be blotted out legitimately and to our advantage only by a man; though, of course, not by one who should be a mere descendant of Adam, and thus himself stand in need of redemption, but by a second Adam, supernaturally begotten, a new progenitor of our race, as divine as he is human. A new birth unto life must take the place of the old birth unto death.

As the completer, also, Christ must enter into fellowship with us, to be our teacher and pattern. He made himself equal with man, that man, by his likeness to the Son, might become precious in the Father's sight.” Irenaeus (to quote Dr. Schaff still further) “conceived the humanity of Christ not as mere corporeality, though he often contends for this alone against the Gnostics, but as true humanity, embracing body, soul, and spirit. He places Christ in the same relation to the regenerate race which Adam bears to the natural, and regards him as the absolute universal man, the prototype and summing up of the whole race. Connected with this is his beautiful thought, found also in Hippolytus in the tenth book of the Philosophoumena, that Christ made the circuit of all the stages of human life, to redeem and sanctify all. To apply this to advanced age, he singularly extended the life of Jesus to fifty years, and endeavored to prove his view from the gospels against the Valentinians. The full communion of Christ with men involved his participation in all their evils and sufferings, his death, and his descent into the abode of the dead.” Also on the doctrine of the mutual relation of the divine and the human in Christ, which was neither specially discussed nor brought to a final, definite settlement until the Christological controversies of the 5th century, Irenaeus, in a number of passages, throws out hints which deserve consideration from their importance. “He teaches unequivocally a true and indissoluble union of divinity and humanity in Christ, and “repels the Gnostic idea of a mere external and transient connection of the divine Σωτήρ with the human Jesus.

The foundation for that union he perceives in the creation of the world by the Logos, and in man's original likeness to God and destination for permanent fellowship with him. In the act of union, that is, in the  supernatural generation and birth, the divine is the active principle, and the seat of personality; the human, the passive or receptive; as, in general, man is absolutely dependent on God, and is the vessel to receive the revelations of his wisdom and love. The medium and bond of the union is the Holy Ghost (see below), who took the place of the masculine agent in the generation, and overshadowed the virgin womb of Mary with the power of the Highest. In this connection he calls Mary the counterpart of Eve, the ‘mother of all living' in a higher sense, who, by her believing obedience, became the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race, as Eve, by her disobedience, induced the apostasy and death of mankind-a fruitful parallel, which was afterwards frequently pushed too far, and turned, no doubt, contrary to its original sense, to favor the idolatrous worship of the blessed Virgin. Irenaeus seems, at least according to Dorner (Christology, 1, 495), to conceive the incarnation as progressive, the two factors reaching absolute communion (but neither absorbing the other) in the ascension; though before this, at every stage of life, Christ was a perfect man, presenting the model of every age” (Schaff, 1, § 79).

3. The Holy Ghost. — On the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Irenaeus, more nearly than the Greek Church fathers, especially the Alexandrians, represents the dogma of the perfect, substantial identity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; “though his repeated figurative (but for this reason not so definite) designation of the Son ‘and Spirit as the hands' of the Father, by which he made all things, implies a certain subordination (see Irenaeus's views given below under “Trinity”). He differs from most of the fathers in referring the Wisdom of the book of Proverbs not to the Logos, but to the Spirit, and hence he must have regarded him as eternal. Yet he was far from conceiving the Spirit as a mere power or attribute; he considered him an independent personality, like the Logos. ‘With God,' says he (Adv. Hares. 4, 20, § 1), ‘are ever the Word and the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, through whom and in whom he freely made all things, to whom he said, “Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.”' But he speaks more of the operations than of the nature of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit predicted in the prophets the coming of Christ; has been near to man in all divine ordinances; communicates the knowledge of the Father and the Son; gives believers the consciousness of sonship; is fellowship with Christ, the pledge of imperishable life, and the ladder on which we ascend to God” (Schaff, 80).

4. The Trinity. — On the doctrine of the Trinity, the language of Ireneus is perhaps plainer-and more incontrovertible than that of any other of the early Church fathers, and yet both Arians and Socinians have sometimes presumed to claim him as a supporter of their peculiar theories. But we have his own expressions making both Christ and the Holy Spirit parts of the supreme divinity. Nay, Christ is often expressly declared to be God. Thus, in a passage in which Irenaeus is commenting on the prophecy respecting the birth of Emmanuel he says: “Carefully, then, has the Holy Ghost pointed out. by what has been said, his birth from a virgin, and his essence, that he is God, for the name Emmanuel indicates this” (3:21, 4); and again, in allusion to the Father: “With him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, he made all things; to whom, also, he spoke, saying, ‘Let us make man after our image and likeness.'” Indeed, Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1, 286) seems hardly justified in his statement that” of a supra- mundane trinity of essence Irenaeus betrays but faint indications.” He continually quotes from Genesis, with the object of showing that both Christ and the Holy Spirit existed with the Father anterior to all creation (“ante omnem constitutionem”). With a writer in the Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. (1869, p. 12), we are inclined to believe that the word “hands” is used by Irenaeus to indicate that they are both co-workers of the Father rather than his subordinate workman (compare Ebrard, Kirchen und Dogmengesch. 1, 110 and 111, note 8). “In all things and through al things there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one Spirit, and one salvation to all that believe in him.” Another very beautiful passage “reveals the doctrine of the Trinity as being, in fact, wrapped up in the official title by which the Savior is designated.” Says he: “In the name of Christ (3, 18, 3) is implied he that anoints, he that is anointed, and the unction itself with which he is anointed. And it is the Father who anoints, but the Son who is anointed by the Spirit, who is the unction, as the word declares by Isaiah, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me,' thus pointing out the anointing Father. the anointed Son, and the Unction which is the Spirit” certainly “a rich and pregnant thought, which will bear much consideration.

It is very striking and satisfactory to find the doctrine of the three divine persons thus developed out of the very name which the Savior bears. Nor does there seem anything fanciful in the reasoning; for, as we cannot think of an anointed one without necessarily thinking also of one who anoints, and of the unction with which he is anointed, we are thus led to conceive, by a simple remembrance of our  Lord's official designation, of the Father, the anointer, the Son, the anointed, and the Spirit, the living unction who came down, in infinite fullness, from the Father on the Son-the three-one God, being by means of a single word thus brought before us as the God of our salvation” (Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. 1869, p. 13). With all these direct testimonies staring us in the face, it is certainly ridiculous to see the efforts on the part of some Rationalistic theologians to assert that Irenaeus was not strictly Trinitarian in his views on this subject. But more than this: it was this self-same Irenaeus who opposed the Philonic doctrine of the Xyog, which other Church fathers, especially of the Alexandrian school, seemed so ready to accept, as Theophilus of Antiochia, and even Tertullian (comp. Ebrard, Kirchen- ut. Dognmengesch. 1, 116.

5. Redemption. — Of all the Church fathers, Irenaeus was the first who gave a careful analysis of the work of redemption, “and his view,” says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist. 1, 297), “is by far the deepest and soundest we find in the first three centuries. Christ, he teaches, as the second Adam, repeated in himself the entire life of man, from birth to death and hades, from childhood to manhood, and, as it were, summed up that life and brought it under one head (this is the sense of his frequent expression, Α᾿νακεφαλαιοῦν, ἀνακεφαλαίωσις, recapitulare, recapitulatio), with the double purpose of restoring humanity from its fall and carrying it to perfection. Redemption comprises the taking away of sin by the perfect obedience of Christ, the destruction of death by victory over the devil, and the communication of a new divine life to man. To accomplish this work, the Redeemer must unite in himself the divine and human natures; for only as God could he do what man could not, and only as man could he do, in a legitimate way, what man should. By the voluntary disobedience of Adam the devil gained a power over man, but in an unfair way, by fraud (dissuasio). By the voluntary obedience of Christ that power was wrested from him by lawful means (by suadela, persuasion, announcement of truth, not overreaching or deception). This took place first in the temptation, in which Christ renewed or recapitulated the struggle of Adam with Satan, but defeated the seducer, and thereby liberated man from his thraldom. But then the whole life of Christ was a continued victorious conflict with Satan, and a constant obedience to God. This obedience was completed in the suffering and death on the tree of the cross, and thus blotted out the disobedience which the first Adam had committed on the tree of knowledge. It is, however, only the negative side. To this is added the  communication of a new divine principle of life, and the perfecting of the idea of humanity first effected by Christ.” SEE REDEMPTION; SEE ORIGEN.

6. The Sacraments. — On this subject, perhaps more than upon on other on which Irenaeus has written, we meet with a vagueness of expression which hardly enables us definitely to determine what he actually believed. But even “Romanists tacitly admit that he says nothing of confirmation, ordination, marriage, or extreme unction favorable to the sacramental character which they assign to these rites. And this is a very strong negative testimony against the correctness of their opinions. If such an early writer as Irenaeus, in the course of a lengthened theological work, which naturally led him to the ordinances as well as doctrines of the Church, has not a word to say in regard to the above so-called sacraments, the inference is pretty clear that they were not recognized as such in his day… Massuet makes a very lame attempt to prove from the writings of Irenaeus that the sacrament of penance was practiced in the Church of his day. There can be no doubt that the passages to which he refers (1, 6, 3; 13, 5) prove that public confession of flagrant sins was common in the Church of the 2nd century. This was called exomologesis, and seems to have been indispensable for the removal of the censures of the Church. But there is nothing to indicate its sacramental character, and not a shadow of support can be derived from it for the popish practice of auricular confession” (Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. Jan. 1869, p. 18). SEE CONFESSION.

Of Infant Baptism the first clear trace is found in the writings of our author, who thus writes of the sacrament of baptism (2, 22, 4): “Christ came to save all who are regenerated by him, infants and little children, and boys, and youths, and elders.” He thus applies it to all ages, Christ having passed through all the stages of life for this purpose. Neander says of this passage (Hist. Christian Dogmas, 1, 230): “If by the phrase renasci in Denum (in the Latin transl.) baptism is intended, it contains a proof of infant baptism. Inifntes and parvuli are distinguished; the latter possess a developed consciousness, hence to them Christ is a pattern of piety, while to the infantes he merely gives an objective sanctification: we must therefore understand the latter to mean quite little children.” But the statement of Irenaeus leads us to infer that he believed in the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which is strengthened by another passage (3, 17, 1): “And again giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God,  he said to them, ‘Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”' (Compare an article on this subject in the American Presbyterian Review, April, 1867, p. 239 sq.; Schaff, Church History, 1, 402.)

On the Lord's Supper, also, the indefinite statements of Irenseus have given rise to much dispute. Romanists stoutly affirm that he declares in favor of their doctrine of transubstantiation, and the real presence; but this arises from a variable reading of one passage, of which Neander says (p. 238), “According to one reading it is said, Verbuem quod offertur Deo, which must mean the Logos which is presented to God; therefore, the sacrifice would refer to the presentation of Christ himself. Yet we can hardly make up our minds to accept this as the opinion of Irenaeus, who always says that Christians must consecrate all to. God in Christ's name; for example, Ecclesia offert per Jesum Christum. We cannot doubt that the other reading is the correct one, Verbum per quod effertur Deo.” Dr. Schaff also declines to give the Romanists a hearing on this point, and argues further, that Irenaeus “in another place (4:18 and passim) calls the bread and wine, after consecration, ‘antitypes,' implying the continued distinction of their substance from the body and blood of Christ. This expression in itself, indeed, might be understood as merely contrasting here the Supper, as the substance, with the Old-Testament Passover, its type; as Peter calls baptism the antitype of the saving water of the flood (1Pe 3:20-21). But the connection, and the usus loquendi of the earlier Greek fathers, require us to take the term antitype in the sense of type, or, more precisely, as the antithesis of archetype. The bread and wine represent and exhibit the body and blood of Christ as the archetype, and correspond to them as a copy to the original. In exactly the same sense it is said in Heb 9:24 (comp. 8:5), that the earthly sanctuary is the antitype, that is, the copy of the heavenly” (1, 387). We think Irenseus speaks more definitely of this ordinance in one of the Fragments (38, Massuet), from which it clearly follows that he by no means believed in the opus operatum of the Romanists. (Comp. Brit. and For. Evang. Review, Jan. 1869, p. 19, 20.)

7. The Church. — By the peculiar attitude in which Irenaeus placed himself when combating the Gnostic heresies, he became unconsciously one of the most elaborate writers on the early Church that now remains to us, and the utterances of no other of the early Church fathers have so frequently been misinterpreted to prop up the claims of Romanism as those of Irenaeus. It  is beyond question that the Romanists, as well as High Church prelatists, however hesitatingly-, misconstrued the statements of Irenaeus in defense of the Church of Christ against Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion, and other schismatics, who in his time threatened the very life of the early Christian Church, as statements favoring the doctrine of apostolic succession (q.v.). Irenaeus, evidently in defense of his Church, and as an opponent of the heretics, presents a “historical chain of bishops.” Says he (3, 3, 1), “We are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successors of these bishops to our own times.” But, in naming the bishops in their historical order, he “never dreams of ascribing to them any sort of spiritual influence or authority which was propagated from one to another. To show that he could link historically Eleutherius, who was then head of the Church of Rome, with the apostles, who were supposed to have founded that Church, was the sole and simple object contemplated by our author in reference to the succession.” In his arguments with the Valentinians, Marcionites, and others, he endeavors to prove, by constant appeals to the Scriptures, that their doctrines were not in harmony with the inspired writings. “Had he found ‘the truth' among them, he would have had no occasion to treat of the succession at all, but would ac once have owned them as forming a part of the Catholic Church,” which he defined, not as Romanists and High-Churchmen, to be only where the pope's supremacy is acknowledged, or the Episcopal Church doctrines are adhered to, but, he says, “Ubi ecclesia”-pitting the Church first, in the genuine catholic spirit (3, 24) — ” ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, illic ecclesia et omnis gratia,” or, as Dr. Schaff says, Protestantism would put it conversely: “Where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church; and where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God and all grace.”

8. The Millennium. — The peculiar millennial views of Irenaeus. which stamp him, by his close adherence to Papias, as a Chiliast, we hardly care to touch; they are certainly the weak spot in our author, and deserve to be passed not only without comment, but even unnoticed. They are brought out specially near the end of his great work (Mat 5:32-36), declaring a future reign of the saints on earth; arguing that such promises of Scripture as those in Gen 13:14; Mat 26:27-29, etc., can have no other interpretation.

9. The Easter Controversy. — The personal character of Irenaeus, of which we have as yet said but little, in perhaps best illustrated by his conduct ‘in  the Easter controversy (q.v.). Determined to work for a union of all Christians (4, 33, 7), he displayed an irenical disposition in all disputes about unessential outward things, and more especially in his mediation between Victor, then bishop of Rome, and the Asiatic churches.

10. Testimony to the Scriptures. — The influence which Irenaeus exerted at this time, and in other controversies that preceded, adds additional interest to the writings of this Church father, and makes especially valuable any testimony that he may have left us on the authenticity of the sacred writings. A leading representative of the Asiatic Johannean school of the second half of the 2nd century, born ere the apostle John had departed this life, and consequently called by Eusebius “a disciple of the apostles,” and by Jerome “the ‘disciple of John the apostle,” he bears us such direct testimony in behalf of the Gospels, or, as Eusebius terms them, the “Homologoumena,” that it becomes to us of the very highest importance among the external proofs of their genuineness, more especially at the present moment, in face of the denials of this truth by Rationalists, and by those “who take up themes which lie outside of their chosen studies, or with which they are not profoundly conversant,” among them figuring no less a personage than the distinguished English historian Froude (Short Essays on Great Subjects). Now what does Irenaeus say of the Gospels? “We have not received,” he says, “the knowledge of the way of our salvation by any others than those by whom the Gospel has been brought to us; which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of the faith.” Here follows a declaration that the first Gospel was written among the Jews by Matthew; the second by Mark, a companion of Peter; the third by Luke, a companion of Paul; and the fourth by John, of whom he says, “Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he likewise published a gospel while he dwelt in Ephesus, in Asia.” “Let us assume now that Irenaeus-between whom and the apostles there is only one intervening link-was an honest man and an intelligent man; in short, that he is a competent witness.

At the time when he knew Polycarp, were the four Gospels extant and acknowledged authorities in the Church? We will here confine the question to the Gospel of John (q.v.), which is now so much a topic of controversy. Was or was not this gospel received as the production of him whose name it bears by Polycarp and his contemporaries at the time to which Irenaeus, in his graphic reminiscence, refers? If it was thus received-received in the  neighborhood of Ephesus, in the very region where John had lived to so advanced an age, and where his followers and acquaintances survived-it will be very difficult to disprove its genuineness. But if it was not thus received, when, we ask, can it be supposed to have first seen the light? Who contrived a book of which Polycarp had known nothing, and palmed it off on him and on the whole circle of Johannean disciples and churches in Asia? How is it that Irenaeus knows nothing of the late discovery or promulgation of so valuable a book? Why does he not mention the momentous fact-if, indeed, it be a fact that after. his interviews with Polycarp there was found somewhere, or put forth by somebody, this priceless treasure? It is obvious that Irenaeus would have had something to say of the extraordinary concealment and final appearance of this Gospel history had he remembered a time or known of a time since John's death when this Gospel had not been a familiar and prized possession of the Church. This testimony of Irenaeus is a tough piece of evidence. Here we have specific declarations as to what he had himself seen and heard. Yet the — attempt is made to disparage the value of this testimony on the ground of the following passage, which stands in connection with his statements about the composition of the several gospels: ‘Nor can there be more or fewer gospels than these. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four catholic spirits, and the Church is spread all over the earth, and the Gospel is the pillar and foundation of the Church, and the spirit of life, in like manner was it fit it should have four pillars, breathing on all sides incorruption and refreshing mankind.

Whence it is manifest that the Word, the former of all things, who sits upon the cherubim and upholds all things, having appeared to men, has given us a Gospel of a fourfold character, but joined in one spirit.' (Here follows a brief characterization of the several gospels in their relation to one another.) That this is a fanciful (if one will, a puerile) observation there is no reason to deny; but how it can in the least invalidate the credibility of the author's testimony on a matter of fact within his cognizance, it is impossible to see. If these analogies had exerted any influence in determining Irenaeus's acceptance of the four gospels of the canon, the case would be different. But Froude admits that such was not the fact. He accepts the Gospels on account of the historical proof of their genuineness, as he repeatedly affirms, and independently of these supposed analogies. It is the established and exclusive authority of the four gospels that sends him after these fancied analogies and accounts for the suggestion of them.

The suggestion of them, therefore, strengthens instead of weakens the evidence  in behalf of the canonical evangelists, because it shows how firm and long- settled must have been the recognition of them in the Church. It is even a hasty inference from such a passage that the author was intellectually weak. If this inference is to be drawn from such an observation, the ablest of the fathers, as Augustine, must be equally condemned. Men who are not deficient in ability may say sometimes rather foolish things.... On the whole, Irenaeus is distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his understanding. (See Schaff in the first part of our article.) He is rather averse to speculation, being of a practical turn. There is hardly one of the early ecclesiastical writers who, in all the qualities that made up a trustworthy witness, is to be set before him.

There is no reason to doubt that, in his statements concerning the origin and authority of the Gospels, he represents the Christians of his time. It is not the sentiment of an individual merely, but the state of things, the general judgment of the Church, which he brings before us. No good reason can be given for this general, exclusive recognition of the Gospels now included in our canon, no even plausible solution of the fact can-be rendered, unless it be granted that they were really handed down from the days of the apostles, and were thus known to embody the testimony of eve-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the events which they record. Had Polycarp known nothing of John's Gospel or, knowing of it, had he rejected it-it is impossible that Irenaeus and his contemporaries should have been ignorant of the fact. It is proved by the most convincing array of circumstantial evidence that Polycarp, a personal acquaintance of John the Apostle, an honored bishop in the neighborhood where John had labored and died, considered the fourth gospel to be his composition” (Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale College, in the Independent, Feb. 4, 1869; comp. the reply to Dr. Davidson Introd. to the N.T. Lond. 1868, 2 vols. 8vo], in the Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. Jan. 1869, p. 4-8).

In a similar strain argues Mr.Westcott (History of the New Test. Canon): “In the same Church where Irenaeus was a presbyter — ‘zealous for the covenant of Christ' — Photinus was bishop, already ninety years old. Like Polycarp, he was associated with the generation of St. John, and must have been born before the books of the N.T. were all written. And how, then, can it be supposed with reason that forgeries came into use in his time, which he must have been able to detect by his own knowledge that they were received without suspicion or reserve in the church over which he presided? It is possible to weaken the connection of facts by arbitrary hypotheses; but, interpreted according to their natural meaning, they tell of a Church united by its head with the times of St. John, to which  the books of the N.T. furnished the unaffected language of hope, and resignation, and triumph. And the testimony of Irenaeus is the testimony of the Church.” But not only to the authenticity of the Gospels does Irenaeus bear his testimony. He also furnishes conclusive evidence in support of other N.T. books which have been questioned (see Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. 1869, p. 7 sq.).

11. Canon of Scripture. — Not a little surprising, but agreeably so, it must be to the Christian of the present day to find that in the days of Irenaeus, even when the canon of Scripture could not be expected to have been so accurately defined as it afterwards was, we find, with the exception of the spurious additions to Daniel, found in the Septuagint, and the books of Baruch, quoted. under the name of Jeremiah, no writings of the O.T., acknowledged as forming part of the O.T. canon, which Protestants do not include in it at the present day. So likewise of the N.T., the only book not now accepted, but to which Irenaeus credited canonical authority, is the- “Shepherd of Hermas.” Altogether, “with the most inconsiderable exceptions .... the canon of both the O. and N.T., then accepted by the Church, was coincident and conterminous with our own.” But more then this, by the language which Irenaeus uses, we find the Church of his day harmonizing with and justifying that very highest claims that have ever been-advanced in support of the inspired authority and infallible accuracy of the canonical writings. The utterance which Irenaeus has made on this subject Romanists have-sought to turn to account in their assertions of the authority of tradition as co-ordinate with that of Scripture. But though, as was natural in such an early writer, Irenaeus often refers to the apostolic traditions preserved in the churches, he never ascribes to these an authority independent of Scripture.

12. Literature. — Heaven, Life of Irenaeus (Lond. 1841); Schaff, Irenaeus, in Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund, vol. 5 (Mercersb. 1852); Gervaise, La Vie de S. Irenee (Paris, 1723, 2 vols. 8vo); ‘Stieren, art. “Irenaeus,” in Ersch u. Gruber, Encyklop. vol. 2, sec. 22; Massuet, Dissertationes in Irenaei libros, prefixed to his edition of the Opera; Deyling, Irenceus, evangelice veritatis confessor ac testis (Lips. 1721), against Massuet; Ceillier, Hist. geesr. des Auteurs sacres et Ecclis. 1, 495 sq.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. 7, 75 sq.; Bohringer, Kirchengesch. in Biographien, vol. 1; Mohler, Patrologie, vol. 2; Ritter, Gesch. der Philos. 1, 345 sq.; Duncker, Des heil. Iren. Christol. 1. Zusam menhasngege 2. d. theol. und anthropol. Grundlehren dargestellt (1843, 8vo); Graul, D.  christlich Kirche a. d. Schwelle d. Iren. Zeitalters (Lpz. 1860), a very valuable little work of 168 pages, in which “the position of Irenaeus is sketched with a bold and firm hand;” Schröckh, Kirchengeschichte, 3, 192 sq.; Schaff, Church History, vol. 1 (see Index); Neander, Church History, vol. 1 (see Index); Shedd, History of Doctrines (see Index); Harrison, Whose are the Fathers-? (see Index); Augusti, Dogmengesch. vol. 1 and 2; Baumgarten-Crusius, Dogmengesch. (see Index); Bullet. Theolog. 1869, Oct. 25, p. 319; Rev. de deux Mondes, 1865, February 15, art. 8; Christian Remembrancer, July, 1853, p. 226; Herzog, Real-Encyklopadie, 7:46 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Irenaeus (2)[[@Headword:Irenaeus (2)]]

             a pseudonym for the celebrated Church historian SEE JOHANN KARL LUDWIG GIESELER (q.v.).

## Irenaeus, Christoph[[@Headword:Irenaeus, Christoph]]

             one of the most zealous defendants of the doctrine of the Flacians, was born at Schweidnitz, near the middle of the 16th century. First a deacon at Aschersleben, he was afterwards called to Eisleben as regular pastor, and finally appointed court preacher at Weimar. Accused of favoring the views of Flacius, a consistent though much persecuted follower of Luther, he was, with other prominent preachers guilty of the same failing, dismissed from his position in 1572. He now removed to Austria; where he published in 1581 a pamphlet against the first article of the Concordien formel, under  the title of Christoph Irenaei Examen d. ersten Artikels u. d. lirbel-Geistes i. d. neuen Concordienbuch von der Erbsiinde. The date of his death is not known to us. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. 2, 781. SEE FLACIUS.

## Irenaeus, Klementievski[[@Headword:Irenaeus, Klementievski]]

             a very able Russian theologian, was born at Klementief (Vladimir district) in 1753. Of his early history but little is known to us. He enjoyed the reputation of a great savant, and held the bishopric of Tvar, and, later, the archbishopric of Pskof, and died at St. Petersburg April 24, 1818. Of course he belonged to the monastic order of the Russo Greek Church, for, as is well known, the higher ecclesiastical offices of Russia are accessible only to monastic orders (compare Eckardt, Modern Russia). Archbishop Irenaeus wrote Commentaries on the Twelve minor Prophets: — St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and to the Hebrews: — and also published some of his sermons, delivered before the royal household at St. Petersburg (1794). He likewise translated into Russian the writings of several of the Church fathers, and cardinal Bellarmine's Commentary on the Psalms (Moscow, 1807, 2 vols. 4to); and two other works on ascetism by Bellarmine. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25, 949.

## Irenaeus, St[[@Headword:Irenaeus, St]]

             another martyr, was bishop of Sirmium (now Sirmish, a Hungarian village), his native country, at the beginning of the 4th century. Many inducements were offered him by the then governor of the country, Probus, who, no doubt, acted under instructions from the emperors Diocletian and Maximus, to renounce Christianity, but, all proving futile, he was at last beheaded, after having been subjected to various tortures. Though but little is known of this Irenaeus's personal history, it is evident, from the efforts of the governor to secure his adhesion to the heathen practices, that he was a man of great influence. The date of his death is not accurately known. Some think it to be March 25, the day on which his death is commemorated by Romanists; others put it April 6, A.D. 304. See Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Géneralé. 25:948; Ceillier, Hist. des aut. sacr. 3:27; Butler, Lives of the Saints, 3:651 sq.; Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschland, v, 715 sq.

## Irenaeus, St (2)[[@Headword:Irenaeus, St (2)]]

             a Tuscan martyr, flourished in the second half of the 3rd century. But very little is known of the history of his life. He suffered martyrdom during the persecutions under the emperor Aurelius (275), and is commemorated in the Roman Church July 3. Tillemont, Memoires Ecclus. vol. 4; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 25:948.

## Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre[[@Headword:Irenaeus, bishop of Tyre]]

             flourished in the first half of the 5th century, He was originally a count of the empire, and first took part in ecclesiastical affairs at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he represented the emperor Theodosius as  assistant to Candidius; to settle the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, and their respective followers. Both he and Candidius favored Nestorius, and, failing to prevent his condemnation at the council, did their utmost, on their return to court, to counteract on the emperor's mind the influence and decision of the Cyrillians against Nestorius. For a time they succeeded well, as their representations “bore on their very face the impress of truth.” But the Cyrillian party predominating, and John, the secretary of Cyril, appearing himself at court to counteract the efforts of Irenaeus and Candidius, the feeble sovereign was soon turned in favor of the Cyrillian party, and Irenaeus himself was banished from the court about A.D. 435. He at once betook himself to his friends, the Oriental bishops, and by them was raised to the bishopric of Tyre in 444. The emperor now issued an edict condemning the Nestorians. and, in addition, it was ordered that Irenaeus should be deposed from. the bishopric, and deprived of his clerical character. In 448 the sentence was finally executed. ‘After his retirement Irenaeus wrote a history of the Nestorian struggle; under the title of Tragdia seu Comsenitarii de rebus in Synodo Ephesina ac in Oricite gestis. The original, which was written in' Greek, is lost, and only parts of it remain to us in a Latin translation published by Christian Lupus, under the inaccurate title of Variorum Patrum Epistole ad Concilinum Ephesinum pertinentis (Lotv. 1682). See Mansi, Sacr. Concil. Nov. Collect. 5, 417, 731; Tillemont, lam. Sirach 14; Cave, Hist. Litt. sub. ann. 444; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Genesis 25:949; Neander, Ch. Hist. 2, 468 sq.

## Irenasus, Falkovski[[@Headword:Irenasus, Falkovski]]

             a learned Russian priest, was born May 28,1762. He acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Latin, French, and German, then went to Hungary to study philosophy, history, and mathematics. He was married, but his great merits caused him to be appointed bishop, although, according to the general rules of the Greek Church, marriage is a bar to a candidate for this office. He died April 29, 1823. Irenaeus wrote Chronologie ecclesiastique (Moscow, 1797): — Christiance, orthodoxe dogmatico-polemicae Theologic Compendium (Moscow, 1802, 2 vols. 8vo), and commentaries on Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians (Kief, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo). See Gagarin, De la Theol. dans Eglise Russe (Par. 1857), p. 53. (J. N. P.)

## Irene[[@Headword:Irene]]

             (Eipnjv, Peace), empress of Constantinople, and one of the most extraordinary, though corrupt characters of the Byzantine empire, was born in Athens about A.D. 725. An orphan, 17 years of age, without any fortune except her beauty and talents, she excited the admiration of the  then reigning emperor, Leo IV, and in A.D. 769 became his lawful wife. — Her love for power, it is said, caused her to commit the crime of murder, for her husband, who died in 780, is generally believed to have been poisoned by her. During his reign she had acquired not only the love, but also the confidence of the emperor, and in his testament he declared her empress guardian of the Roman world, and of their son Constantine VI,” who was, at the decease of Leo IV, only ten years of age. Educated in the worship of images, she was herself an ardent opponent of the iconoclasts, who held sway during the reign of her husband, and who, even at one time, had caused her banishment from his court on account of her secret worship of images, and her conspiracies with image-worshippers against iconoclasm. “But, as soon as she reigned in her own name and that of her son, Irene most seriously undertook the ruin of the iconoclasts, and the first step of her future persecution was a general edict for liberty of conscience. In the restoration of the monks, a thousand images were exposed to public veneration; a thousand legends were invented of their sufferings and miracles. As opportunities occurred by death or removal, the episcopal seat were judicially filled; the most eager competitors for earthly or celestial favor anticipated and flattered the judgment of their sovereign; and the promotion of her secretary, Tarasius, gave Irene the patriarch of Constantinople, and the command of the Oriental Church.” But the decrees of a general council could only be repeated effectually by a similar assembly, and to this end she convened a council of bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 786.

By this time, however, the people and the army had learned to abhor the worship of images in place of the true God, and the council was opposed by a mob, assisted by the troops, and even driven from the capital. This by no means intimidated Irene in her marked course. She had determined on the reintroduction of image-worship and the extirpation of all iconoclasts, and well did her zeal for the restoration of this gross superstition deserve to be rewarded by the Church (Greek) with a saintship (which she still occupies in the Greek calendar). A second council was convened only a year after the first had been broken up, but this time at Nice. “No more than 18 days were allowed for the consummation of this important work; the iconoclasts appeared not as judges, but as criminals or penitents; the scene was decorated by the legates of pope Adrian and the Eastern patriarchs, the decrees were framed by the president Tarasius, and ratified by the acclamations and subscriptions of 350 bishops. They unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the fathers and  councils of the Church; but they hesitate whether that worship be relative or direct; whether the godhead and the figure of Christ be entitled to the same mode of adoration. Of this second Nicene Council the acts are still extant; a curious monument of superstition and ignorance, of falsehood and folly” (Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Romans' Empire, 5, 37 sq.). Meanwhile, however, the young emperor was attaining the maturity of manhood; “the maternal yoke became more grievous; and he listened to the favorites of his own age, who shared his pleasures, and were ambitious of sharing his power.” But Irene was by no means ready to concede to her son the power which she preferred to hold in her own hand, and, ever vigilant, she soon penetrated the designs of her son. As a consequence, there arose at court two factions.

The young and the vigorous gathered around the heir presumptive, and in 790 he actually succeeded in assuming himself the government of affairs. As Constantine VI he became the lawful emperor of the Romans, and Irene was dismissed to a life of solitude and repose. “But her haughty spirit condescended to the arts of dissimulation: she flattered the bishops and eunuchs, revived the filial tenderness of the prince, regained his confidence, and betrayed his credulity. The character of Constantine was not destitute of sense or spirit; but his education had been studiously neglected; and the ambitious mother now exposed to the public censure the vices which she herself had nourished, and the actions which she herself had secretly advised.” Meanwhile a powerful conspiracy was also concocted against Constantine, and only reached his ears when he knew it to be impossible for him to successfully resist. In haste he fled from the capital. But his own guards even had been bought in the interests of Irene, and the emperor was seized by them oil the Asiatic shore, and transported back to Constantinople to the porphyry apartment of the palace where he had first seen the light. “In the mind of Irene ambition had stifled every sentiment of humanity and nature;” and it was decreed, in a bloody council which she had assembled, that Constantine must by some means be forever rendered incapable of assuming the government himself. While asleep in his bed, the hirelings of Irene entered the room of the prince and stabbed their daggers with violence and precipitation into his eyes, depriving him not only of his eyesight, but rendering his life even critical. As if this crime were in itself not sufficiently great, the youth was even deprived of his liberty when it was found that he had survived the fatal stroke, and confined in a dungeon, where he was left to pine away. Thus the unnatural mother, guilty of a crime unparalleled in the history of crimes, secured for herself the reins of government. But still Irene was not  free from anxieties. Though the punishment which her crime deserved did not immediately follow the bloody deed, it yet came surely. Her two favorites, Stauracius and AEtius, whom she had raised. enriched, and entrusted with the first dignities of the empire, were constantly embroiled with each other, and their jealousies only ceased with the death of the former, A.D. 800. In order to secure her possession of the throne, she sought a marriage with Charlemagne; but the Frank emperor had evidently no relish for a woman who had committed so many crimes, and the scheme proved abortive. Two years later, her treasurer, Nicephorus, rebelled against her, and, suddenly seizing her person, banished her to the isle of Lesbos, where she was forced to spin for a livelihood. Here she died of grief, AD. 803. SEE ICONOCLASM. (J. H. W.)

## Irenical Theology[[@Headword:Irenical Theology]]

             is a term (from εἰρήνη, peace) used to designate the art or science of conciliating any differences which arise in religion and in the Church from one-sided theories or misapprehension. Making peace implies a previous warfare, hence irenical theology is closely allied to polemics (q.v.), which, in its true character, should be but a struggle for peace. For the σύνδεσμος τῆς εἰρήνης, or “bond of peace” (Eph 4:3), embraces all Christians, and the ἀληθεύειν ἐν ἀγάπῃ, or “speaking the truth in love” (Eph 4:15), contains two commandments which cannot be separated. Hence we find in the Christian Church, from her earliest days up to our own times, attempts to secure peace and unity by conciliating all differences and by reuniting those who had separated from each other. Such was particularly the case when schism occurred first between the Latin and the Greek churches, then between the Romish and the Protestant, and, again, between the Lutheran and the Reformed. Irenical attempts accompanied each of these separations, as is evinced by the large number of works known as Irenicum, Unio, Concordier, etc.

But the labor of dogmatical peace-makers, or, as some call them, the angels of peace upon earth, is so profoundly, so quietly, and unostentatiously done, that the general mass of professional theologians hardly become aware of it. As a regular science, however, or systematic theory, these efforts at peaceful agreement on the points of difference could only spring from a well defined and developed state of Christian doctrine, and Christian life and its theory. Hence irenical theology is comparatively modern, and its system but little developed as yet. No one can deny that in the N.T., in the works of the apologists, apostles, and fathers, and down through a long  series of ecclesiastical writings, and particularly in those of the mystics and pious ascetics, there are many pacificatory elements which might serve as material for an irenical system. After. the Reformation we find such fragments side by side with the most violent polemical works.

We might mention in this connection Erasmus (De amabili ecclesice concordia), George Wicel, H. Cassander, Fr. Junius, besides Melancthon, Martin Bucer, etc. It was against one of these peace-makers, David Paraeus (t 1615) that Leonhard Hutter wrote his Irenicum vere Christianum (2nd edit. Rostock, 1619), in which, however, he admits that the attainment of ultimate unity and peace is problematical. Among the most active in the cause of union we find, in the Reformed Church, Hugo Grotius († 1645), and, in the Lutheran, George Calixtus († 1656). The Jesuits, however, managed to interfere in all these attempts, and to render them abortive by proposing sophistical and impossible bases of union. On the other hand, untimely propositions on both sides, dictated either by fear or worldly motives, threw discredit on the cause itself. It was now decried as Babelianism, Samaritanism, neutralism, syncretism, etc. Still there continued to appear persons who believed, in the possibility of union, and labored zealously for it. Among them were John Fabricius of Helmstadt († 1729), a disciple of Calixtus, and the Scotch divine, John Dury, or Dureeus (1630-78), who, knowing the relation between the Protestant confessions, labored with a truly Christian spirit to secure this end. His principal work, Irenicorum tractatuenum Prodromuns (Amstelod. 1662, 8vo), is in itself a sort of irenical theory, as it treats of the manner of removing the obstacles to union, of the grounds sufficient for evangelical unity, of the causes and means of religious reconciliation, and of the true method of accomplishing that result. Similar works, like the vice ad pacern, etc., appeared in the Reformed Church, and also, though not so numerously, in the Lutheran.

Among she Romanists even, we find some earnest peacemakers, but their efforts met with little success. Among the most prominent was the Spaniard, Christopher Roja de Spinola appointed bishop in Austria in 1668; he made great efforts towards reconciling the churches, and was countenanced by the emperor Leopold and pope Innocent XI, but was afterwards disowned by the latter, and Spener himself was obliged to caution all against holding secret intercourse with him. He gained to his views the Lutheran abbot Molanus, of Loccum, in Hanover, who, in turn, found a zealous and distinguished advocate of unity in Leibnitz. Correspondence was be gun with Bossuet on this subject, and Leibnitz wrote a very ingenious Systenma Theologia, which was only published in  1819, at Paris, and afterwards in German by the Roman Catholic Lorenz Doller (Mayence, 1820), with a preface, in which he asserts that Leibnitz was at heart a Romanist. This brought an. answer of G. E, Schulze, Ueber die E'ntdeckung das. Leibzitz ein Katholik gewoesen (Getting. 1827).

The negotiations in the mean time proved unsuccessful, and matters remained unchanged; but still the irenical tendency was clearly gaining ground. Soon after the impulse towards a living faith given by Spener and his school, there appeared a large number of works for and against the union of the Protestant churches, which finally led, in Prussia, to some practical results. These, however, we shall not dwell upon here, our present object being only to show the development of irenical theology. John Christopher Kocher († 1772) published a Bibliotheca theologice irenicae (Jeene, 1764), which, though short, is valuable. He defines irenical theology (§ 3) as being “that part of controversial theology which inquires into the import of such doctrines and religious ceremonies as either whole ecclesiastical bodies or personal members contend about, with a view to preserve the peace and unity of the Church of God, or to restore them to the position which they first held.” The tendency to unity now gradually became transformed into a general toleration; nothing was done towards the actual settlement of the differences, though much preparation was made in that direction by the humanistic tendency, and the spirit of inquiry into all religious systems. (On the literature of the subject in that period, see Winer, landbuch der theol. Literaturg. 1, 356-60.) Among the works which advocated a union of the churches, but rather from a practical than a scientific point of view, are to be mentioned first those of Joseph Planck († 1833) and Marheineke († 1845); then those of J. A. Stark († 1816); Theoduls Gastmahl, the crypto- catholic Protestant court-preacher of Darmstadt (7th edit. 1828, 8vo); the Christliche Henotikon of Dr. C. F. Bohme (Halle, 1827); and Ideen 2. d. innern Zusammenhang v. Glaubenseinigung u. Glaubenseinigung in d. Evangel. Kirche, by Daniel of Cologne (Leipzig, 1823).

In Germany, Marheineke; who, in imitation of Planck, transformed symbolics into a comparison of the different Christian confessions, greatly advanced the I real scientific character of irenical theology, partly as the general union of the churches, partly as that of the different confessions. The same spirit, though joined to much partiality, pervades also the Roman Catholic Symbolik of Adam Mohler, and in a more liberal tone Leopold Schmid's Geist des Katholicisnus oder Grundlegung der christlzchen  Irenik (1848). On the contrary, such works as Dr. F. A. Staudenmaier's (t 1856) Zum religiosen Frieden d. Zukunft (1846, 2 vols. 8vo) disfigure Protestantism to such an extent, and are written in so illiberal a tone. that, if such were more abundant, they would kindle again the fiercest strife. Yet the scientific basis of religious and denominational peace has made much progress since Schleiermacher gave a scientific development to polemics and apologetics. This is especially evident in J. Peter Lange's Christliche Dogmatik,' the third part of which (Heidelberg, 1852) contains a clever sketch of practical dogmatics, or of polemics and irenical theology. According to him, it is the province of irenical theology to bring out of the different religious opinions those which coincide with the Christian dogma, to free them from all errors and excesses, and to bring them into the life and consciousness of the Church, or to submit them to the Christian dogmas (§ 5). It has therefore to search out the hidden efforts of truth in ,all religious manifestations. All distortions of truth are evidences of the existence of an original truth. Irenical theology is again divided into elementary, i.e. an exposition of the struggles of truth and of the means of assisting it; and concrete, i.e. an exposition of the organic liberation and development of truth in humanity until the completion of the Church. Sin, however, will always remain an obstacle to absolute peace till it is finally abolished in the kingdom of God. For this we must prepare ourselves by adhering to Meldenius's maxim: “In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrisque caritas.” See Dr. F. J. Liicke, Ueber d. Alter dieses kirchlichen Friedensspruches (Gott. 1850). — Herzog, Real- Encyyklopadie, 7:60; Ersch u. Gruber's Encylclopadie, 2, 23.

## Irhov, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Irhov, Wilhelm]]

             a Dutch theologian, who died November 18, 1760, at Utrecht, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of Conjectanea Philol. Crit.- Theologica in Psalmorum Titulos (Leyden, 1728). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:82; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:137. (B.P.)

## Iri[[@Headword:Iri]]

             (Heb. I-i', עַירַי, citizen; Sept. Οὐρί, Vulg. Urai), the last-named of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1Ch 7:7). B.C. between 1856 and 1658. See IR.

I'RI also appears in the A.Vers. of the Apocrypha (1Es 8:62) as tne name (Οὐρία v.r. Οὐρί, Vulg. Jorus) of the father of the priest Marmoth; evidently the URIAH SEE URIAH (q.v.) of Ezr 8:33.

## Irijah[[@Headword:Irijah]]

             (Heb. Yiriyah', יַרְאַיָּיה, seen by Jehovah; Sept. Σαρουϊvας, Vulg. Jerias), son of Shelemiah, and a captain of the ward at the gate of Benjamin, who arrested the prophet Jeremiah on the pretence that he was deserting to the Chaldaeans (Jer 37:13-14). B.C. 589.

## Irish Church[[@Headword:Irish Church]]

             SEE IRELAND.

## Irish Presbyterian Church[[@Headword:Irish Presbyterian Church]]

             SEE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN IRELAND, s.v. PRESBYTERIAN CHURCHES.

## Irish Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Irish Version Of The Scriptures]]

             The Irish or Erse language is now little known except as the vernacular of an illiterate population, but it was once the language of literature and science. The Roman letters are often used in Erse compositions, but the Irish have an ancient alphabet of their own, for which they feel a truly national predilection. The origin of this alphabet is very uncertain; it bears some resemblance to the Anglo-Saxon, and it has been questioned whether the Saxons derived their alphabetical system from the Irish, or vice versa. In the dedication of the Irish Prayer Book of 1608, it is confidently asserted that the Saxons borrowed their letters from Ireland.

The first printed New Test., in the Irish characters, was published in 1602. When bishop Bedell was appointed to the see of Kilmore and Ardagh, in 1629, he undertook the translation of the Old Test. Not being acquainted with the language, he commenced to study the same at the age of fifty- seven. His next measure was to secure the services of native Irish scholars, and with their help the version of the Old Test. was completed in 1640, to remain in MS. till 1681. After due examination and revision it was published in London in 1686, together with the New Test. More than a century was suffered to roll away before any efficient measures were taken to reprint the Scriptures in Irish, until, in 1809, an edition of 2000 New Tests., conformable to the accredited version: of bishop Bedell, was published in Roman characters by the British and Foreign Bible Society. Other editions followed in 1813, 1816, and 1817. In the latter year also a complete Irish Bible was issued, the version of Bedell being employed as  the text of the Old Test. In the course of the following year 3000 copies of the New Test., in the Irish character, were published, and in 1828 the entire Irish Bible appeared in the vernacular. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for the year 1881 we learn that a revised edition of the New Test. is to be published. In order to bring about such a revision, twenty-five interleaved New Tests. are to be placed in the hands. of competent Irish scholars, and their corrections of archaisms, obsolete words, and orthographical errors will be examined by the chief reviser and editor, the Reverend James Goodman, Canon of Ross, and professor of Irish in the University of Dublin. As the first installment of this revision the Gospel of Luke was published in 1884. See Bible of Every Land, page 160. (B.P.)

## Irmensaul[[@Headword:Irmensaul]]

             a statue of unknown form and significance, which was erected at Eresberge, in Hessen or Westphalia, and worshipped by the ancient Saxons. In 772. Charlemagne, having conquered the country and brought the people under subjection, destroyed it, to discontinue the idolatrous worship. It is said that he found in' the inside a great amount of gold and silver. In the cathedral of Hildesheim they show a column of green marble which is claimed to be the column of Irmensaul. See Grimm, Irmenstrasse u. Irmensaüle (Vienna, 1815); Von der Hagen, Isrmin, seine Sdule u. s. Wege (Bresl. 1817). — Pierer, Univ. Lex. 9:66. (J. N. P.)

## Irmin[[@Headword:Irmin]]

             (Irmensdule, Irminsul, etc.), in German mythology, seems to have been a principal god of the ancient Saxons. At Eresburg, now Stadtbergen, on the Dimel, the famous pillar Irmin is said to have stood, that was destroyed by Charlemague in 772, during the Saxon wars. Might, courage, war, were all-important to the Germanic nations; therefore it is quite possible that Irmin was a god of war.

## Iron[[@Headword:Iron]]

             (בִּרְזֶל, barzel'; Chald. פִּרְזֶל, parzel'; Gr. σίδηρος, Lat. ferrum). There is not much room to doubt the identity of the metal denoted by the above terms. Tubal-Cain is the first-mentioned smith, “a forger of every instrument of iron” (Gen 4:22). As this metal is rarely found in its native state, but generally in combination with oxygen, the knowledge of the art of forging it, which is attributed to Tubal-Cain, argues an acquaintance with the difficulties that attend the smelting of this metal. Iron melts at a temperature of about 3000° Fahrenheit, and to produce this heat large furnaces supplied by a strong blast of air are necessary. But, however difficult it may be to imagine a knowledge of such appliances at so early a period, it is perfectly certain that the use of iron is of extreme antiquity, and that therefore some means of overcoming the obstacles in question must have been discovered.

What the process may have been is left entirely to conjecture; a method is employed by the natives of India, extremely simple and of great antiquity, which, though rude, is very effective, and suggests the possibility of similar knowledge in an early stage of civilization (Ure, Dict. Arts and Sciences, s.v. Steel). The smelting furnaces of AEthalia, described by Diodorus (5, 13), remains of which still exist in that country, correspond roughly with the modern bloomeries (Napier, Metallurgy of the Bible p. 140). Malleable iron was in common use, but it is doubtful whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. SEE METAL.

The mineral wealth of Canaan is indicated by describing it as “a land whose stones are iron” (Deu 8:9), a passage from which it would seem that in ancient times it was a plentiful production of that vicinity (compare Job 28:2), as it is still in Syria, especially in the region of Lebanon (Volney's Tray. 1, 233). There appear to have been furnaces for smelting at an early period in Egypt (Deu 4:20; comp. Hengstenberg, Mois. u. Aeq. p. 19). Winer, indeed (Realo. s.v. Eisen), understands that the basalt which predominates in the Hauran (Burckhardt, 2, 637) is the material of which Og's bedstead (Deu 3:11) was made, as it contains a large percentage of iron. But this is doubtful. Pliny (36, 11), who is quoted as an authority, says, indeed, that basalt is “ferrei coloris atque duritise,” but does not hint that iron was ever extracted from it. The  book of Job contains passages which indicate that iron was a metal well known. Of the manner of procuring it, we learn that “iron is taken from dust” (38, 2). Iron was prepared in abundance by David for the building of the Temple (1Ch 22:3), to the amount of one hundred thousand talents (1Ch 29:7), or, rather, ‘without weight” (1Ch 22:14). Working in iron was considered a calling (2Ch 2:7). SEE SMITH.

In Sir 38:28, we have a picture of the interior of an iron-smith's (Isa 44:12) workshop: the smith, parched with the smoke and heat of the furnace, sitting beside his anvil, and contemplating the unwrought iron, his ears deafened with' the din of the heavy hammer, his eyes fixed on his model, and never sleeping till he has accomplished his task. The superior hardness and strength of iron above all other substances is alluded to in Dan 2:40; its exceeding utility, in Sir 39:31. It was found among the Midianites (Num 31:22), and was part of the wealth distributed among the tribes at their location in the land (Jos 22:8).

The market of Tyre was supplied with bright or polished- iron by the merchants of Dan and Javan (Eze 27:19). Some, as the Sept. and Vulg., render this “wrought iron” so De Wette “geschmiedetes Eisen.” The Targum has “bars of iron,” which would correspond with the stricture of Pliny (34, 41). But Kimchi (Lex. s.v.) expounds עָשׁוֹת, ‘ashoth, as “pure and polished” (= Span. acero, steel), in which he is supported by R. Sol. Parchon, and by Ben-Zeb, who gives “glanzend” as the equivalent (comp. the Homeric αῖΟωᾷ οαιλποτ, ΙΙ. 7, 473). If the Javan alluded to were Greece, and not, as Bochart (Phaleg, 2, 21) seems to think, some place in Arabia, there might be reference to the iron mines of Macedonia, spoken of in the decree of AEmilius Paulus (Livy, 45, 29); but Bochart urges, as a very strong argument in support of his theory, that, at the time of Ezekiel's prophecy, the Tyrians did not depend upon Greece for a supply of cassia and cinnamon, which are associated with iron in the merchandise of Dan and Javan, but that rather the contrary was the case. Pliny (34, 41) awards the palm to the iron of Serica, that of Parthia being next in excellence. The Chalybes of the Pontus were celebrated as workers in iron in very ancient times (AEsch. Prom. 733). They were identified by Strabo with the Chaldee of his day (12, 549), and the miles which they worked were in the mountains skirting the seacoast. The produce of their labor is supposed to be alluded to in Jer 15:12, as being of superior quality. Iron mines are still in existence on the same coast, and the ore is found “in small  nodular masses in a dark yellow clay which overlies a limestone rock” (Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v. Chalybes).

From the earliest times we meet with manufactures in iron of the utmost variety (some articles of which' seem to be anticipations of what are commonly supposed to be modern inventions). Thus iron was used for chisels (Deu 27:5), or something of the kind; for axes (Deu 19:5; 2Ki 6:5-6; Isa 10:34; comp. Homer, II. 4:485); for harrows and saws (2Sa 12:31; 1Ch 20:3); for nails (1Ch 22:3), and the fastenings of the Temple; for weapons of war (1Sa 17:7; Job 20:24), and for war chariots (Jos 17:16; Jos 17:18; Jdg 1:19; Jdg 4:3; Jdg 4:13). The latter were plated or studded with it, or perhaps armed with iron scythes at the axles, like the currus falcati of the ancient Romans. Its usage in defensive armor is implied in 2Sa 23:7 (compare Rev 9:9), and as a safeguard in peace it appears in fetters (Psa 105:18), prison gates. (Act 12:10), and bars of gates or doors (Psa 107:16; Isa 45:2), as well as for surgical purposes (1Ti 4:2). Sheet-iron was used for cooking utensils (Eze 4:3; compare Lev 7:9), and bars of hammered iron are mentioned in Job 40:18 (though here the Sept. perversely renders σίδηρος χυτός, “cast-iron”). We have also mention of iron instruments (Num 35:7); barbed irons, used in hunting (Job 41:7); an iron bedstead (Deu 3:11); iron weights (shekels) (1Sa 17:7); iron tools (1Ki 6:7 : 2Ki 6:5); horns (for symbolical use, 1Ki 22:11); trees bound with iron (Dan 4:15); gods of iron (Dan 5:4), etc.

It was used by Solomon, according to Josephus, to clamp the large rocks with which he built up the Temple mount (Ant. 15:11, 3), and by Hezekiah's workmen to hew out the conduits of Gihon (Sir 48:17). Images were fastened in their niches in later times by iron brackets or clamps (Wis 13:15). Agricultural implements were early made of the same material. In the treaty made by Porsena was inserted a condition like that imposed on the Hebrews by the Philistines, that no iron should be used except for agricultural purposes (Pliny, 34:39). It does not follow from Job 19:24, that it was used for a writing implement, though such may have been the case (comp. Isa 17:1), any more than that adamant was employed for the same purpose (Jer 17:1), or that shoes were shod with iron and brass (Deu 33:25). Indeed, iron so frequently occurs in poetic figures that it is difficult to discriminate between its literal and metaphorical  sense. In such passages as the following, in which a “yoke of iron” (Deu 28:48) denotes hard service; “a rod of iron” (Psa 2:9), a stern government; “a pillar of iron” (Jer 1:18), a strong support; “and threshing instruments of iron” (Amo 1:3), the means of cruel oppression: the hardness and heaviness (Sir 22:15) of iron are so clearly the prominent ideas, that, though it may have been used for the instruments in question, such usage is not of necessity indicated. “The furnace of iron” (Deu 4:28; 1Ki 8:51) is a figure which vividly expresses hard bondage, as represented by the severe labor which attended the operation of smelting.

Iron is alluded to in the following instances: Under the same figure, chastisement is denoted (Eze 22:18; Eze 22:20; Eze 22:22); reducing the earth to total barrenness by turning it into iron (Deu 28:23); strength, by a bar of it (Job 40:18); affliction, by iron fetters (Psa 107:10); prosperity, by giving silver for iron (Isa 60:17); political strength (Dan 2:33); obstinacy, by an iron sinew in the neck (Isa 48:1); giving supernatural fortitude to a prophet, making him an iron pillar (Jer 1:18); destructive power of empires, by iron teeth (Dan 7:7); deterioration of character, by becoming iron (Jer 6:28; Eze 22:18), which resembles the idea of the iron age; a tiresome burden, by a mass of iron (Sir 22:15); the greatest obstacles, by walls of iron (2Ma 11:9); the certainty With which a real enemy will ever show his hatred, by the rust returning upon iron (Sir 12:10). Iron seems used, as by the Hebrew poets, metonymicaliy for the sword (Isa 10:34), and so the Sept. understands it μάχαιρα. The following is selected as a beautiful comparison made to iron (Pro 27:17), “Iron (literally) uniteth iron; so a man uniteth the countenance of his friend,” gives stability to his appearance by his presence.

It was for a long time supposed that the Egyptians were ignorant of the use of iron, and that the allusion in the Pentateuch were anachronisms, as no traces of it have been found in their monuments; but in the sepulchers at Thebes butchers are represented as sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their aprons, which, from its blue color, is presumed to be steel. The steel weapons on the tomb of Rameses III are also painted blue; those of bronze being red (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 3, 247). One iron mine only has been discovered in Egypt, which was worked by the ancients. It is at Hammami, between the Nile and the Red Sea; the iron found by Mr. Burton was in the form of specular and red ore (ibid. 3:246).  That no articles of iron should have been found is readily accounted for by the fact that it is easily destroyed by exposure to the air and moisture. According to Pliny (34, 43), it was preserved by a coating of white lead, gypsum, and liquid pitch. Bitumen was probably employed for the same purpose (35, 52).

The Egyptians obtained their iron almost exclusively from Assyria Proper in the form of bricks or pigs (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 415). Specimens of Assyrian ironwork overlaid with bronze were discovered by Mr. Layard, and are now in the British Museum (Nin. and Bab. p. 191). Iron weapons of various kinds were found at Nimrfid, but fell to pieces on exposure to the air. Some portions of shields and arrow-heads (ib. p. 194, 596) were rescued, and are now in England. A pick of the same metal (ib. p. 194) was also found, as well as part of a saw (p. 195), and the head of an axe (p. 357), and remains of scale-armor and helmets inlaid with copper (Nineveh, 1, 340). It was used by the Etruscans for offensive weapons, as bronze for defensive armor. The Assyrians had daggers and arrow-heads of copper mixed with iron, and hardened with an alloy of tin (Layard, Nineveh, 2, 418). So in the days of Homer war-clubs were shod with iron (I. 7, 141); arrows were tipped with it (II. 4, 123); it was used for the axles of chariots (II. 5, 723), for fetters (Od. 1, 204), for axes and bills (I1. 4, 485; Od. 21:3, 81). Adrastus (II. 6, 48) and Ulysses (Od. 21, 10) reckoned it among their treasures, the iron weapons being kept in a chest in the treasury with the gold and brass (Od. 21, 61). In Od. 1, 184, Mentes tells Telemachus that he is traveling from Taphos to Tamese to procure brass in exchange for iron, which Eustathius says was not obtained from the mines of the island, but was the produce of piratical excursions (Millin, Mineral. Hon. p. 115, 2nd ed.).

Pliny (34, 40) mentions iron as used symbolically for a statue of Hercules at Thebes (comp. Dan 2:33; Dan 5:4), and goblets of iron as among the offerings in the temple of Mars the Avenger, at Rome. Alyattes the Lydian dedicated to the oracle at Delphi a small goblet of iron, the workmanship of Glaucus of Chios, to whom the discovery of the art of soldering this metal is attributed (Herod. 1, 25). The goblet is described by Pausanias (10, 16). From the fact that such offerings were made to the temples, and that Achilles gave as a prize of contest a rudely-shaped mass of the same metal (Homer, II. 23, 826), it has been argued that in early times iron was so little known as to be greatly esteemed for its rarity. That this was not the case in the time of Lycurgus is evident, and Homer attaches to it no epithet which would denote its preciousness (Millin, p. 106). There is reason to suppose that the discovery of brass preceded that of iron (Lucret. 5, 1292), though little weight can be  attached to the line of Hesiod often quoted as decisive on this point (Op. et Dies, 150). The Dactyli Idaei of Crete were supposed by the ancients to have the merit of being the first to discover the properties of iron (Pliny, 7:57; Diod. Sic. 5, 64), as the Cyclopes were said to have invented the ironsmith's forge (Pliny, 7:57). According to the Arundelian marble Iron was known B.C. 1370, while Larcher (Chronologie d'Herod. p. 570) assigns a still earlier date, B.C. 1537. SEE STEEL.

## Iron (2)[[@Headword:Iron (2)]]

             (Heb. Yiron', יַרְאוֹן, place of alarm; Sept. Ι᾿ερών), one of the “fenced” cities of Naphtali, mentioned between En-hazor and Migdal-el (Jos 19:38). De Saulcy (Narrat. 2, 382) thinks it may be the Yaroun marked in Zimmerman's map north-west of Safed, the Yaron observed by Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, 3. 61, 62, notes). Van de Velde likewise remarks that it is “now Yarun, a village of Belad Besharah. On the north- east side of the place are the foundations and other remains of the ancient city” (Memoir, p. 322).

## Iron (3)[[@Headword:Iron (3)]]

             The modern representative of this site, Yaruzn, located four miles north- west from El-Jish (Ahlab or Gischala), is described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (1:203), as "a stone village, containing about 200 Metawileh and 200 Christians. It is situated on the edge of a plain, with vineyards and arable lands; to the west rises a basalt top, called el-Burj [the castle], full of cisterns, and supposed to be the site of an ancient castle; there are large stones strewn about; three large birkehs [pools] and many cisterns to supply water; one of the birkehs is ruined." The remains of a large church in the village are described in detail (page 258).

## Irons, William Josiah, D.D[[@Headword:Irons, William Josiah, D.D]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Hoddesdon, Hertshire, September 12, 1812. He graduated from Queen's College, Oxford, in 1833; became curate at Newington in 1835, rector at Walworth in 1837, of Barkway in 1838, of Brompton in 1842; prebendary of St. Paul's, London, in 1860; rector at Wadingham, Lincolnshire, in 1870; of St. Mary's, Woolnoth, London, in 1872, and died June 19, 1883. Besides numerous lectures, sermons, and ecclesiastical essays, Dr. Irons published several poetical works, especially Hymns for the Church (1875), from which a number of pieces have been adopted in many modern hymnals, notably his version of the Dies Irae (q.v.).

## Ironside, Gilbert, D.D[[@Headword:Ironside, Gilbert, D.D]]

             a bishop in the Church of England during the period of the Restoration. Of his early history but little is known to us. He was the rector of a small church in an obscure little village in Dorsetshire when he was promoted to the see of Bristol immediately after the Restoration. Wood (Athen. Oxon. 3:940) says of him that he owed his promotion to a poor bishopric solely to his great wealth. He died in 1671. Bishop Ironside is the author of a work entitled The Sabbath (Oxford, 1637, 4to). See Stoughton, Eccles. History of England (Church of the Restoration), 1, 494. C

## Iroquois[[@Headword:Iroquois]]

             SEE INDIANS.

## Iroquois Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Iroquois Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This version is of very recent date. There are also Iroquois Indians in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario who do not understand the Scriptures in Mohawk published by the British and Foreign Bible Society. For the benefit of these Indians, the Four Gospels were published in 1880 at Montreal. The translation was made by chief Joseph Oncsakeural, revised by Jean Dion and the Reverend T. Laforte. Chief Joseph had all qualifications for the translation, since, in 1865, under the direction of the Roman Catholic missionaries at Oka, and with the approval of the Roman Catholic bishop of Montreal, he prepared a translation into Iroquois of the Gospels and Epistles used in the Missal. (B.P.)

## Irpeel[[@Headword:Irpeel]]

             (Hebrew Yirpeel', יַרְפְּאֵל, restored by God; Sept. Ι᾿ερφαήλ), a city in the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Rekem and Taralah (Jos 18:27). The associated names only afford a conjectural position somewhere in the district west of Jerusalem, possibly at el-Kustul (Lat. castellum), on  a conical hill about half way between Kuloniyeh (Lat. colonia) and Soba (Robinson, Researches, 2, 328).

## Irpeel (2)[[@Headword:Irpeel (2)]]

             is conjectured by Conder (Tent Work, 2:337), to be represented by the modern Rafat, as two of the radical letters are the same. This place lies one and a half miles north of el-Jib (Gibeon), and is thus described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (3:13, also 155): "A small hamlet on a ridge, with a spring to the west, and many rock-cut tombs.... Traces of ruins: cisterns cut in rocks, and rough pillar-shafts, with ruins of a modern village and a Mukan.

## Irregularity[[@Headword:Irregularity]]

             is a technical term for the want of the necessary canonical qualifications for the acquisition and exercise of an ecclesiastical office. These requisite qualifications are set forth in canones or regule enacted from time to time by the Church for that purpose. It was based first on the apostolic examples given in 1Ti 3:1 sq.; 1Ti 5:22; Tit 1:6 sq.; and, after the notion of the Levitical priesthood gained ground among the clergy, on the regulations of the O.T., which were explained in a mythical sense. The qualifications themselves can all be reduced to this, that the party ordained should not be in disrepute for crime, or in a state which would render him unfit for and incapable of ordination. Innocent III (in c. 14, X. De purgatione canonica [5, 33] an. 1207) distinguishes “nota delicti” and “nota defectus” as “impedienta ad sacros ordines promovendum;” and subsequent canonists have therefore divided the impediments in a like manner. In early times divers expressions were made use of to designate these impediments, but since Innocent III irregularitas has become the technical name of them in canon law (c. 33, X. De testibus [2, 20] an. 1203). SEE INCAPACITY.

The Greek Church in general adhered more to the principles which had been established during the first six centuries (see Canonses Apostolorum, Conc. Neocesar. an. 314, can. 9 [c. 11, dist. 34]; ‘Concil. Niccen. eod. an., Trullianum, an. 692, can. 21), whilst the Evangelical Church has so far adopted also later regulations, which were in accordance with its general spirit. The formulas of confession and ecclesiastical discipline still continue, however, to refer expressly to the above-named passages of Scripture.

I. Irregularity on Account of a Crime. — The apostle demands that he who is to assume an office over the congregation should be unimpeached. Church discipline has gradually defined the offenses which compose irregularity. Originally it consisted of all offenses that necessitated public penance; after the 9th century, of such as were publicly known (delictum manifestum, notorium), and all faults entailing dishonor, in which the “infamibus portae non pateant dignitatum” of c. 87, De regalisjuris, was practically adhered to (comp. c. 2, Cod, Just. “de dignitatibus,” 12:1, Constantin.). There are, besides, other offenses named by the law which,  even though secret (delicta occulta), constitute irregularity, namely, heresy, apostasy, schism, simony, Anabaptism, subreption of the ordination, promotion without passing through the regular hierarchical degrees, ministration without consecration, performance of worship whilst under excommunication or interdict, disregard of the rule of celibacy, etc. (see Thomassin, Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplina, pt. 2, lib. 1, cap. 56- 65; Ferraris, Bibliotheca canonica, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, No. 11; Ersch und Gruber, Encyklopadie, s.v. Ordination).

Whilst the Greek Church generally adhered to these regulations, the Evangelical Church naturally deviates from them in many particulars, in consequence of the absence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the abolition of the rule of celibacy, etc. That a person who has undergone punishment for crime is incapable of being ordained is self-evident. If a party is in bad repute, the congregation has a right to oppose his appointment, in case the imputations are well founded. This is a law among all Christian denominations.

The Romish Church suppresses the consequences of irregularity on account of crime by means of a dispensation which the bishops are empowered to give when the crime is not public, except in case of premeditated murder (Concilium Trident. Sess. 24, cap. 6, “De reform. verb.;” Sess. 14, cap. 7, “De reform.”). In this case the dispensation can come only from the pope himself. So also for public offences, except he delegates special powers to the bishop for that purpose. In the Greek Church, on the contrary, the strict regulations of old are maintained, whereby irregularity for heavy offences cannot be removed (Thomassin, Vetus et nova eccles. disciplina, cap. lx, § 12),

II. Irregularity caused by Want of Qualification. Irregularity for offense constitutes also irregularity for want of sufficient qualification, as it entails the loss of good reputation (defectus fiamae); to this are, however, added other causes which are considered as defects. Among these are:

1. Defectus cetatis (want of the canonical age). — The age appointed for ordination has undergone various changes. According to the present canon law, the primary consecration of the Romish Church can be imparted in the seventh year; it is the tonsure (c. 4, De temporib. ord. in 6 [ 1, 9] Boniface VIII; Cone. Trid. Sess. 23, cap. 4, “De reform.”). The age demanded for the other orders is: for subdeacons, the twenty-second; deacons, the twenty-third; presbyters, the twenty-fifth; bishops must be over thirty  (Conc. Trid. Sess. 23, cap. 12, “De reform.”). Yet ‘the pope can grant dispensations. In the Greek Church, the old rule demanding that deacons should be twenty years old when ordained, and presbyters thirty; is still retained (Nov. Justin. 137, cap. 1; Cone. Trullianum., can. 12). The evangelical churches generally require full majority, or twenty-five years; in some countries ordination is given at twenty-one. Dispensations are also granted under certain circumstances. The Church of England requires candidates to deacons' orders to be twenty-three, presbyters twenty-four, and bishops thirty.

2. Defectus natalium (legitimorum). — Illegitimacy was no obstacle to ordination in the ancient Church (c. 8, dist. 56, Hieronymus). It has been considered so since the 9th century; yet the rule was not very strictly enforced (Concil. Weldense, an. 845 [in cap. 17, Song of Solomon 1, qu. 7]; Regino, De discipl. eccl. lib. 1, c. 416 sq.). Especial action was taken concerning the children of ordained priests (Concil. Pictaviense, an. 1078 [ c. 1, X. “De fillis presbyterorum ordinandisve non,” 1, 17 ]; Claramontan. an. 1095 [comp. c. 14, dist. Ivi, Urban II), etc.'; see especially dist. 56, tit. 10:1, 17; lib. 6:1, 11; Cone. Trid. Sess. 25, cap. 15, “De reform.”), and justified their laws by the passage of the O.T., Deu 23:2 (comp. c. 10, § 6, X. “De renunciat.” 1, 9, Innocent III, an. 1206). This defect, however, can be remedied (a) by recognition (c. 6, X. “Qui filii sint legitimi,” 4:17, Alexander III); (b) by entrance into a convent or foundation of regular canons (c. 11, dist. 56, Urban II; c. 1, 10. “De filiis presbyterorum,” etc.). This regulation, abolished by Sixtus V, was restored by Gregory XVI in 1591, but with this condition, that such persons should be disabled from prelatical honors. (c) By dispensation; which, for ordines minores, and for majores when the defect is not publicly known, can be granted by the bishop; otherwise, for ordines majores, and benefits connected with cure of souls, the dispensation can be granted only by the pope (c. 1, “De filiis presbyterorum,” in 6 [1, 11; comp. c. 20, 25, X. “De electione” [1, 6]). The Greek Church does not recognize this defect (Thomassin, cap. 81, § 4), neither does the evangelical Church, although many jurists consider the canonical principle on which it is based as common law (Wiese, Kirchenrecht, pt. 3, sec. 1, p. 160; Eichhorn, Deutsches Privatrecht, § 89; Kirchenrecht, 1, p. 704).

3. Delecius corporis. — In imitation of the Mosaic law (Lev 21:17-20 sq.), it was at an early time demanded that the candidates for orders' should have no bodily blemishes such as might render them unfit  for the duties of their office, or a subject of dislike to the people (Constif. Apost. lib. 7, cap. 2, 3; Canones Apostolorlum, cap. 76, 77). The Church became subsequently very strict on this point, and declared all bodily defects sufficient ground for irregularity (cap. 2, dist. 33; cap. 7, dist.. 34; c. I, dist. 36; c.,1, 3, dist. 55, etc.), but finally returned again to the former rules (tit. 10, “De corpor. vitiatis Cordinandis vel non,” 1, 20). Thus ordination is refused to the deaf, dumb, and blind (Con. Apostol, 77, c. 6, X. “De clerico aegrotante vel debilitato,” 3:6); also to those who have but one eye, especially if the one wanting is the left (oculus canonis), as in reading mass the Missal is placed on the left side (cap. 13, dist. 55), the lame (c. 10, dist. 55; c. 56, dist. 1, “De consecr.”), epileptics (c. 1, 2, Song of Solomon 7, qu. 2; c. 21, X. “De electione” is 6), lepers (c. 3, 4, X. “De clerico engrot.” 3:6), those who had mutilated themselves (c. 21 sq; Apost. c. 7 sq., dist. 55), hermaphrodites (Ferraris, Bibliotheca canonica, s.v.). In some of these cases there can be dispensations granted, as, for instance, for the loss of the left eye, when the right has gained more strength so as to compensate for the defect (Ferraris, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, no. 12). The Greek Church has retained the original principle, and its application by the Evangelical Church appears fully justified..

4. De Jectus anime (want of spiritual capacity). — Thus madness, imbecility, etc., are grounds of irregularity (c. 2-5, dist. 33).

5. Defectus scientip (the want of adequate educational preparation). — In accordance with various passages of the O.T. (Jer 1:9; Hos 4:6; Mal 2:7, etc.), even the early Church demanded of its officers to have enjoyed special educational advantages, which alone-could qualify them to act as teachers of the people (comp. dist. 36-38, etc.), and the civil laws also insisted on this point (Novella, 5. 6, cap. 4, etc., Capitulares of Charlemagne; Rettberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschlands, vol. 2, § 124). With regard to the different orders special regulations were gradually adopted. The Council of Trent prescribes: “Prima tonsura non initientur, qui sacramentum confirmationis non susceperint et fidei rudimenta edocti non fuerint, quique legere et scribere nesziant. Minores ordines iis qui saltem Latinam linguam intelligant... conferantur. Subdiaconi et diaconi or- dinentur... in minoribus ordinibus jam probati, ac libris et iis quee ad ordinem exercendum pertinent instructi. Qui…ad ordinem presbyteratus assumuntur... ad populurr docenda ea, que scire omnibus necesse esf ad salutem, ac ministranda sacramenta diligenti examine precedente idonei comprobentur. Qui cunque posthac ad ecclesias cathedrales erit  assumendus... antea in universitate studiorum magister sive doctor aut licentiatus in sacra theologia vel jure canonico merito sit promotus, aut publico alicujus academic testimonio idoneus ad alios docendos tendatur” (Concil. Trid. Sess. 23:cap. 4, 11, 13, 14, “De reform;” Sess. 22, cap. 2, “De reform.”). No dispensations can be granted for this case; still the pope may direct that a party be ordained without possessing the necessary instruction, but should not act in the office until he has remedied this defect. Otherwise the party thus ordained is to be deposed (c. 15, X. “‘De aetate” [1, 14]), The Evangelical Church has from the beginning attached much importance to the proper preparation and natural attainments of candidates. They are therefore generally subjected to examinations before ordination. SEE LICENTIATE; SEE MINISTRY; SEE THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION; and also the different articles on Christian denominations.

6. Defectus fidei (want of a well-grounded faith). — In consequence of the prescription of the apostle (1Ti 3:6; 1Ti 5:22) that no ῃσεσᾷρΤα should be ordained, the Church commanded that none should be ordained immediately after conversion (Canon. Apost. 79; Concil. Nicen. 325, c. 2 [c. 1, dist. 47]; Gregorius, anno 599 [c. 2, eod.]), and especially none who had been baptized in sickness (clinici) (Cone. Neocaesar. an. 314, c. 12 [c. 1, dist. 57]). Its original strictness-against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. “In fine de rescriptis” [1, 3]); Gonzalez Tellez, Comment. No. 7; Lancelot, Instit. jur. can. lib. 1, tit. 7:§ 12). It was, however, always the rule that no new convert could be raised at once to high offices (c. 1 sq., dist. 61), and this rule has been maintained in the Greek Church (Synod. 1 et 2, anno 861, c. 17). In the Evangelical Church it was also forbidden to raise any proselyte to office, but this is not generally adhered to in practice.

7. Defectus perfectae lenitatis (want of meekness). — It applies to those who have departed from the principle Ecclesia no sirit sancuinem. Hence, to those who have shed blood in war (Cone. Tolef. 1, anno 400, c. 8 [c. 4,' dist. 51].; Innocent I, anno 404 [c. 1, cod.]; c. 24, X. “De homicidio” [5, 12], Honorius III); also those who have sat as accuser, witness, lawyer, judge, or juryman in a criminal court, and taken part-in a sentence of death (Concil. Tolet. 4, anno 633, c. 31; Cone. Tolet. 11:anno 675, c. 6 [c. 29, 30, can. 23, qu. 8]; c. 5, 9, X. “Iu clerici vel monachi negotiis secularibus se immisceant,” 3, 50; comp. c. 21, X. “De homicidio,” 5. 12, etc., especially the glosses to c. 1, dist. 41, “Ad. 5. sacerdotium”); also all who  had practiced surgery, in so far as cutting and cauterizing were concerned (quae ad ustionem vel incisiolen inducit) (c. 9, X. cit. 3:50).

8. Defectus sacramenti (marimonii) (want of adherence to the rule of monogamy). — The apostolic command about the bishops and deacons being the husbands of one wife (1Ti 3:2; 1Ti 3:12; Tit 1:6) was by the Church considered as forbidding not only actual bigamy (bigamia vera sen simultanea), but also second marriage (bigamia successiva) (dist. 26; c. 1, 2, dist. 33, tit. 10:“De bigamis non ordinandis,” 1, 21, etc.). The idea of bigamy was subsequently extended to include marriage with a widow or a deflowered virgin (bigamia intepretativa) (c. 2, dist. 33; c. 10, 13, dist. 34; c. 8. dist. 1; c. 10, § 6, X. “De renunciatione,” 1, 9; c. 33, X. “De testibus,” 2, 20; c. 4, 5, 7, X. “De bigamis non ord.” 1, 21; Novella Justiniani, 6, cap. I, § 3; cap. 5, 123; cap. 12); also the continuation of the marriage relation after a woman had committed adultery (c. 11, 12, dist. 34). Finally, it was considered bigamy for those who, by a vow of chastity, had been joined in spiritual marriage to the Church, like monks, or who had attained high ecclesiastical positions, to marry even a virgin (bigamia similitudinaria) (c. 24, can. 27m qu. 1 [Conc. Ancyr. an. 314]). In this case the irregularity results non propter sacramenti defectum. sed propter affectum intentionis cum opere subsecuto, as Innocent III expressly declares (c. 4 and 7. X. “De bigamis non ord.”). This constitutes a real offense, for which, however, the bishop can give a dispensation (c. 4, X. “De clericis conjugatis,” 4:3; c. 1, X. “Qui clerici vel voventes matrim. contrahere possunt,” 4, 6). In cases of real bigamy, the dispensation is granted by the pope himself for higher, and by the bishop for minor orders (see glosses on c. 17, dist. 34, and on c. 2. X. “De bigamis non ord.”). The Greek Church follows the same principles, whilst the Evangelical Church thinks there is nothing reprehensible in repeated marriages, even with widows (see Rom 7:2-3; 1Co 7:39).

9. Defectus famae (a bad reputation). — On the many cases of this kind which may produce irregularity, but are distinguished from those in which irregularity results from a misdeed, see Ferraris, Bibliotheca canonica, s.v. Irregularitas, art. 1, no: 12, a; E. Phillips, Kirchenrecht, vol. 1, c. 53.

10. Defectus libertatis (want of liberty). — No one who is not perfectly free to dispose of himself can be ordained until consent has been given to it by the party on whom he depends. Thus slaves require the assent of their master (Canones Apostolorum, c. 82; c. 1, 2, 4 sq., 12, 21, dist. 54; c. 37,  can. 17, qu. 4, tit. 10:”De servis non ordinandis,” 1, 18). But on being ordained with the consent of their master they become free; when they are ordained without his consent he can reclaim them within one year (Novella Justiniani, 123, cap. 17, “Auth. si servus” [c. 37, Cod. de episcopis et clericis, 1, 3]). Yet we find among the clergy of the Middle Ages some who remained in the dependence of their former masters after their ordination, though with some restrictions (see Ftrth, Die Ministerialen, Cologne, 1836, § 272, p. 462-465). Those who are liable to civil or military duties are to free themselves from such obligations before ordination (Cod. Theodos. tit. “De decurionibus,” 12:1; c. 12, 53, Cod. Justin. “De episcopis et clericis,” 1, 3; Noella, 123, cap. 1, pr. § 1; cap. 15. “Auth. sed neque curialem” [Cod. de episcopis et clericis, 1, 3]; c. 1-3, dist. 51; c. 3, can. 23, qu. 6, etc.). Those who have accounts to settle are to do so before being ordained (Conc. Carthag. anno 348, c. 8; and c. 3, dist. 54, cap. un. X. “De obligatis ad ratiocinia ordinandis vel non,” 1, 19; c. 1, disit. lv [Gelasius, 494]; c. 1, dist. 53 [Gregor. 1, 598]). Those who are married require the consent of their wife, who is then to take the vow of chastity or to enter a convent (c. 6, dist. 38 [Concil. Arelat. 2, 461?]; c. 8, X. “De clericis conjugatio” [3, 3], Innocent III, an. 1207; comp. c. 5, 8, X. “De conversione conjugatorum” [3, 32], Alex. III; c. 4, “De tempore ordinat.” in 6 [1, 9], Boniface VIII). According to Greek canon law the presbyter may be married; and it is only in case he should be made bishop that his wife is obliged to enter a convent (Cone. Trullian. an. 692, c. 48). Children need the consent of their parents until they have reached the age of puberty (fixed at 14) (c. I, can. 20, qu. 2; c. 5, dist. 28). See Thomassin, Vetus et nova ecclesice ,7, 1, 7. part 2. lib. 1. cap. 12-92, Phillips, Kirchenrecht, vol. 1, § 46-53. — Herzog, Real Encyklopadie, 7:67 sq. 7. (J. N. P.)

## Irresistible Grace[[@Headword:Irresistible Grace]]

             As already stated in the article on GRACE, the word grace is the hinge of three great theological controversies. One of these, on the nature of depravity and regeneration, between the orthodox doctrine of the Church and Pelagianism, comprehends the question of irresistible grace. Some of the followers of Augustine, in their attempt to oppose Pelagianism, says the Rev. O. Adolphus (Compendium Theologicum, p. 144, 3rd edit. Cambridge, England, 1865), of the Church of England, and himself a believer in predestination, carry their views of the absolute predestination of a limited number to the ultimate attainment of salvation, through the  influence of the irresistible grace of God causing their final perseverance, to such an extreme in their logical deductions that there appeared persons who charged the Augustinian system with leading to the dangerous conclusions that human actions are immaterial, and human efforts for the conversion of the wicked unavailing, in the face of God's free gift of grace in accordance with his secret decrees, predetermined from everlasting. For the Arminian argument , on the other hand, SEE ARMINIANISM; SEE ELECTION; SEE PREDESTINATION; SEE WILL.

## Irrigation[[@Headword:Irrigation]]

             Gardens in the East anciently were, and still are, when possible, planted near streams, which afford the means of easy irrigation. (See the curious account of ancient garden irrigation in Pliny, Hist. Nat. 19, 4.) This explains such passages as Gen 2:9 sq., and Isa 1:30. But streams were few in Palestine, at least such as afforded water in summer, when alone water was wanted for irrigation: hence rain-water, or water from the streams which dried up in summer, was in winter stored up in reservoirs, spacious enough to contain all the water likely to be needed during the dry season. SEE POOL; SEE WELL.

In fact, many of our own large nurseries are watered in the same manner from reservoirs of rain- water. The water was distributed through the garden in numerous small rills, which traversed it in all directions, and which were supplied either by: a continued stream from the reservoir, or had water poured into them by the gardeners, in the manner shown in the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. abridgm. 1, 33 sq.). SEE GARDEN.

These rills, being turned and directed by the foot, gave rise to the phrase “watering by the foot,” as indicative of garden irrigation (Deu 11:10). Thus Dr. Thomson says (Land and Book, 2, 279), “I have often watched the gardener at this fatiguing and unhealthy work. When one place is sufficiently saturated, he pushes, aside the sandy soil between it and the next furrow with his foot, and thus continues to do until all are watered.” The reference, however, may be to certain kinds of hydraulic machines turned by the feet, such as the small water-wheels used on the plain of Acre and elsewhere. At Hamath, Damascus, and other places in Syria, there are large waterwheels, turned by the stream, used to raise water into  aqueducts. But the most common method of raising water along the Nile is the Shadeif, or well-sweep and bucket, represented on the monuments, though not much used in Palestine. (On the whole subject, see Kitto, Nat. Hist. of Pal. p. 293 sq.). See WATER.

## Iru[[@Headword:Iru]]

             (Hebrew Irru', עַירוּ, citizen; Sept. ᾿Ηρά, Vulg. Hir), the first-named of the sons of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh (1Ch 4:15). B.C. 1618.

## Irvine, Matthew[[@Headword:Irvine, Matthew]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Cumberland Co., Pa., December 22,1817. In early life he was a schoolteacher. On account of his piety and gifts he was made an elder in the Church. His call to the ministry then became more apparent to himself and to others, and he began the study of theology privately with his pastor, and in 1843 was licensed and ordained. He took charge of feeble and scattered German Reformed congregations in Bedford Co., Pa., where he did the work of a pioneer in a truly apostolic spirit. A number of separate charges were formed from time to time out of parts of his field. His ministry was greatly blessed, and the wilderness and solitary places all around became glad. He accomplished the work of a long life in a comparatively few years, and died in peace April 21, 1857.

## Irving, Edward[[@Headword:Irving, Edward]]

             “the great London preacher, and promoter of a strange fanaticism, whose name thirty years ago was in everybody's mouth, and whose career, so strange, grotesque, solemn, and finally so sad, was the theme of the sneers of the thoughtless and of the wonder of the thoughtful,” was born Aug. 15, 1792, at Annan, county of Dumfries, Scotland, where his father was a tanner. He was piously brought up, having been early destined by his  ambitious parents for the ministry. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and shortly after graduation (1805) was appointed to superintend the mathematical school at Haddington, whence he removed in 1812 to Kirkcaldy to assume the duties of a similar but more eligible position. About this time he also began his theological studies, and, in accordance with the usage of his alma mater, he entered as one of her students of theology. After a stay of about seven years, having completed the probation required by the Church of Scotland, he attained, by action of the Presbytery of Annan, to “the ambiguous position of a licensed preacher and candidate-a layman in fact, though often recognized as a clergyman by courtesy; and he only waited an opportunity to escape from his present occupation to that for which he had been formally designated.”

But not finding an opening immediately, and tired of the occupation of teaching, he recommenced study at Edinburgh, devoting most of his time to the writings of Bacon, Hooker, and Jeremy Taylor. At last there came an invitation to preach in the hearing of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, who was desirous of procuring for himself an assistant in the great parish of St. John's, Glasgow; and shortly after Irving was chosen for this position, and so enabled to begin “in earnest the great life-work for which he had been preparing, and which he had anticipated with most painful longings.

A parish of 10,000 souls, mostly the families of poor artisans and laborers, composed the pastorate of St. John's, Glasgow, and Irving at once entered on its varied duties with all his energies.” But as his association in this parish with Dr. Chalmers only afforded him an inferior place, he soon grew dissatisfied with the position; and, his preaching having secured him quite a favorable reputation, he was invited to the great English metropolis as minister of the Caledonian Church a kirk of Scotland in Cross Street, Hatton Garden. Early in July 1822, he began his labors in this little out-of the-way church, composed of only fifty members, occasionally enlarged by some stray Scotchmen visiting the great city. In a very few weeks he began to attract large congregations; in three months the applications for seats had risen to 1500; at length it became necessary to exclude the general public, and to admit only those who were provided with tickets. Statesmen, orators, the noble, the wealthy, the fashionable, occupied the seats of the church, and their carriages thronged the adjoining streets. His ability and success as a preacher are thus stated by a writer on “Henry Drummond” in the London Quart. Review, October. 1860, p. 275: “The preacher's great stature, his bushy black hair hanging down in ringlets, his deep voice, his solemn manner, the impressiveness of his action, his broad Scotch dialect,  his antiquated yet forcible style, all combined to rivet attention, and made you feel that you were in the presence of a power. Nor did his matter belie the impression which was thus created, He was bent upon accomplishing the end of the Gospel ministry in saving souls from death; and at the beginning of his course, before the disturbing influences of his position had done their full work upon him, he preached with great force and effect.” The influence which Irving exerted among all classes of society of London was really surprising.

Such an amount of applause as was awarded to his pulpit discourses has never fallen to the lot of man since his day, excepting perhaps in the case of Spurgeon. In 1824, a volume containing some of his discourses was sent forth, not as sermons, but under the title of Orations: For the Oracles of God, for Orations; For Judgments to come, an Argument in nine Parts. The author shared the same popular favor as the preacher, and three editions of the book were sold in less than half a year. “Aimless, and without a wide or lasting interest, curiously quaint in style and manner, while the matter generally bears upon the topics of the passing hour, it contains many passages of extraordinary beauty and depth, many an outpouring of lofty devotion, and frequent bursts of the most passionate eloquence” (Encyclop. Brita. 12:625). But, as the production of the preacher of the little Hatton Garden chapel, everybody who wished to be up with the times had to read it, and so it soon “became the talk of the town, and was criticized by each according to his position and temper.” The book had many vulnerable points, one of which, not the least perhaps, was the thrust in his introduction against the evident lack of success of the ordinary instructions of the pulpit, charging it all as the result of the defective manner of preaching generally prevalent in England at that time. But if this arrayed a number of critics against him, an estrangement of the great body of contemporary evangelical Christians only followed his course of action in 1824. In this year he was called upon, as one of the pulpit celebrities of the great metropolis, to preach before the London Missionary Society.

He had long dreamed of a revival of apostolical missions, and to advance “these sublime fancies” this opportunity afforded him scope. ‘For three mortal hours the vast assembly was held entranced by his gorgeous oratory while he depicted, not the work of that or any other body, but a grand ideal of a mission scheme after the model of apostolic times. During all this time the managers sat in painful solicitude, first for their usual collections, and ultimately for the damage that such a discourse must entail upon the cause in which they were engaged. But nobody could suspect the preacher of a design to harm the cause he was called to advocate. To his  mind the missionary work was not the same thing with that contemplated by the society, and, as he spoke from his own inflamed fancy and full heart, his utterances were foreign to the subject as they viewed it. But the discourse was more than a blunder; it was a burning protest, though undesigned, against the spirit of cowardly prudence in which the work of missions was, and, alas! that it must be said, still is prosecuted. It unluckily struck precisely upon those points which annual reports and platform orators are usually careful to leave untouched, and by holding up the bright ideal it condemned the actual” (Dr. Curry).

However candid may have been his manner and true the zeal for the Christian cause which unquestionably impelled Irving at this time, the effect was to estrange from him many of his Christian friends. But the birth of a son for a time turned his attention from the controversy which his acts had provoked and to him, so fond of home life, atoned in a measure for the loss of friends. The child, however, soon died, and this additional loss incited him to the study of prophecy. His attention had already been called in this direction by Hatley Frere, “an earnest but one-sided student of the prophecies,” who was propounding about this time a new theory of interpretation, the especial object of which was to establish the idea of a personal reign of Christ on earth. The study and translation of a Spanish work on this subject, generally attributed to Ben-Ezra, but really the production of the Jesuit Lacunza (q.v.) (published by Irving under the title of The Coming of Messiah in Glory and Majesty), aided in “turning the balance of Irving's mind the wrong way just at the crisis of his intellectual fate. These prophetical studies met an original bias in his mind, and made him a fatal prey to religious delusion.”

An opportunity soon occurred to lay before the public his favorite theory of the millennium by an invitation from the Continental Society to preach the annual sermon (1825). Like the missionary sermon of the previous year, it gave rise to considerable commotion, more especially among the friends of “Catholic Emancipation.” England at this time was decidedly in favor of bestowing upon Roman Catholics unlimited political power, which Irving vehemently opposed. A good part of his audience left their seats before the speaker had finished his discourse, which, like the missionary sermon, occupied some “three or more hours in the delivery.” To make a bad matter still worse, Irving determined to publish his discourse, enlarged and rearranged, in book form, and during the next year sent it forth under the title Babylon and Infidelity Foredoomed, dedicating it “to my beloved friend and brother  in Christ, Hatley Frere, Esq.” “Irving now threw himself unreservedly,” says Dr. Curry, “into the current that swept him away from his moorings.

By the strange fascination which often attends the study of prophecy and the expectation of a terrestrial millennium, he now came to expect the speedy coming of Christ to set up his kingdom on earth, and this wrought in him the usual results of excitement and specialty of religious thought and conversation. He had reached that stage of mental excitement in which almost every event becomes a proof of the cherished expectation, and the mind's own action steadily intensifies the dominant fascination. ‘In this, too, he craved the sympathy of other minds inspired with the same sentiments, and these he readily obtained; a kind of mystic circle, among whom were Hatley Frere, now relieved of his isolation, the celebrated Rabbin, Dr. Wolff, Irving himself, and Henry Drummond, with others less distinguished, after numerous informal conversations, at length came together in a conference at Albury, the hospitable residence of Mr. Drummond, brought together, as Irving declared, by ‘a desire to compare their views with respect to the prospects of the Church at this present crisis'”(comp. art. 9. “On Drummond,” in the London Quart. Review, Oct. 1860). “Irving sat down with his motley associates, a giant among pigmies, the most docile of the company, and quite ready to yield his own' views to the superficial fancies of the least distinguished of the body, and to surrender his clearest intellectual convictions to what was styled the answer to prayer. From such sessions the only probable results followed: the fanaticism in which they began was heightened and confirmed, especially in the single mind capable of being damaged by it.”

The popularity of the great preacher, however, continued unabated in the midst of all these difficulties; nay, his late meditations and yearnings rather increased his reputation, ‘and soon a new and more commodious church had to be provided for the throngs of hearers that weekly came to listen to him. The money for the building of a new edifice was easily procured, and early in 1827 he was installed pastor of the newly-built church in Regent Square, Chalmers preaching on the occasion. “The transition from the little Caledonian chapel, so long thronged by a promiscuous crowd of London fashionable life, to the commodious National Scotch Church in Regent Square, with its well-ordered and well-defined congregation, marks the culmination and the beginning of the descent of Irving's popularity.” Shortly after his removal to the new church, he again ventured before the public as an author by the publication of three volumes (1828) selected  from his discourses preached since the commencement of his ministry at London.

Up to this time many of the extravagances of Irving had more or less displeased his brother laborers in the ministry, but no one had ventured to attack him publicly until “an idle clergyman called Cole,” of whom Mr. Irving's biographer, Mrs. Oliphant, can barely speak with civility, accused Irving of inculcating heterodox doctrines on the Incarnation in the first volume of his sermons, which treats chiefly of the Trinity; first of the divine character, and especially of the person and work of Christ. “The perfect humanity of Christ was Irving's favorite theme. With the utmost intensity he clung to the idea of the brotherhood of his Master-an idea he held with perfect reverence. The first shock of the charge of heresy, and of heresy, too, in relation to his adorable Lord, utterly unmanned him. The last thought of his heart would have been to derogate from the dignity of his Master, his impassioned reverence for whom had probably stimulated the teaching which now bore the brand of heresy” (Lond. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 193).

It would hardly be worth while to follow up the controversy incited by the impertinent, if not treacherous conduct of Mr. Cole in exaggerating “an error which should have been the groundwork of a brotherly expostulation,” were it not for the fact that for these very views on the incarnation Irving was, some years later, deposed from the ministry. As we have already said, he was the last of all persons who could be led to believe that the views which he set forth on this subject had anything novel or unusual in them. All that he was possibly guilty of, says Dr. Curry, is that “he took in a larger view which contemplated the whole work of the incarnation of the Word as redemptive in that by it the Godhead came into vital union with humanity, fallen and under the law. This last thought carried to his realistic mode of thinking the notion of Christ's participation in the fallen character of humanity, which he designated by terms that implied a real sinfulness in Christ. His attempt to get rid of the odiousness of that idea by saying that this was overborne and at length wholly expelled by the indwelling Godhead helped the matter but little, and still left him open to grave censures for at least an unhappy method of statement. But under all this there is unquestionably a most precious Gospel truth, and if Irving was justly condemned for an unwarrantable misstatement of certain doctrines of Christianity, the orthodoxy of the age may be justly called to account for its partial exhibition of those doctrines. For centuries the Church has been actively occupied in setting forth and defending the doctrine of Christ's divinity, until that of his humanity has largely fallen out of its thinkings. It is quite time to cease from this one-sidedness and to take  in a whole Gospel. Fallen humanity demands a sympathizing no less than an almighty Savior; and if indeed Jesus is to be that Savior, he must be apprehended by our faith, as ‘man with man,' and as really and fully ‘touched with a sense of our infirmities.'

The Church of Rome answers to the heart's yearning for human sympathy in the Mediator by giving that office to Mary; while our malformed practical creeds remove Jesus beyond our sympathies, and give us no other Mediator. The Church awaits the coming of a John, uprising from the Savior's bosom, to set forth in all fullness the blessedness of the grace of Jesus, the incarnate God, who hath ‘borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.”' With this charge of heresy advanced against him, Irving set out on a visit to his native land “to warn, first his father's house and kindred, and the country side which had still so great a hold upon his heart, and then universal Scotland, of that advent which he looked for with undoubting and fervent expectations;” and brilliant was the success with which he saw his labors crowned wherever he went. For once he was a prophet who received honors in his own country. Wherever he preached, not only whole congregations from neighboring towns came to swell his already large numbers of hearers, but oftentimes even the ministers would adjourn their services and go with their flocks en masse to hear Scotland's noble descendant. While preaching at Edinburgh on the Apocalypse, the special theme of study in these later years, the services began at six o'clock A.M. Of these Chalmers writes: “He is drawing prodigious crowds. We attempted this morning to force our way into St. Andrew's Church, but it was all in vain. He changes to the West Church, with its three hideous galleries, for the accommodation of the public,” and even then there was not room. As in Edinburgh, so was his success at Glasgow and other places that he visited, and we need not wonder that Chalmers himself exclaims “that there must have been a marvelous power of attraction that could turn a whole population out of their beds as early as five in the morning.”

As if to augment the difficulties already in his way, in his candid and straightforward manner, he further estranged his friends of the Scottish Church by extending his sympathy to a minister of his native Church, a Mr. Campbell, of Row, who was just then under the odium of teaching false notions on the Procrustian high Calvinistic doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in the Westminster Confession.

But the grand and final divergence from his mother Church further resulted, not from the communication of any doctrinal excitement from the  banks of Guirloch, but from a very strange phenomenon which about this time took its rise along the quiet banks of this river. For some time Irving had been pondering on the heritage of the gift of tongues (q.v.; SEE GIFTS ), and was inclined to believe this spiritual gift to have been not only possessed by the apostolic Church, but an actual heritage of the Church of all times; indeed, a necessary condition for the healthy state of any Church of Christ.

These thoughts of his became convictions when seconded at this juncture by some remarkable instances. In the locality of Row, celebrated for the piety of its inhabitants there had lived and died a young woman, Isabella Campbell by name, of rare and saintly character. A memoir which her minister had written of her attracted the attention of people far and near, and many of them came as pilgrims to visit the spot where she had lived and prayed. These visits to the earthly dwelling-place, as well as the noble reputation, if not example of a departed sister, had a wonderful influence on the surviving sister Mary — gifted with the same spiritual temperament, with powers of mind of no ordinary character, and, moreover, with the personal fascination of beauty.” For a long time she had been afflicted with the same disease which had made a prey of her sister, and while lying, as all believed, at the point of death, she professed to have received “the gift of tongues,” and, “as she lay in her weakness,” the Holy Ghost, they said, had come upon her with mighty power, and “constrained her to speak at great length, and with superhuman strength, in an unknown tongue.”

Similar cases occurred in other neighboring places, and the news of the wondrous phenomena soon reached the ears of Irving. To him of course, these indicated “an approaching realization of his prophetic dreams.” Not for an instant was he to hesitate to acknowledge them as the natural answer of his aspirations and prayer; and many of his own flock, prepared by his previous teachings, seconded his leanings in favor of these long-lost spiritual gifts. Manifestations of a similar character soon appeared in his own Church at first privately, then at the weekday matins, and finally even in the public service on the Sabbath. “The die” had truly been “cast, and from that time the Regent Square church became a Babel.” His oldest and most discreet friends one by one deserted him, finding that their counsel was of no avail. Even a visit of Chalmers and Coleridge, both his friends, could not in the least stay the current that was fast hurrying him to a most frightful abyss. A collision between the pastor and his flock was inevitable, though some of his people shared his views. Against the continuation of the “new prophets” even his own brother-in-law voted, and the inevitable result was of course the ejectment of the minister and his  believers in the “gift of tongues” from Re, gent Square Church. But it must not be supposed that a man of Irving's great abilities, though his course was now downward, was surrounded only by a few weak followers. Among those who faithfully followed their pastor were some of London's most distinguished characters, and when on the following Sunday he met his adherents in the hall of the great infidel Owen, no less than 800 were there to partake of the Lord's Supper. Indeed, the place they had temporarily secured was far too small to contain all that still flocked to hear Irving, and they removed to a large gallery in Newman Street, generally designated as West's Gallery, because it had formerly belonged to West the painter.

The denouement of the play had now fairly begun, and it rapidly hastened to its close. The “gifted ones” at Newman Street had things in their own hands, and everything proceeded by “vision,” and “prophecy,” and in the “Spirit;” to all which Irving gave the most reverent and obedient attention. The Presbytery of Annan, by which body Irving had been first licensed to preach, but not ordained, “by a remarkable stretch of power” condemned him as guilty of heresy, and excommunicated him from the Church of Scotland. But as if his cup of sorrows was not yet sufficiently bitter, to add to the condemnation which he had just received at the hand of his mother Church, which he so dearly loved, he was, on his return from Annan to London, deprived even by his own adherents of the authority which by reason of his superiority had universally been granted to him, and, in accordance with a “revelation,” was interdicted “from exercising any priestly function, or administering the sacraments, or even preaching, excepting to those less sacred assemblies to which unbelievers were admitted. Astounded, he yet uttered no murmur, but sat in the lowest places of the Church which he himself had created, in silent and resigned humility.” Mr. Andrews, in an article on Irving in the New Englander (1863, p. 816 sq.), seeks to refute this statement, so generally accepted as made by Mrs. Oliphant in her biography of Mr. Irving. But even Mr. Andrews acknowledges that when Mr. Irving was finally reordained by these “‘superior” officers, who claimed to have been called by God to higher distinctions, his position “was in some respects less independent than before,” and that it could not have been otherwise than “that Mr. Irving should have met with trials and difficulties in the progress of the work under his new phase,” especially “‘a man. of his great strength of character, and gifts for leadership, accustomed hitherto to be foremost in whatever he engaged in” (p. 821). But for once fortune favored Irving. The great degradation which he was called upon to suffer was to be his last,  and a short one at that. In the autumn of 1834, the severe task which he had been imposing on his mind and body began to tell upon him, and while on a journey to Scotland for the recovery of his failing health, he was taken dangerously ill, and died at Glasgow Dec. 8,1834.

Of Irving it may truly be conceded that a more devout or earnest spirit has not appeared on the stage of time in the 19th century. Destined to be a Christian minister, “he strove” (said of him a friend who knew him well), “with all the force that was in him, to be it. He might have been so many things; not a speaker only, but a doer-the leader of hosts of men. For his head, when the fog of Babylon had not yet obscured it, was of strong, far- reaching insight. His very enthusiasm was sanguine, not atrabiliar; he was so loving, full of hope, so simple-hearted, and made all that approached him his. A giant form of activity was in the man; speculation was accident, not nature. There was in him a courage dauntless, not pugnacious; hardly fierce, by no possibility ferocious; as of the generous war-horse, gentle in its strength, yet that laughs at the shaking of the spear. But, above all, be he what he might, to be a reality was indispensable for him.” In another place the same friend exclaims: “But for Irving I had never known what the communion of man with man means. His was the freest, brotherliest, bravest human soul mine ever came in contact with. I call him, on the whole, the best man I have ever, after trial enough, found in this world, or now hope to find.” Similar was the judgment of all Irving's friends, and even of most of his opponents. “All admired the man, his many virtues, his matchless eloquence; all deplored his fall, and the gulf of separation which it created between him and his mother Church.” His works have been collected by his nephew, the Rev. P. Carlyle, who has published them under the title of Collected Writings of Edward Irving (Lond. 1864-5, 5 vols. 8vo). See Mrs. Oliphant, Life of Edward Irving (Lond. 1862; N. Y. [Harpers'] 1862, 8vo); Carlyle, Miscellaneous Essays; Meth. Qu. Rev. Jan. 1849; 1863; Lond. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, art. oi; Edinb. Rev. Oct. 1862, art. 7; Encyclop. Britain. 12:s.v.; Baring Gould, Post Mediaeval Preachers (of England only); Littell's Living Age (on Irving's works), Feb. 23, 1867, art. 1; and M. V. Andrews (of the Catholic Apostolic Church, the name now assumed by the Irvingites), in the A New Englander, July, 1863, art. 1; Oct., art. 8. (J. H. W.)

## Irvingites[[@Headword:Irvingites]]

             SEE IRVING, EDWARD; SEE CATHOLIC APOSTOLIC CHURCH.

## Irwing, Karl Friedrich Von[[@Headword:Irwing, Karl Friedrich Von]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who was born at Berlin, November 21, 1728, and died there, December 17, 1801, member of consistory, is the author of Versuch uber den Ursprung der Erkenntniss der Wahrheit und der Wissenschaft (Berlin, 1781). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:430. (B.P.)

## Isaac[[@Headword:Isaac]]

             (Heb. Yitschak', יַצְחָק, laughter, in the poet. books sometimes יַשְׂחָק, Yischak', Psa 105:9; Jer 33:26; Amo 7:9; Amo 7:16, in the last two passages spoken of the Israelitish nation; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿σαάκ, Joseph. Ι᾿σακος, Ant. 1, 10, 5), the only son of Abraham by Sarah, and the middle one of the three patriarchs who are so often named together as the progenitors of the Jewish race.

I. Personal History. — The following are the facts which the Bible supplies of the longest-lived of the three patriarchs, the least migratory, the least prolific, and the least favored with extraordinary divine revelations. A few events in this quiet life have occasioned discussion.

1. The promise of a son had been made to his parents when Abraham was visited by the Lord in the plains of Mamre, and appeared so unlikely to be fulfilled, seeing that both Abraham and Sarah were “well stricken in years,” that its utterance caused the latter to laugh incredulously (Gen 18:1 sq.). B.C. 2064. Being reproved for her unbelief, she denied that she had laughed. The reason assigned for the special visitation thus promised was, in effect, that Abraham was pious, and would train his offspring in piety, so that he would become the founder of a great nation, and all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him. SEE ABRAHAM.

In due time Sarah gave birth to a son, who received the name of Isaac (Gen 21:1-3). B.C. 2063. This event occurred at Gerar. Isaac was thus emphatically the child of promise. Born, as he was, out of due time, when his father was a hundred years old and his mother ninety, the parents themselves laughed with a kind of incredulous joy at the thought of such a prodigy (Gen 17:17; Gen 18:12), and-referring to the marvelousness of the event when it had actually taken place, Sarah said that not only she, but all who heard of it, would be disposed to laugh (Gen 21:6). The name Isaac, therefore, was fitly chosen by God for the child, in commemoration of the extraordinary, supernatural nature of the birth, and of the laughing joy which it occasioned to those more immediately interested in it. This signification of Isaac's name is thrice alluded to (Gen 17:17; Gen 18:12; Gen 21:6). Josephus (Ant. 1, 12, 2) refers to the second of those passages for the origin of the name; Jerome (Quaest. Hebr. in Genesis) vehemently confines it to the first; Ewald (Gesch. 1, 425), without assigning reasons, gives it as his opinion that all three passages have been added by different writers to the original record. There need be no dispute as to which of  these passages the import of the name refers; it includes a reference to them all, besides according with and expressing the happy, cheerful disposition of the bearer, and suggesting the relation in which he stood, as the seed of Abraham, the channel of the promised blessing, and the type of him who is pre-eminently the Seed, whose birth has put laughter into the hearts of myriads of our race. The preternatural birth of Isaac was a sign from heaven at the outset, indicating what kind of seed God expected as the fruit of the covenant, and what powers would be required for its production-that it should be a seed at once coming in the course of nature, and yet in some sense above nature-the special gift and offspring of God. When Isaac was eight days old he received circumcision, and was thus received into the covenant made with his father; while his mother's skeptical laughter was turned into triumphant exultation and joy in God (Gen 21:4-7). (See De Wette., Krit. p. 133 sq.; Ewald, Gesch. 1, 388; Hartmann, Ueber d. Pentat. p. 269; Lengerke, Ken. p. 290; Niemeyer, Charact. 2, 160.) SEE NAME.

2. The first noticeable circumstance in the life of Isaac took place in connection with his weaning. This precise age at the time is not given, but we may suppose him to have been (according to Eastern custom) fully two years old. In honor of the occasion Abraham made ‘a great feast, as an expression, no doubt, of his joy that the child had reached this fresh stage in his career-was no longer a suckling, but capable of self-sustenance, and a certain measure of independent action. For the parents, and those who sympathized with them, it would naturally be a feast of laughter-the laughter of mirth and joy; but there was one in the family--Ishmael-to whom it was no occasion of gladness, who saw himself supplanted in the more peculiar honors of the house by this younger brother, and who mocked while others laughed-himself, indeed, laughed (for it is the same word still, מְצִֵחק, Gen 21:9), but with the envious and scornful air which betrayed the alien and hostile spirit that lurked in his bosom. He must have been a well-grown boy at the time; and Sarah, descrying in the manifestations then given the sure presage of future rivalry and strife, urged Abraham to cast forth the bondmaid and her son, since the one could not be a co-heir with the other. Abraham, it would seem, hesitated for a time about the matter, feeling pained at the thought of having Ishmael separated from the household, and only complied when he received an explicit warrant and direction from above.

At the same time, he got the promise, as the ground of the divine procedure, “For in Isaac shall thy seed  be called,” that is, in Isaac (as contradistinguished from Ishmael. or any other son) shall the seed of blessing that is to hold of thee as a father have its commencement. It is probable that Abraham needed to have this truth brought sharply out to him, for correction on the one side, as well as for consolation and hope on the other, as his paternal feelings may have kept him from apprehending the full scope of former revelations concerning the son of Hagar. The high purposes of God were involved in the matter, and the yearnings of natural affection must give way, that these might be established. In the transactions themselves the apostle Paul perceived a revelation of the truth for all times-especially in regard to the natural enmity of the heart to the things of God, and the certainty with which, even when wearing the badge of a religious profession, it may be expected to vent its malice and opposition towards the true children of God (Rom 9:7; Rom 9:10; Gal 4:28; Heb 11:18). The seed of blessing, those who are supernaturally born of God, like Isaac, and have a special interest in the riches of his goodness, are sure to be eyed with jealousy, and, in one form or another, persecuted by those who, with a name to live, still walk after the flesh (Gal 4:21-31). SEE ISHMAEL.

It has been asked, what were the persecutions sustained by Isaac from Ishmael to which Paul refers (Gal 4:29)? If, as is generally supposed, he refers to Gen 21:9, then the word מְצִהֵק, παίζοντα, may be translated mocking, as in the A.V., or insulting, as in 39:14, and in that case the trial of Isaac was by means of “cruel mockings” (ἐμπαιγυῶν), in the language of the Epistle to the Heb 11:36. Or the word may include the signification paying idolatrous worship, as in Exo 32:6; or fighting, as in 2Sa 2:14. These three significations are given by Jarchi, who relates a Jewish tradition (quoted more briefly by Wetstein on Gal 4:29) of Isaac suffering personal violence from Ishmael, a tradition which, as Mr. Ellicott thinks, was adopted by Paul. The English reader who is content with our own version, or the scholar who may prefer either of the other renderings of Jarchi, will be at no loss to connect Galatians 9:29 with Gen 21:9. But Origen (in Genesis Hon. 7, § 3), and Augustine (Sereno 3), and apparently Prof. Jowett (on Gal 4:29), not observing that the gloss of the Sept. and the Latin versions “playing with her son Isaac” forms no part of the simple statement in Genesis, and that the words מְצִחֵק, παίζοντα, are not to be confined to the meaning “playing,” seem to doubt (as Mr. Ellicott does on  other grounds) whether the passage in Genesis bears the construction apparently put upon it by St. Paul. On the other hand, Rosenmüller (Schol. in Gen 21:9) even goes so far as to characterize ἐδίωκε - ”persecuted”-as a very excellent interpretation of מְצִחֵק(See Drusius on Gen 21:9, in Crit. Sacr., and Estius on Gal 4:29.)

What effect the companionship of the wild and wayward Ishmael might have had on Isaac it is not easy to say; but his expulsion was, no doubt, ordered by God for the good of the child of promise, and most probably saved him from many an annoyance and sorrow. Freed from such evil influence, the child grew up under the nurturing care of his fond parents, mild and gentle, loving and beloved.

3. The next recorded event in the life of Isaac is the memorable one connected with the command of God to offer him up as a sacrifice on a mountain in the land of Moriah (Genesis 22). B.C. cir. 2047. Nothing is said of his age at the time except that he is called “a lad” (נִצִד), perhaps sixteen years of age. According to Josephus (Ant. 1, 13, 2), he was twenty- five years old. That Isaac knew nothing of the relation in which he personally stood to the divine command, came affectingly out in the question he put to his father while they journeyed together, “Behold the fire and the wood, but where is the lamb for a burnt-offering?” Even then the secret was not disclosed to him; and only, it would appear, when the act itself was in process of being consummated, did the fearful truth burst upon his soul that he was himself to be the victim on the altar. Yet the sacred narrative tells of no remonstrant struggle on the part of this child of promise, no strivings for escape, no cries of agony or pleadings for deliverance: he seems to have surrendered himself as a willing sacrifice to the call of Heaven and to have therein showed how thoroughly in him, as in his believing parent, the mind of the flesh had become subordinate to the mind of the spirit. To act thus was to prove himself the fitting type of him who had the law of God in his heart, and came to do, not his own will, but the will of him that sent him. But the death itself, which was to prove the life of the world, it belonged to the antitype, not to the type, to accomplish. The ram provided by God in the thicket must meanwhile take the place of the seed of blessing. In the surrender by the father of his “only son,” the concurrence of the son's will with the father's, the sacrificial death which virtually took place, and the resurrection from the dead, whence Abraham  received his son “in figure” (Heb 11:19), are all points of analogy which cannot be overlooked.

The offering up of Isaac by Abraham has been viewed in various lights. It is the subject of five dissertations by Frischmuth in the Thes. Theol. Philol. p. 197 (attached to Crit. Sacri; originally Jena, 1662-5, 4to). By bishop Warburton (Div. Leg. b. 6:§ 5) the whole transaction was regarded as “merely an information by action (comp. Jer 27:2; Eze 12:3; Hos 1:2), instead of words, of the great sacrifice of Christ for the redemption of mankind, given at the earnest request of Abraham, who longed impatiently to see Christ's day.” This view is adopted by dean Graves (On the Pentateuch, pt. 3:§ 4), and has become popular. But it is pronounced to be unsatisfactory by Davidson (Primitive Sacrifice, pt. 4:§ 2), who, pleading for the progressive communication of the knowledge of the Christian atonement, protests against the assumption of a contemporary disclosure of the import of the sacrifice to Abraham, and points out that no expiation or atonement was joined with this emblematic oblation, which consequently symbolized only the act, not the power or virtue of the Christian sacrifice.

Mr. Maurice (Patriarchs and Lawgivers, 4) draws attention to the offering of Isaac as the last and culminating point (compare' Eald, Geschichte, 1, 430-4) in the divine education of Abraham, that which taught him the meaning and ground of self-sacrifice. The same line of thought is followed up in a very instructive and striking sermon on the sacrifice of Abraham in Doctrine of Sacrifice, 3, 33-48. Some German writers have spoken of the whole transaction as a dream (Eichhorn, Biblioth. f. bibl. Liter. 1, 45 sq.), or a myth (De Wette), or as the explanation of a hieroglyph (Otman, in Henke's Magazine, 2, 517), and treat other events in Isaac's life as slips of the pen of a Jewish transcriber. Even the merit of novelty cannot be claimed for such views, which appear to have been in some measure forestalled in the time of Augustine (Sermo 2, De tentatione Abrahae). They are, of course, irreconcilable with the declaration of St. James, that it was a work by which Abraham was justified. Eusebius (Praep. Evang. 4:16, and 1, 10) has preserved a singular and inaccurate version of the offering of Isaac in an extract from the ancient Phoenician historian Sanchoniathon; but it is absurd to suppose that the widely-spread (see Ewald, Alterthümer, p. 79, and Thomson's Bampton Lectures, 1853, p. 38) heathen practice of sacrificing human beings (so Bruns, in Paulus's Memorab. 6:1 sq.) received any encouragement from a sacrifice which Abraham was forbidden to  accomplish (see Waterland, Works, 4:203). Some writers have found for this transaction a kind of parallel-it amounts to no more-in the classical legends of Iphigenia and Phrixus (so Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 1, 95), etc. (see J. G. Michaelis, De Abr. et Is. a Graecis in Hyrilum et Orionem conversis, Freft. a. O. 1721; Zeibich, Isaaci ortus in fubula Orionis vestigia. Ger. 1776). The story of Iphigenia, which inspired the devout Athenian dramatist with sublime notions of the import of sacrifice and suffering (AEsch. Again. 147, et seq.), supplied the Roman infidel only with a keen taunt against religion (Lucret. 1, 102), just as the great trial which perfected the faith of Abraham and molded the character of Isaac draws from the Romanized Jew of the first century a rhetorical exhibition of his own acquaintance with the meaning of sacrifice (see Joseph. Ant. 1, 13, 3). The general aim of certain writers has been, as they consider it, to relieve the Bible from the odium which the narrated circumstances are in their opinion fitted to occasion.

That the passage is free from every possible objection it may be too much to assert: it is, however, equally clear that many of the objections taken to it arise from viewing the facts from a wrong position, or under the discoloring medium of a foregone and adverse conclusion. The only proper way is to consider it as it is represented in the sacred page. The command, then, was expressly designated to try Abraham's faith. Destined as the patriarch was to be the father of the faithful, was he worthy of his high and dignified position? If his own obedience was weak, he could not train others in faith, trust, and love: hence a trial was necessary. That he was not without holy dispositions was already known, and indeed recognized in the divine favors of which he had been the object; but was he prepared to do and to suffer all God's will? Religious perfection and his position alike demanded a perfect heart: hence the kind of trial. If he were willing to surrender even his only child, and act himself both as offerer and priest in the sacrifice of the required victim, if he could so far conquer his natural affections, so subdue the father in his heart, then there could be no doubt that his will was wholly reconciled to God's, and that he was worthy of every trust, confidence, and honor (comp. Jam 2:21). The trial was made, the fact was ascertained, but the victim was not slain. What is there in this to which either religion or morality can take exception?

This view is both confirmed and justified by the words of God (Gen 22:16 sq.), “Because thou hast not withheld thy only son, in blessing I will bless thee, and in multiplying I will multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.” We remark, also, that not  a part, out the whole of the transaction must be taken under consideration, and especially the final result. If we dwell exclusively on the commencement of it, there appears to be some sanction given to human sacrifices; but the end, and the concluding and ever-enduring fact, has the directly opposite bearing. Viewed as a whole, the transaction is, in truth, an express prohibition of human sacrifices. Nothing but a clear command from God could have suggested such a service. “A craving to please, or propitiate, or communicate with the powers above” by surrendering “an object near and dear” to one, which canon Stanley erroneously says is the “source of all sacrifice,” and to which he attributes Abraham's conduct in the present case (History of the Jewish Church, 1, 47), could never have led to such an act. — The idea is wholly improbable and irrational. Kurtz maintains that the basis for this trial of Abraham was laid in the state of mind produced in him by beholding the Canaanitish human sacrifices around him. His words are: “These Canaanitish sacrifices of children, and the readiness with which the heathen around him offered them, must have excited in Abraham a contest of thoughts.... and induced him to examine himself whether he also were capable of sufficient renunciation and self- denial to do, if his God demanded it, what the heathen around him were doing. Butt if this question was raised in the heart of Abraham, it must also have been brought to a definite settlement through some outward fact. Such was the basis for the demand of God so far as Abraham was concerned, and such the educational motive for his trial. The obedience of Abraham's faith must, in energy and entireness, not lag behind that which the religion of nature demanded and obtained from its professors. Abraham must be ready to do for his God what the nations around him were capable of doing for their false gods. In every respect Abraham, as the hero of faith, is to out-distance all others in self-denial” (Hist. of the 0. Coven. 1, 269). Objectively, the transaction was intended to recognize the element of truth in human sacrifices, while condemning the sacrifices themselves (p. 269,270). SEE SACRIFICE.

4. Isaac passed his early days under the eye of his father, engaged in the care of flocks and herds up and down the plains of Canaan. At length his father wished to see him married. Abraham therefore gave a commission to his oldest and most trustworthy servant to the effect that, in order to prevent Isaac from taking a wife from among the daughters of the Canaanites, he should proceed into Mesopotamia, and, under the divine direction, choose a partner among his own relatives for his beloved son.  Rebekah, in consequence, becomes Isaac's wife, when he was forty years of age (Genesis 24). B.C. 2023. In connection with this marriage an event is recorded which displays the peculiar character of Isaac, while it is in keeping with the general tenor of the sacred record regarding him. Probably in expectation of the early return of his father's messenger, and somewhat solicitous as to the result of the embassy, he went out to meditate in the field at the eventide. While there engaged in tranquil thought, he chanced to raise his eyes, when lo! he beheld the retinue near at hand, and soon conducted his bride into his mother's tent. In unison with all this is the simple declaration of the history, that Isaac “loved her.” Isaac was evidently a man of kind and gentle disposition, of a calm and reflective turn of mind, simple in his habits, having few wants, good rather than great, fitted to receive impressions and follow a guide, not to originate important influences, or perform deeds of renown. If his character did not take a bent from the events connected with his father's readiness to offer him on Mount Moriah, certainly its passiveness is in entire agreement with the whole tenor of his conduct, as set forth in that narrative. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.)

Isaac having, in conjunction with his half-brother Ishmael, buried Abraham his father, “in a good old age, in the cave of Machpelah,” took up a somewhat permanent residence “by the well Lahai-roi,” where, being blessed of God, he lived in prosperity and at ease' (Gen 25:7-11). B.C. 1988. One source of regret, however, he deeply felt. Rebekah was barren. In time, however, two sons, Jacob and Esau, were granted to his prayers (Gen 25:21-26). B.C. 2003. As the boys grew, Isaac gave a preference to Esau, who seems to have possessed those robust qualities of character in which his father was defective, and therefore gratified him by such dainties as the pursuits of the chase enabled the youth to offer; while Jacob, “a plain man, dwelling in tents,” was an object of special regard to Rebekah — a division of feeling and a kind of partiality which became the source of much domestic unhappiness, as well as of jealousy and hatred between the two sons (Gen 25:27-28). SEE ESAU.

5. The life of Isaac, moreover, was not passed wholly without trials coming in from without. , A famine compels him to seek food in some foreign land (Gen 26:1 sq.). B.C. cir.: 1985. At the occurrence of this famine Isaac was expressly admonished by God not to go down into Egypt, but to abide within the boundaries of the Promised Land; and occasion was taken to renew the promise to him and his seed, and to confirm in his behalf the  oath which had been made to his father. The Lord pledged his word to be with him and to bless him in the land-which he certainly did, though Isaac did not feel so secure of the promised guardianship and ‘support as to be able to avoid falling into the snare which had also caught his father Abraham. When sojourning in the neighborhood of Gerar, during the prevalence of the famine, and no doubt observing the wickedness of the place, he had the weakness to call Rebekah his sister, in fear that the people might kill him on her account, if they knew her to be his wife. It does not appear that any violence was offered to Rebekah; and the Philistine king, on discovering, as he did, from the familiar bearing of Isaac towards Rebekah, that she must be his wife, simply rebuked him for having, by his prevarication, given occasion to a misapprehension which might have led to serious consequences (Gen 26:10).

No passage of his life has produced more reproach to Isaac's character than this. Abraham's conduct while in Egypt (ch. 12) and in Gerar (ch. 20), where he concealed the closer connection between himself and his wife, was imitated by Isaac in Gerar. On the one hand, this has been regarded by avowed adversaries of Christianity as involving the guilt of “lying and endeavoring to betray the wife's chastity,” and even by Christians, undoubtedly zealous for truth and right, as the conduct of “a very poor, paltry earthworm, displaying cowardice, selfishness, readiness to put his wife in a terrible hazard for his own sake.” But, on the other hand, with more reverence, more kindness, and quite as much probability, Waterland, who is no indiscriminate apologist for the errors of good men, after a minute examination of the circumstances, concludes that the patriarch did “right to evade the difficulty so long as it could lawfully be evaded, and to await and see whether divine Providence might not, some way or other, interpose before the last extremity. The event answered. God did interpose” (Scripture Vindicated, in Works, 4:188, 190).

There is no improbability, as has been asserted, that the same sort of event should happen in rude times at different intervals, and, therefore, no reason for maintaining that these events have the same historical basis, ‘and are, in fact, the same event differently represented. Neither is it an unfair assumption that Abimelech was the common title of the kings of Gerar, as Pharaoh was of the kings of Egypt, or that it may have been the proper name of several kings in succession, as George has been of several English kings.  In all respects except this incident, Isaac's connection with the Philistine territory was every way creditable ‘to himself, and marked with tokens of the divine favor. He cultivated a portion of ground, and in the same year reaped a hundred fold-a remarkable increase, to ‘encourage him to abide under God's protection in Canaan. His flocks and herds multiplied exceedingly, so that he rose to the possession of very great wealth; he even became, on account of it, an object of envy to the Philistines, who could not rest till they drove him from their territory. He reopened the wells which his father had digged, and which the Philistines had meanwhile filled up, and himself dug several new ones, but they disputed with him the right of possession, and obliged him to withdraw from them one after another. Finally, at a greater distance, he dug a well, which he was allowed to keep unmolested; and in token of his satisfaction at ‘the peace he enjoyed, he called it Rehoboth (room) (Gen 25:22). Thence he returned to Beersheba, where the Lord again appeared to him, and gave him a fresh assurance of the covenant-blessing; and Abimelech, partly ashamed of the unkind treatment Isaac had received, and partly desirous of standing well with one who was so evidently prospering in his course, sent some of his leading men to enter formally into a covenant of peace with him. Isaac showed his meek and kindly disposition in giving courteous entertainment to the messengers, and cordially agreed to their proposal

It was probably a period considerably later still than even the latest of these transactions to which the next notice in the life of Isaac must be referred. This is the marriage of Esau to two of the daughters of Canaam (Judith and Bashemath), which is assigned to the fortieth year of Esau's life, coeval with Isaac's hundredth. These alliances were far from giving satisfaction to the aged patriarch; on the contrary, they were a grief of mind to him and his wife Rebekah (Gen 26:35).

6. The last prominent event in the life of Isaac is the blessing of his sons (Gen 27:1 sq.). B.C. 1927. It has been plausibly suggested (Browne, Ordo Saeclorum, p. 310) that the forebodings of a speedy demise (Gen 27:2) on the part of Isaac, whose health always appears to have been delicate (Kitto's Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.), may have arisen from the fact that his brother Ishmael died at the age he had just now reached (Gen 25:17), although he himself survived this point for many years (Gen 35:28). When old and dim of sight (which fails much sooner in Eastern countries than with us), supposing that the time of his departure was at hand, he called for his beloved son Esau, and sent him to “take some  venison” for him, and to make his favorite “savory meat,” that he might eat and “bless” him before his death. Esau prepared to obey his father's will, and set forth to the field; but through the deceptions stratagem of Rebekah the ‘savory meat” was provided before Esau's return; and Jacob, disguised so as to resemble his hairy brother, imposed on his father, and obtained the blessing. Yet, on the discovery of the cheat, when Esau brought in to his father the dish he had prepared, Isaac, remembering no doubt the prediction that “the elder should: serve the younger,” and convinced that God intended the blessing for Jacob, would not, perhaps rather could not, reverse the solemn words he had uttered, but bestowed an inferior blessing on Esau (comp. Heb 12:17). SEE EDOM. This paternal blessing, if full, conveyed, as was usual, the right of headship in the family, together with the chief possessions. In the blessing which the aged patriarch pronounced on Jacob, it deserves notice how entirely the wished-for good is of an earthly and temporal nature, while the imagery which is employed serves to show the extent to which the poetical element prevailed as a constituent part of the Hebrew character (Gen 27:27 sq.). Most natural, too, is the extreme agitation of the poor blind old man on discovering the cheat which had been put upon him. All the parties to this nefarious transaction were signally punished by divine Providence (comp. Jarvis, Church of the Redeemed, p. 47). The entire passage is of itself enough to vindicate the historical character and entire credibility of those sketches of the lives of the patriarchs, which Genesis presents.

Yet Isaac's tacit acquiescence in the conduct of his sons has been brought into discussion. Fairbairn (Typology, 1, 334) seems scarcely justified by facts in his conclusion that the later days of Isaac did not fulfill the promise of his earlier; that, instead of reaching to high attainments in faith, he fell into general feebleness and decay moral and bodily, and made account only of the natural element in judging of his sons. The inexact translation (to modern ears) of צִיַד, prey taken in hunting, by “venison” (Gen 25:28), may have contributed to form, in the minds of English readers, a low opinion of Isaac. Nor can that opinion be supported by a reference to Gen 27:4; for Isaac's desire at such a time for savory meat may have sprung either from a dangerous sickness under which he was laboring (Blunt, Undesigned Coincidences, pt. 1, ch. 6), or from the same kind of impulse preceding inspiration as prompted Elisha (2Ki 3:15) to demand the soothing influence of music before he spoke the word of the Lord. For sadness and grief are enumerated in the Gemara among the impediments to  the exercise of the gift of prophecy (Smith's Select Discourses,  6:245). The reader who bears in mind the peculiarities of Isaac's character will scarcely infer from those passages any fresh accession of mental or moral feebleness. Such a longing in an old man was innocent enough, and indicated nothing of a spirit of self-indulgence. It was an extraordinary case, too, and Kalisch sets it in its true light: “The venison is evidently like a sacrifice offered by the recipient of the blessing, and ratifying the proceedings; and hence Jacob killed and prepared two kids of the goats (2Ki 3:9), whereas, for an ordinary meal, one would have been more than sufficient; it imparted to the ceremony, in certain respects, the character of a covenant (comp.Gen 21:27-30; Gen 26:30; Exo 12:2; Exo 24:5-11, etc.); the one party showed ready obedience and sincere affection, while the other accepted the gift, and granted in return the whole store of happiness he was able to bequeath. Thus the meal which Isaac required has a double meaning, both connected with the internal organism of the book” (Comms. on Gen 27:1-4).

7. The stealing, on the part of Jacob, of his father's blessing having angered Esau, who seems to have looked forward to Isaac's death as affording an opportunity for taking vengeance on his unjust brother, the aged patriarch is induced, at his wife's entreaty, to send Jacob into Mesopotamia, that, after his own example, his son might take a wife from among his kindred and people, “of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother” (Gen 27:41-46). B.C. 1927. SEE JACOB.

This is the last important act recorded of Isaac. Jacob having, agreeably to his father's command, married into Laban's family, returned after some time, and found the old man at Mamre, in the city of Arbah, which is Hebron, where Abraham and Isaac sojourned (Gen 35:27). B.C. cir. 1898. Here, “being old and full of days” (180), Isaac gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered unto his people, and his sons Esau and Jacob buried him” (Gen 35:28). B.C. 1883.

In the N.T. reference is made to the offering of Isaac (Heb 11:17, and James 2, 21) and to his blessing his sons (Heb 11:20). As the child of the promise, and as the progenitor of the children of the promise, he is contrasted with Ishmael (Rom 9:7; Rom 9:10; Gal 4:28; Heb 11:18). In our Lord's remarkable argument with the Sadducees, his history is carried beyond the point at which it is left in- the O.T., into and beyond the grave. Isaac, of whom it was said (Gen 35:29) that he was gathered to his  people, is represented as still living to God (Luk 20:38, etc.); and by the ‘same divine authority he is proclaimed as an acknowledged heir of future glory (Mat 8:11, etc.).

II. His Character. — Isaac, the gentle and dutiful son, the faithful and constant husband (see Becker, De Isaaco, etc., Greifsw. 1750), became the father of a house in which order did not reign. If there were any very prominent points in his character, they were not brought out by the circumstances in which he was placed. He appears less as a man of action than as a man of suffering, from which he is generally delivered without any direct effort of his own. Thus he suffers as the object of Ishmael's mocking, of the intended sacrifice on Moriah, of the rapacity of the Philistines, and of Jacob's stratagem. But the thought of his sufferings is effaced by the ever-present tokens of God's favor; and he suffers with the calmness and dignity of a conscious heir of heavenly promises, without uttering any complaint, and generally without committing any action by which he would forfeit respect. Free from violent passions, he was a man of constant, deep, and tender affections. Thus he mourned for his mother till her place was filled by his wife. ‘His sons were nurtured at home till a late period of their lives; and neither his grief for Esau's marriage, nor the anxiety in which he was involved in consequence of Jacob's deceit, estranged either of them from his affectionate care. His life of solitary blamelessness must have been sustained by strong habitual piety, such as showed itself at the time of Rebekah's barrenness (Gen 25:21), in his special intercourse: with God at Gerar and Beersheba (Gen 26:2; Gen 26:23), in the solemnity with which he bestows his blessing and refuses to change it. His life, judged by a worldly standard, might seem inactive, ignoble, and unfruitful; but the “guileless years, prayers, gracious acts, and daily thank-offerings of pastoral life” are not to be so esteemed, although they make no show in history. Isaac's character may not have exercised any commanding influence upon either his own or succeeding generations, but it was sufficiently marked and consistent to win respect and envy from his contemporaries. By his posterity his name is always joined in equal honor with those of Abraham and Jacob, and so it was even used as part of the formula which Egyptian magicians in the time of Origen (Contra Celsun, 1, 22) employed as efficacious to bind the daemons whom they adjured (comp. Gen 31:42; Gen 31:53).

If Abraham's enterprising, unsettled life foreshadowed the early history of his descendants; if Jacob was a type of the careful, commercial, unwarlike  character of their later days, Isaac may represent the middle period, in which they lived apart from nations, and enjoyed possession of the fertile land of promise. (See Kalisch, Genesis ad loc.)

III. The typical view of Isaac is barely referred to in. the N.T., but it is drawn out with minute particularity by Philo and those interpreters of Scripture who were influenced by Alexandrian philosophy. Thus in Philo, Isaac (laughter the most exquisite enjoyment--the soother and cheerer of peace-loving souls) is foreshadowed in the facts that his father had attained 100 years (the perfect number) when he was born, and that he is specially designated as given to his parents by God. His birth from the mistress of Abraham's household symbolizes happiness proceeding from predominant wisdom. His attachment to one wife (Rebekah =perseverance) is contrasted with Abraham's multiplied connections, and with Jacob's toil- won wives, as showing the superiority of Isaac's heaven-born, self- sufficing wisdom to the accumulated, knowledge of Abraham and the painful experience of Jacob. In the intended sacrifice. of Isaac, Philo sees only a sign (laughter =rejoicing is, the prerogative of God, and is a fit offering to him) that God gives back to obedient man as much happiness as is good for him. Clement of Rome (ch. 31), with characteristic soberness, merely refers to Isaac as an example of faith in God.

In Tertullian he is a pattern of monogamy, and a type of Christ bearing the cross. But Clement of Alexandria finds an allegorical meaning in the incidents which connect Abimelech with Isaac and Rebekah (Gen 26:8), as well as in the offering of Isaac. In this latter view he is followed by Origen, and by Augustine, and by Christian expositors generally. The most minute particulars of that transaction are invested with a spiritual meaning by such writers as Rabanus Maurus, in Genesis § 3. Abraham is made a type of the first person in the blessed Trinity, Isaac of the second; the two servants dismissed are the Jewish sects who did not attain to a perception of Christ in his humiliation; the ass bearing the wood is the Jewish nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God which they failed to understand; the three days are the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations; the ram is Christ on the cross; the thicket they who placed him there. Modern English writers hold firmly the typical significance of the transaction, without extending it into such detail (see Pearson, On the Creed, 1, 243, 251, edit. 1843; Fairbairn's Typology, 1, 332). A recent writer (A. Jukes, Types of Genesis), who has shown much ingenuity in attaching a spiritual meaning to the characters and incidents in the book of Genesis, regards  Isaac as representing the spirit of sonship, in a series in which Adam represents human nature, Cain the carnal mind, Abel the spiritual, Noah regeneration, Abraham the spirit of faith, Jacob the spirit of service, Joseph suffering or glory. With this series may be compared the View of Ewald (Gesch. 1, 387-400), in which the whole patriarchal family is a prefigurative group, comprising twelve members with seven distinct modes of relation:

1. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, respectively personifying active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles, distinguished from the rest as Agamemnon, Achilles, and Ulysses among the heroes of the Iliad, or as the Trojan Anchises, AEneas, and Ascanius, and mutually related as Romulus, Remus, and Numa;

2. Sarah, with Hagar, as mother and mistress of the household,

3. Isaac as child;

4. Isaac with Rebekah as the type of wedlock (comp. his Alterthümer. p. 233);

5. Leah and Rachel the plurality of coequal wives;

6. Deborah as nurse (compare Anna and Caieta, E12. 4:654, and 7:1) —

7. Eliezer as steward, whose office is compared to that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

IV. Traditions. — Jewish legends represent Isaac as an angel made before the world, and descending to earth in human form (Origen, in Johann. 2, § 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eisenmenger, Entd. Jud. 1, 343, 864). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Shem (Jarchi, on Genesis 25). The ordinance of evening prayer is ascribed to him (Gen 24:63), as that of morning prayer to Abraham (Gen 19:27), and night prayer to Jacob (Gen 28:11) (Eisenmenger, Ent. Jsd. 1, 483).

The Arabian traditions included in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, a righteous person inspired with grace to do good works, observe prayer, and give alms (ch. 21), endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, ‘children, and- wealth (ch. 19). The promise of Isaac and the offering of  Isaac are also mentioned (Heb 11:38). Faith in a future resurrection is ascribed to Abraham: but it is connected, not, as in Heb 11:19, with the offering of Isaac, but with a fictitious miracle (chap. 2). Stanley mentions a curious tradition of the reputed jealousy of Isaac's character that prevails among the inhabitants of Hebron respecting the grave of Rebekah (Jewish Church, 1, 496 sq.). (On the notices of Isaac in the Talmud, see Otho's Lex. Talm. p. 133; Hamburger, Real-Encyklop. Bible u. Talmud, p. 612 sq.; for the notices in the Koran, see Hottinger's Hist. Orient. p. 25, 52). See Boucher, History of Isaac (Lond. 1864). For older treatises, see Darling, Cyclop. Bibliograph. col. 190.

## Isaac "the Blind"[[@Headword:Isaac "the Blind"]]

             a Jewish writer of the 13th century (from 1190-1210), is noted as the reputed author of the modern cabalistic system. SEE CABALA. Some writers, as is well known, assert that the Cabala originated with him, but this is doubted by the best authorities, and he is considered only to have been the first to give a new impulse to the study of this peculiar philosophical system, to oppose the inroads of Maimonides's (q.v.) philosophical interpretation of the Scriptures. It ‘is certain, at least, that he had much to do with one of ‘the mystical books of the Cabala, the Jezirah. His theories were further developed after his death by his two disciples Ezra and Azariel of Zerona. Gratz (Gesch. d Julden, 7, 74 sq., 444 sq.) seems inclined to favor the assertion of Joseph Ibn-Gikatilla, that the Cabala system was the production of Isaac the Blind, and that neither the sacred Scriptures nor Jewish tradition bear any reference to prove its earlier existence. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac Aboab[[@Headword:Isaac Aboab]]

             a Spanish Jew of some distinction as a commentator and preacher, was born, according to Gratz (Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 225), in 1433, and succeeded the celebrated Isaac of Campanton as gaon of Castile. He died in 1493. Aboab wrote, besides super commentaries to the commentaries of Rashi and Nachmani, שַׁטּוֹת עִל הִתִּלְוּד, or Dissertations on a Part of the Talnmudic Tract Janm-Tob (Beza), edited by Jedidja Galante (Venice, 1608; Wilmersdorf, 1716):-- נְהִר פַּישׁוֹן, or Homilies, with free Use of the Hagadah, edited by Gershom Soncini (Constantinople, 1538, 4to; Zolkiew, 1806, 4to). There are a number of other works that have frequently been attributed to the pen of this Isaac, which Dr. Zunz assigns, as Gratz  believes very properly, to another Isaac Aboab, who flourished about i300- 1320. Among these, the most important, which Furst (Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 4 sq.) assigns to the present Isaac, is מְנוֹרִת הִמָּאוֹר, a hagadic or ethical treatise on the Talmud and Midrashim, in seven sections (published at Venice, 1544, fol., and several times later; also with a Heb. commentary by Frankfurter, Amsterd. 1701, 8vo; and by others with Spanish, Hebrew, German, and High-German translations at different times and places). (J. H.W.)

## Isaac Abrabanel[[@Headword:Isaac Abrabanel]]

             SEE ABRABANEL, ISAAC.

## Isaac Albalag[[@Headword:Isaac Albalag]]

             a Jewish philosopher of some note, flourished in Spain during the latter half of the 13th century. He was a contemporary of the celebrated Falaquera, and, like him, well versed in Arabian philosophy. Albalag possessed greater natural endowments than Falaquera, but, wanting that independence of mind which made the latter so justly celebrated, he failed to take as prominent a position. He died about 1294. About 1292 he edited and improved Alghazali's Makasid Alphilsapha, under the title of הִיֲעוֹת תַּקּוּן. A part of it has been published by Schorr in Chaluz, 4 (1859) and 6 (1861). See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7, 252 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac Alfez (or Alfass)[[@Headword:Isaac Alfez (or Alfass)]]

             SEE ALFEZ, ISAAC.

## Isaac Alissani[[@Headword:Isaac Alissani]]

             SEE IBN-GIATH, ISAAC.

## Isaac Arama [[@Headword:Isaac Arama ]]

             SEE ARAMA, ISAAC.

## Isaac Argyrus[[@Headword:Isaac Argyrus]]

             a Greek monk who flourished in the latter half of the 14th century at AEneus, in Thracia, wrote about 1373, when he is said to have been at the age of sixty, Computus Graecorums de solemnitatepascha, tis celebrandi, published in Greek and Latin by J. Christmann (Heidelberg, 1611, 4to), and inserted by Dionysius Petavius in his De Doctrina temporum (3, 359). He is also supposed to be the author of a work still in MS. form on astronomy. Of Isaac's personal history but little is clearly known. — Jocher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2. 1984; Mosheim. Eccl. Hist. bk. 3, cent. 14, pt. 2, ch. 2. (J. H.W.)

## Isaac Athias [[@Headword:Isaac Athias ]]

             SEE ATHIAS, ISAAC.

## Isaac Ben-Jehuda ha-Levi[[@Headword:Isaac Ben-Jehuda ha-Levi]]

             a Jewish writer of the 17th century, is the author of ס8 פענח רזא, a commentary on the Pentatench, compiled from different authors (Prague, 1607). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 2:142. (B.P.)

## Isaac Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Isaac Ben-Moses]]

             SEE PROFIAT DURAN.

## Isaac Ben-Simeon[[@Headword:Isaac Ben-Simeon]]

             of Prague, who lived in the 17th century, is the author of מדרש שוחר עם פרוש, i.e., the Midrash Shocher Tob (a midrash on Psalms, Proverbs, and Samuel), with short glosses (Prague, 1613): — חומש עם פרוש, i.e., the Pentateuch in Hebrew, with a Judaeo-German commentary (ibid. 1608). See First, Bibl. Jud. 1:145; De' Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), page 125. (B.P.)

## Isaac Blitz[[@Headword:Isaac Blitz]]

             SEE JEKUTHIEL BEN-ISAAC.

## Isaac Campanton[[@Headword:Isaac Campanton]]

             SEE KAMPANTON.

## Isaac Campanton (2)[[@Headword:Isaac Campanton (2)]]

             SEE CAMPANTON, ISAAC.

## Isaac Cantarini[[@Headword:Isaac Cantarini]]

             SEE CANTARINI, ISAAC.

## Isaac Carodso[[@Headword:Isaac Carodso]]

             SEE CARIOSO, ISAAC.

## Isaac De Acosta[[@Headword:Isaac De Acosta]]

             SEE ACOSTA, ISAAC DE.

## Isaac Ibn-Albalia[[@Headword:Isaac Ibn-Albalia]]

             a Jewish writer of great distinction, was born at Cordova. about 1035. He manifested at an early age superior talents and great thirst for learning. Besides the study of the Talmud, and of philosophy, he was eager for the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of astronomy and the mathematical sciences, and when thirty years old began a commentary on the most difficult parts of the Talmud, under the title Kupat ha-Rochelim. but it was so extensive a work that he did not live long enough to complete it. He also attempted an astronomical work on the principle of the Jewish mode of calculating the calendar, under the title Ibbur (about 1065). Becoming a favorite of the reigning prince of Spain, he was honored with the distinguished position of nasi and grand rabbi of the Jews of that domain. , He died about 1094. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:72. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac Ibn-Giat[[@Headword:Isaac Ibn-Giat]]

             SEE IBN-GIAT.

## Isaac Israeli ben-Josef[[@Headword:Isaac Israeli ben-Josef]]

             a very distinguished' Jewish writer who flourished at Toledo in the first half of the- 14th century (1300-1340), deserves our notice as the author of יְסוֹד עוֹלָם, or The Foundation of the World, a masterly production on Jewish chronology, including also the entire field of the science of astronomy, both theoretically and practically delineated (Berlin, 1777, 4to; and a better edition, ibid. 1848, 4to). This work, of which a part of the MS. has been preserved, was written about 1310 at the express wish of Israeli's teacher, Asher ben-Jechiel. He also compiled tables of Jewish chronology under the title of סֵדֶד הִקִּבָּלָה(Zolkiew, 1805, 8vo, et el.). See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:290; Carmoly, Itineraires, p. 224; B. Goldberg, Isaac Israeli (in the Lib. d. Or. 1845), c. 433-435; Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2, 150. (J. H.W.)

## Isaac Lampronti[[@Headword:Isaac Lampronti]]

             SEE LAMPIRONTI, ISAAC.

## Isaac Levita, or Johann Isaac Levi[[@Headword:Isaac Levita, or Johann Isaac Levi]]

             as he called himself after his change from Judaism, one of the most celebrated Jewish savans of the 16th century, was born at Wetzlar in 1515.  He was thoroughly prepared by his friends for the Rabbinical ‘office, and filled it for years with great distinction but, becoming impressed with the truthfulness of the Christian interpretation of the Messianic predictions, he and his son both, after a careful and extended study of the prophecies, forsook the faith of their forefathers, and joined the Roman Catholic Church. Some Jewish writers have attributed this course to a desire for promotion in literary circles, which as a Jew were closed to him. But there is no reason to believe it other than the result of association with Christians, and the study of the writings of Christian commentators on the prophecies, especially of Isaiah (more particularly chapter 53), which is said first to have led him to a study of the Messianic predictions. After his conversion (1546) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the city of Liwen, and in 1551 was called to a like position in the University of Cologne. He became a vigorous defendant of the Hebrew text of the Bible, and replied to Lindanus, who had attacked it, (in his De optimo Scripturas interpretandi genere, Cologne, 1538), in a work entitled Defensio Veritatis Hebrew sacrarum scripturarum (Col. 1559). He published also the following works on Hebrew grammar, which rank among the best in' that language:

(1.) An Introduction to the Hebrew Grammar, and to the Art of Writing a pure Hebrew style, entitled מבוא אמרי שפר(Colon. 1553),in which he gave different specimens of Hebrew writing, dialogues, and epistles, both from the O.T. and other Hebrew writings, as well as the books of Obadiah and Jonah in Hebrew, with a Latin translation:--

(2.) A grammatical treatise entitled Meleditationes Hebraicae in Arten Grammn. per integrum librum Ruth explicatce; adjecta sunt quaedam contra D. 1. Forsteri lexicon (Colon. 1558), which consists of a useful analysis and excellent translation of the entire book of Ruth:

(3.) Notae in Clenardi Tabulam, etc. (Colon. 1555), being annotations on Clenard's Tables of Hebrew Grammar.

(4.) An excellent introduction to the edition of-Elias Levita's Chaldee Lexicon, entitled מתורגמן, (Colon. 1560). He likewise translated several scientific works written by Jews into Latin, and was an assistant to Pagnini on his great lexicological work. See Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb.; Jocher, Gelehkt. Lex. Addenda, 2, 2332 sq.; Rivet, Isagoge ad Sacr. Script.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Cor. 26, 10; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop, 2, 410.

## Isaac Loria[[@Headword:Isaac Loria]]

             SEE LORIA, ISAAC.

## Isaac Nasir[[@Headword:Isaac Nasir]]

             SEE NASIR, ISAAC.

## Isaac Of Antioch[[@Headword:Isaac Of Antioch]]

             SEE ISAAC THE SYRIAN (a).

## Isaac Onquenira[[@Headword:Isaac Onquenira]]

             SEE ONQUENIRA, ISAAC.

## Isaac Orobio[[@Headword:Isaac Orobio]]

             SEE OROBIO, ISAAC.

## Isaac Pulgar[[@Headword:Isaac Pulgar]]

             SEE PULGAR.

## Isaac Viva[[@Headword:Isaac Viva]]

             SEE CANTARINI, ISAAC.

## Isaac ben-Abba-Mare[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Abba-Mare]]

             a Jewish exponent of the Talmud, was born at Bourg des St. Gilles, France, in 1139. His father was an officer under the government of the count of Toulouse, and afforded Isaac every opportunity for distinction, but he early devoted himself to the study of the Talmud under the celebrated Rabbi Tam of Rameru. When only seventeen years old he prepared a compendium of certain ritualistic laws of the Jews, in which he evinced thorough familiarity with the Talmud. He also wrote a commentary  on one of the most difficult parts of the Talmud, and finally collected all his investigations on the Jewish traditions under the title of הָעַטּוּר(probably in 1179). It was incompletely published by Josef ben-Saruk (Ven. 1608; and since then, Warsaw, 1801). See Gratz, Gesch. l. Juden, 6:244; Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2, 137. (J. H.W.)

## Isaac ben-Abraham[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Abraham]]

             a distinguished Jewish Rabbi of the Karaitic sect, was born at Trock, near Wilna (Lithuania) about 1533. He is especially celebrated as the author of a work against Christianity, entitled , חַזּוּפ אָמוּנָה, Chizzuk Amunah (munimem fidei) written in 1593. It is divided into two parts: the first, containing fifty chapters, consists of an apology for Judaism, and a general attack on the Christian faith; the second contains a critical examination of a hundred passages of the N.T., intended by the writer to refute the proofs adduced by Christians from the Old Test. It is considered, next to the productions of Duran (q.v.), the ablest work ever written by any Jew against the Christian religion. It was first published by Wagenseil, with a Latin translation, in the Tela ignea Satance (Altdorf, 1682, 4to), from a MS. obtained from an African Jew, which, as Gratz asserts, was imperfect. The Hebrew text was afterwards reprinted by the Jews (Amsterdam, 1705, 12mo), and by Gousset, with a Latin translation and a refutation (Amst. 1712, fol.). Wolf in his Bibliotheca Hebraica, gives a supplement and variation, said to be derived from a more perfect MS. than the one at Wagenseil's command. But the best edition is held to be that of Rabbi Deutsch (Sohrau, 1865). It was also translated into (German Hebrew (Amst. 1717, 8vo); into ‘German by Gebling, and into Spanish by Is. Athia. Among the works written in answer to it. which deserve especial mention, besides those named above, are J. Miller, Confutatio libri Chizuk Emuna (Hamb. 1644,4to): Gebhard, Cents loca Novi Testamenti vindicata adversus Chizuk Emuna (Greifswald, 1699, 4to); J. P. Storr, Evangelische Glaubenslehre gegen d. Werk Chizuk Emuna (Tub. 1703, 8vo); K. Kidder, Demonstrat. Of the Messiah (Lond. 16841700, 3 pts. 8vo). Isaac ben- Abraham died about 1594. See Rossi, Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei; Bartolocci, Magna Biblio. Rabbisn.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:490 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé. 26, 10; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 139. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Abraham Akrish[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Abraham Akrish]]

             a Jewish writer of considerable note, was born about 1489, in Spain; the name of the place is not known to us. He was lame on both feet, but this maimed condition by no means prevented him from acquiring great learning; nay, he even traveled extensively, and enjoyed the reputation of a great scholar. When yet a boy, the persecutions of the Jews by the Spaniards obliged him to leave his native land (1492), and he removed to Naples. But also here he and his coreligionists were sorely tried by persecution, and again he fled; this time from country to country “whose languages he did not understand, and whose inhabitants spared neither the aged nor the young,” until he finally found a home in the house of a banished coreligionist in far-off Egypt. After a stay of some ten years he removed to Palestine, and finally settled in Turkey, where he was honored with the instruction of one of the princes of the realm. He died after 1577. His works are קוֹל מְבִשֵּׂר, or on Jewish Reign during the Exile; containing (1) the correspondence of Chasdai ben-Isaac with Jusuf, the king of the Chassars; (2) מִעֲשֵׂה בֵית דָּוַד בַּימֵ פָּרִס, or History of the House of David during the reign of the Persians; also the history of Bastanai, etc. (Constant. 15 , 8vo; Basle, 1589, 8vo; and with a work of Farisaolo, Offenb. 1720, 12mo). See Gratz Gesch. d. Juclei, 9, 10 sq., 420 sq. (J. H.W.)

## Isaac ben-Calonymos[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Calonymos]]

             SEE NATHAN.

## Isaac ben-Elia ben-Samuel[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Elia ben-Samuel]]

             a Jewish commentator who flourished in the beginning of the 18th century, deserves our notice as the author of

(1.) A Commentary on the Psalms, published at Dyrhenfurt, under the title of תהלים עם לקוטי מגדים, the Psalms with a valuable catena (1728), consisting of excerpts from the celebrated expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, etc., giving also an abridgment of Alsheich's commentary, entitled רוממות אל, and a German explanation of the difficult words.

(2.) A Commentary on Proverbs, entitled צם לקוטי מגדים משלי, Proverbs with a valuable catena (Wandsbeck, 1730-31), composed of  excerpts from the expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, Ibn Ezra, Levi b. — Gershon, Salomon b. — Melech, giving also a German explanation of the difficult expressions, and an abridgment of Alsheich's exposition called רוב פנינים; and

(3.) A Commentary on the Sabbatic Lessons from the Prophets, entitled פני יצחק, the face of Isaac (Wandsbeck, 1730), which consists of excerpts from nine of the most distinguished commentators, viz. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, D. Kimchi, Levi b. — Gershon, Abrabanel, Alsheich, Samuel b. — Laniado, J. Arama, and Joseph Albo. The works of Isaac b Elia are very valuable, inasmuch as they enable the Biblical student to see on one page the expositions of the best and most famous Jewish commentators on every difficult passage, without being obliged to search for them in inaccessible and costly volumes. — Kitto, Biblical Cyclopcedia, 2, 410.

## Isaac ben-Gikatilla[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Gikatilla]]

             SEE IBN-GIKATILLA.

## Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi or Alcalai[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasi or Alcalai]]

             one of the most distinguished Talmudical scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cala-Hammad near Fez, in Africa, about 1013. It had been the custom among Jewish Rabbis to follow in the interpretation of the Talmud the decisions of the Gaonim, and thus direct inquiry and independence of thought had well nigh become not only obsolete, but even impossible. But when Alfasi had become sufficiently familiar with the Talmudic writings to make his voice heard among his Jewish brethren, he evinced such an independence of thought, and a mind of such penetration, that he was soon acknowledged not only on Africa's shore, but even on the other side of the sea, by Spain's Jewish savans, as one of the ablest interpreters of their tradition. A work which he published at this time, סֵפֵר הִהֲלָכוֹת, or the Halacha's of the whole Talmud, intended as a Talmudical compendium (published at Cracow, 1597, 8vo; Basle, 1602, 8vo), which has preserved its authority even to the present day, still farther increased his renown.

During a time of persecution (1088), being obliged to flee his native country, he sought refuge in Cordova, and there he was received with great honor. But his distinction as a Talmudst, and the kind offices of his Spanish brethren. seem to have annoyed some of the more distinguished Rabbis of Spain. A controversy, into which he was unwillingly drawn, with Ibn-Gia  and Ibn-Albalda, became especially severe. After the death of Ibn-Gia, he removed to Lucena, and was there appointed the successor of his former opponent. But his controversy with Ibn-Albaida continued until the death of the latter (1094), when Alfasi adopted a son of Ibn-Albalda, and made him one of his most faithful adherents. He died in 1103. A list of the different editions of his works may be found in First, Bibliotheca Judaica, 1, 34 sq. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:76 sq., 92 sq.; Munk, Notice sur Aboulwealid, p. 4 sq.; Pinsker, Likute Kadnonijot, text No. 210, and note X. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Jehudah[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Jehudah]]

             SEE IBN-GIATH.

## Isaac ben-Joseph[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Joseph]]

             called also ISAAC DE CORBEL, was born in Corbeil. a city in France, towards the beginning of the 13th century, and died in 1280 according to Rossi (Jachia-Ghedalia and Abraham Zakuth say, the one 1240, the other 1270). He is the author of the celebrated work entitled עִמּוּדֵי גוֹלֶה, Ammudey Goleh (Constantinople, 1510, 4to; Cremona, 1557, 4to; and with glosses by Perez ben-Elia, and indications of the passages quoted from the Bible and the Talmud, Cracow, 1596, 4to). This work is taken from the גָּדֹל סֵפֶר מַצְוֹת(Sepher Mitzvoth Gadol) of Moses of Coucy, and is known also by the name of Semak (from the initials of the three Hebrew words Sepher Mitzvoth Katon). It contains a synopsis of the precepts of the Jewish religion. It is divided into seven parts, each containing regulations for one day of the week. Isaac wrote it in 1277, at the request of the French Jews, who desired to have a clear and convenient manual to guide them in matters pertaining to their religion. It is also known under the Latin title of Columnae captivitatis, and still more frequently as the Liber Preceptorum parvus. Several other copies of it were made by French as well as German Rabbis. Jekutiel Salmon ben- Mose, of Posen, made a compendium of the work (Cracow, 1579, 4to). See Bartolocci, Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.; Wolf, Biblioth.. Hebraica; Rossi, Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei; First, Biblioth. Judaica, 1, 186; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:131; Jost, Gesch. l. Judenthums, 3, 33. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Juda (Abrabanel)[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Juda (Abrabanel)]]

             SEE ABRABANEL.

## Isaac ben-Latif or Allatif[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Latif or Allatif]]

             a Jewish philosopher of some note, was born about 1270, somewhere in the southern part of Spain. Of his early history scarcely anything is now known. But some of his works have been preserved, and from notices of distinguished contemporaries we learn that he was inclined to favor the Cabalists (q.v.). He is highly spoken of by the Rabbins of his day, but evidently, judging from his works, was rather two-sided on all cabalistic points, so that he may most appropriately be said to have stood “with one foot in philosophy, and with the other in the Cabala.” He died some time in the first half of the 14th century. Of his works are printed עִל קהֶֹלֶת פֵּרוּשּׁ, a Commentary on Kohelet (Constantinople, 1554, 8vo): — הִמּוֹר צְרוֹרand צוּרִת הָעוֹלָם, a Cosmology (Vien. 1862, edited by S. Stem)):- — שִׁעִר הִשָּׁמִיַם, a work on Dogmatics, Religious Philosophy, and the Physical Sciences, in 4 parts:-- סֵ תּוֹלְדוֹת אָדָם, a History of Man; etc. See Gratz, Geschd. d. Juden, 7:220 sq.; Jost, Gesch. fudenthums, 3:80; Sachs, Kerem Chemed, 8:88 sq.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 2, 224. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Mose[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Mose]]

             SEE PROFIAT DURAN.

## Isaac ben-Moses[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Moses]]

             also called AVOJI, who flourished in the latter half of the 16th century, deserves our notice as the author of

(1.) a Commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled תנחומוֹת אל, or Consolations of God (Saloniki, 1578-9); and

(2.) a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, entitled מקהיל קהלת, or the Gatherer of the Congregation (ibid 1597), which are both valuable contributions to the exegetical literature of the O.T. Scriptures. See Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop. 2, 410; Steinschneider, Cathol. Lib. Hebr in Biblioth. Bod. col. 1139.

## Isaac ben-Schescheth[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Schescheth]]

             (Barfat), one of the most distinguished Rabbis of the 14th century, was born about 1310, at or near Saragossa (Spain). He presided over the congregation at Saragossa for a- number of years, and when, in 1391, the persecutions instituted against the Jews made it impossible for him to remain, he removed to Algiers, where he continued to hold a like position until his death, about 1444, and appointed as his successor the celebrated Simon ben-Simach Duran (q.v.). He was especially celebrated for his thorough acquaintance with Jewish tradition. Not only from all parts of Spain, but from the different parts of Europe, he was constantly invited to express his opinion on the meaning of obscure Talmudical passages. These were collected, and form a very important source for the study of the interpretation of the Talmud, and convey at the same time a pretty accurate idea of the state of the Jews in his day, not only in Spain and Algiers, but in France and even other countries as well His works are שְׁאֵלוֹת וּחְשׁוּבוֹת, a collection of Halachoth (edited by Samuel Levi in 2 parts, Constantinople, 1547, fol. and often): — פֵּ עִל הִתּוֹרָה, or Commentary on the Pentateuch, with notes from the Talmud::-- חַדּוּשַׁים, also a work on the Talmud. The latter two, we think, still remain in MS. form. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8:33 sq., 109 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenthums, 3, 87; Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, 2, 145. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac ben-Suleiman[[@Headword:Isaac ben-Suleiman]]

             (Salomo) Israeli, a Jewish philosopher and philologian, was born in Egypt about 845. He was a physician by profession, and as such attained to very high distinction, serving from 904 to his death at Kairuan, as private physician to the reigning prince, and celebrated as the author of several medical works valuable even in our day.' But also as philologian and philosopher he attained great notoriety, more particularly as the author of a philosophical commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating of the Creation, of which, however, only a part is now extant. It bore the title of Sefer Jezirah, whence the error that he wrote a commentary on the book Jezirah. He died about 940. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 5, 282 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Isaac the Syrian (A)[[@Headword:Isaac the Syrian (A)]]

             with the surname of Doctor or Magnus, because of his ability as an ecclesiastical writer, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was, in all probability, a native of Syria. He was at first a monk in a convent not far from Gabala, in Phoenicia, and afterwards became a priest at Antioch. He died about 456. He wrote several theological pamphlets in Syriac (and perhaps also in Greek), directed chiefly against the Nestorians and Eutychians. A work on the Contempt of the World would be considered as his chief claim to reputation, but the authorship of this book is not at all  well established. It is by some supposed to have been written by the other Isaac the Syrian (see next art.). There seem to be better grounds for considering him as the author of the treatise De Cogitationibus, the Greek text of which, together with a Latin translation, can be found in the Ascetica of Petrus Possinus. The library of the Vatican contains some other MS. works of Isaac. He is honored as a saint both by the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria. See Gennadius, De Script. Eccles.; Cave. Hist. Litteraria; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graeca, 11:214; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:3; Jocher. Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1991.

## Isaac the Syrian (B)[[@Headword:Isaac the Syrian (B)]]

             generally with the surname of Ninivita, an ecclesiastical writer of the 6th century, became bishop of Nineveh, but afterwards resigned his office to enter a convent, of which he was subsequently chosen abbot. He died towards the close of the 6th, century. He is generally, and, as it seems, justly considered as the author of the treatise De Contemptu Mundi, de' Operatione coporali et sui Abjectione Liber, which may be found in the Orthodoxographi (second edition, Basle, 1569), Bibliotheca Patrum (of Cologne, vol. 6), Bibliotheca Patrum (of Paris, vol. 5), Bibliotheca novissima (of Lyons, vol. 11), and in Galland, Bibliotheca Patrum (vol. 12). All these collections contain a Greek text with a Latin translation, yet the former appears itself to be a translation from the Syriac. There are twenty-seven ascetic sermons of his in Greek (MSS in the Vienna Library) and some homilies (MSS in the Bodleian Library). See Cave, Hist. Liter.; Fabricius, Bibl. Graeca, 11:215; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé 26:4; Jicher, Gelehrt. Lex. 2, 1991.

## Isaac, Daniel[[@Headword:Isaac, Daniel]]

             a prominent Methodist minister, commonly designated as the Wesleyan “Polemic Divine,” was born at Caythorpe, in the county of Lincoln, England, July 7, 1778. He was early devoted to books, and, on his conversion in his nineteenth year, he at once determined to devote his life to the work of the Christian ministry. In 1800 he joined the Conference on probation, supplying at this time a vacancy on Grimsby Circuit. He soon rose to great distinction among his brethren in the ministry, and was appointed to some of the most prominent charges at the command of his denomination. May 20,1832, while in Manchester preaching in behalf of the Sunday-school work, he was seized with paralysis, from the effects of which he never recovered. At the session of the next Conference he was present, and believed himself sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon active work, and was appointed to York Circuit, an old and favorite circuit, to which he was now sent for the third time.

But he began to fail fast, and died in the midst of his work, March 21,1834. Speaking of the abilities of Daniel Isaac, the Rev. Samuel Dunn says: “He was an independent thinker, acute reasoner, formidable opponent, dexterous polemic, sound theologian, striking, instructive, extemporaneous preacher, perspicuous writer, generous benefactor, faithful friend, and amiable Christian. His intellect was original, subtle, analogical, penetrating, clear, strong. His manner was deliberate, grave, conversational, pointed, humorous, sarcastic, ironical. The sagacious Henry Moore remarked: ‘Daniel Isaac, like Paul; reasoned with his hearers out of the Scriptures; and he kept in them, never went out of them, and never reasoned himself out of them.' If at any time he drew a smile from his hearers, he would maintain the utmost gravity He displayed great power in grappling with the conscience, and in bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. Of the ludicrous he had a marvelous perception, and could present an object in such a light as to excite the indignation or the loathing of those who before admired it. He painted from life. Many hearers were disgusted with their own likeness as they saw it in the clear mirror he held before them. He was never declamatory or ornate. In debate he was remarkably cool, calm, collected, keen, argumentative, and close. There was no trembling hesitancy, quibbling, or artifice.

He engaged in no sham fight; never brandished the sword at a distance, but came at once to  close quarters, grappled with his opponent, pierced his vitals, and took from him his armor.” But the great strength of Daniel Isaac lay in his pen, and he wielded it with especial ability in matters of controversy. His works are, — Universal Restoration (N. Y. 1830, 12mo), in which he meets the objections of the Universalists to the eternity of punishment: — Sermons on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ (Lond. 1815): — Ecclesiastical Claims (Lond. 1816), the views of which his Conference disapproved, but to which, in a reply, he steadfastly adhered.. Dr. George Smith (History of Wesleyan Methodism, 3, 7) says of this work and the action of the Conference: “In many important respects the work does great credit to the author's industry and research. It contains the most convincing proofs, from Scripture and history, of the groundless character and the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the ministerial order by Papists and High- Churchmen, and clearly shows the contradictions, impieties, and absurdities to which the admission of these claims must inevitably lead.

But in doing this, Mr. Isaac went so far as to impugn the scriptural position of the Christian ministry as held by Wesley and the Methodist people. Nor. is this the only serious defect in the work; some passages therein are grossly indelicate and irreverent, if not, indeed, profane (from this charge, however, it should be said, others seek to free Mr. Isaac); while, as stated in the resolution of the Conference, its ‘general spirit and style' are decidedly improper.... The case is greatly to be regretted. Mr. Isaac's ability, energy, and sterling worth are fully admitted, and it is equally clear to our judgment, from a careful perusal of the work, that the Conference were not only justified in adopting the course they pursued, but were compelled to pursue it by the circumstances of the case.” His next work was published whilst he was stationed at Leicester, and on terms the most friendly with Robert Hall, the celebrated Baptist minister. It was entitled Baptism Discussed. This volume Hall would never read; but, when urged to do it by his friends, he remarked, in good temper, “If he has exposed our views of baptism as he exposed the Episcopalians in his Ecclesiastical Claims, the Lord have mercy upon us.” Isaac also wrote pamphlets against the use of instrumental music in the house of God, and on the Leeds organ discussions. He edited the Life of his father, Memoirs of the Rev. John Strawe, and published sketches of the. Lives of Robert Bolton, John Corbett, — and other old Divines. In 1826 he began, at the instigation of the Rev. Samuel Dunn, a work on the Atonement, which made its appearance a few years after.' His works were edited after his death by the venerable John Burdsall, and published at London (1828, in 3 vols. 8vo).  See Everett, Polemic Divine, or Memoirs, etc., of Rev. Dan. Isaac (Lond. 1839); Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, 3:482 sq. (J.H.W.)

## Isaac, Usiel[[@Headword:Isaac, Usiel]]

             a Jewish rabbi of Amsterdam, who flourished in the 17th century, is the author of לשון מענה, i.e., a Hebrew grammar (Amsterdam, 1657). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:145; De Barrios, Casa de Jacob (Amsterdam, 1683, giving a biography of Isaac Usiel). (B.P.)

## Isaac, bishop of Langres[[@Headword:Isaac, bishop of Langres]]

             France, is supposed to have been present at the Council of Kiersy in 840, as deacon of Laon. After the death of Theutbalde, Wulfade seized the bishopric of Langres in spite of all opposing canons; but Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, declared against him, and Charles the Bald compelled him to flee. Hilduin, lay abbot of St. Denis, then proposed Isaac as bishop, and by his influence caused him to be appointed. Isaac was ordained bishop of Langres about 856. We afterwards find his name in the councils of Toul and Langres (859), of Tousy (860), of Pistes (862), of Verberie, and of Soissons (866) —an evidence that he had gained great consideration and influence. His mildness caused him to be surnamed bonus, and the martyrology of the Church of Dijon praises him highly. A lasting monument of his efforts to effect a reform among the monastic orders is his work on Canons, published by Sirmond, Conciles, vol. 3; Labbe, Concil. etc.; Baluze, Capitdlaires, vol. 2. See Gallia Christ. vol. 5, col. 533; Hist. Litt. de la France, 5, 528; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, 26:4. (J. N. P.)

## Isaacs, Samuel M[[@Headword:Isaacs, Samuel M]]

             a Jewish rabbi, was born at Leeuwarden, Holland, January 4, 1804. His father having emigrated to England, young Isaacs received his education there. In 1839 he came to New York to take charge of the congregation Benai Jeshurun, then worshipping in Elm Street. In 1857 he commenced the publishing of the Jewish Messenger, which was intended to uphold  conservative Judaism against the so-called reformed party. In 1877 Isaacs retired from his ministry of the Shaare Tefila congregation, with which he had been connected since 1845, and died May 19, 1878. He was highly respected, not only by his own coreligionists, but also by Christians. (B.P.)

## Isaacus[[@Headword:Isaacus]]

             SEE ISAAC LEVITA.

## Isabslla Of Castille[[@Headword:Isabslla Of Castille]]

             queen of Spain, one of the most celebrated characters of the 15th century, deserves our notice on account of the part she acted in the religious history of Spain, and those dominions subject to her rule. Isabella, born April 22, 1451, was the daughter of John II, king of Castile and Leon. In 1469 she married Ferdinand V, surnamed “the Catholic,” king of Aragon. She was not the heir-apparent to the throne on the death of her father in 1481, am she had an elder sister. But, assisted by the powerful armies of her husband, a man of some sterling qualities, but of very little conscience, she succeeded in ascending the throne. Mr. Piescott and most modern historians seek to relieve her of the stigma that she was responsible for the cruelties that were inflicted on those of her subjects who chose to differ with the Church of Rome in their worship of their divine Maker. ‘It seems certain that she was deceived by the Jesuits, and consented to these outrages only because, in her fervor for the Roman Catholic cause, she  believed the very existence of the Church of Rome threatened; and, though we pity her weakness in the hour when resoluteness on her part was most needed to defend and protect her subjects, she saw that, Spain once reformed, Romanism would have passed from the world in the 16th century, instead of still lingering in our midst at this late hour. But if we excuse the conduct of queen Isabella of Castile on the ground of her piety and misled devotion to the Church of Rome, quite otherwise must we treat the conduct of her husband. He it is upon whom must fall the guilt of the outrages committed in the name of God in Spain and other lands under her dominion by the “Holy League.” It was the desire of money, the longing for power, and extension of his government to the American shore that made him the docile follower of the Jesuits, and brought ruin upon Spain. But he was well rewarded for his low and parsimonious conduct by the disturbances which followed the death of Isabella (Nov. 26, 1504) in Castile, and his expulsion from that country, over which, by the will of his departed wife, he had been appointed regent. SEE SPAIN. (J. H. W.)

## Isagogics[[@Headword:Isagogics]]

             SEE INTRODUCTION.

## Isaiah[[@Headword:Isaiah]]

             (prop. Heb. Yeshayah', יְשִׁעְיָה, saved by Jehovah; but this shorter form occurs, with reference to this person, only in the Rabbinic title of the book,: the text always has the name in the paragogic form — Yeshaya'hu, ישִׁעְיָהוּ, Sept., Josephus, and N.T. ῾Ησαϊvας, Vulg. Isaias; Auth. Vers. N.T. “Esaias:” but the Heb. name, both in the simple and prolonged forms, occurs of other persons likewise, although differently Anglicized in the Eng. Vers.; SEE JESHAIAH; SEE JESAIAH ), one of the most important of “the Greater Prophets,” who gave title to one of the books of Scripture.

I. Personal History of the Prophet. — Little is known respecting the circumstances of Isaiah's life. Kimchi (A.D. 1230) says in his commentary on Isa 1:1, “We know not.his race, nor of what tribe he was.” His father's name was Amoz (Isa 1:1), whom the fathers of the Church confound with the prophet Amos, because they were unacquainted with Hebrew, and in Greek the two names are spelled alike (so Clem. Alex.; Jerome, Prce. in Amn.; August. Civ. D. 18, 27). See-Amoz. The opinion of the Rabbins (Gemara, Megilla, 10:2) that Isaiah was the brother of king  Amaziah rests also on a mere etymological combination (see Carpzov, De regis Jesuice natalibus, Rost. 1735). Isaiah resided at Jerusalem, not far from the Temple (ch. 6). We learn from ch. 7 and 8 that he was married. Two of his sons are mentioned, Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hashbaz. These significant names, which he gave to his sons, prove how much Isaiah lived in his vocation. He did not consider his children as belonging merely to himself, but rendered them living admonitions to the people. In their names were contained the two chief points of his prophetic utterances: one recalled to mind the severe and inevitable judgment wherewith the Lord was about to visit the world, and especially his people; the other, which signifies “The remnant shall return,” pointed out the mercy with which the Lord would receive the elect, and with which, in the midst of apparent destruction, he would take care to preserve his people and his kingdom. Isaiah calls his wife a prophetess. This indicates that his marriage-life was not only consistent with his vocation, but that it was intimately interwoven with it. This name cannot mean the wife of. a prophet, but indicates ‘that the prophetess of Isaiah had a prophetic gift, like Miriam, Deborah' and Huldah. The appellation here given denotes the suitableness as well as genuineness of their conjugal relation.

Even the dress of the prophet was subservient to his vocation. According to Isa 20:2, he ‘Wore a garment of haircloth or sackcloth. This seems also to have been the costume of Elijah, according to 2 Kings 1,.8; and it was the dress of John the Baptist (Mat 3:4). Hairy sackcloth is in the Bible the symbol of repentance (compare Isa 22:11-12, and 1Ki 21:27). This costume of the prophets was a sermo propheticus realis, a prophetic preaching by fact. Before he has opened his lips his external appearance proclaims μετανοεῖτε, repent.

It is held traditionally that Isaiah suffered martyrdom under the wicked Manasseh, by being sawn in two under a memorable tree long said to have stood in the vicinity of Jerusalem (Gemara, Jeban. 4, 13; compare Sanhedr. f. 103 b, and the Targumites, in Assemani, Catalog. Bibl. ‘Vat. 1, 452; Trypho, p. 349; Jerome, in Jes. 57; Origen, in Psalms 27 in Matthew 23; Tertullian, Patient. 14; Augustine, Civ. Dei, 18, 24; Chronic. Pasch. p. 155). The traditional spot of the martyrdom is a very old mulberry-tree which stands near the Pool of Siloam, on the slopes of Ophel, below the south-east wall of Jerusalem. A similar account of his death is contained in the Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah, an apocryphal work, the Greek original of which was known to the early Church (Epiphan. licer. 40, 2;  Jerome, in les. 44, 4, p. 761, etc.), and of which only recently an Ethiopic version has been found and translated by Dr. Laurence, Oxford, 1819 (see Nitzsch, in the Studien und Krit. 1830, 2, 209; Engelhardt, Kirchengesch. Abhandl. 207 sq.). The same fate of Isaiah appears to be alluded to by Josephus (Ant. 10:3, 1).

II. Time of Isaiah. — The heading of this book places the prophet under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah; and an examination of the prophecies themselves, independently of the heading, leads us to the same chronological results. Chapter 6 in which is related the definite call of Isaiah to his prophetic office, is thus headed: “In the year in which king Uzziah died I saw the Lord,” etc. The collection of prophecies is, therefore, not chronologically arranged, and-the utterances in-the preceding chapters (1 to 6) belong, for chronological and other reasons to the last year of the reign of Uzziah, although the utterances in chapters 2, 3, 4, and 5 have been erroneously assigned to the reign of Jotham. As, however, the position of affairs was not materially changed under the reign of Jotham, we may say that the first chapter was uttered during that reign. The continuation of prophetic authorship, or the writing down of uttered prophecies, depended upon the commencement of new historical developments, such as took place under the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah. Several prophecies (namely, 7-10:4; 1:2-31; 17) belong to the reign of Ahaz (Isa 14:28-32, apparently to the occasion of his death); and most of the subsequent prophecies to the reign of Hezekiah. The prophetic ministry of Isaiah under Hezekiah is also described in a historical section contained in chapters 36-39. The data which are contained in this section come down to the fifteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah: consequently we are in the possession of historical documents proving that the prophetic ministry of Isaiah was in operation during about forty-five years, commencing in the year B.C. 756, and extending to the year B.C. 711. Of this period, at least one year belongs to the reign of Uzziah, sixteen to the reign of Jotham, fourteen to the reign of Ahaz, and fourteen and upwards to the reign of Hezekiah. It has been maintained, however, by Staudlin, Jahn, Bertholdt, Gesenius, and others, that Isaiah lived to a much later period, and that his life extended to the reign of Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah. For this opinion the following reasons are adduced:

(1.) According to 2Ch 32:32, Isaiah wrote the life of king Hezekiah. It would hence appear that he survived that king; although it must be admitted that in 2Ch 32:32, where Isaiah's biography  of Hezekiah is mentioned, the important words “first and last” are omitted; while in 2Ch 26:22, we read, “Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah, the son of Amoz, write.”

(2.) We find (as above stated) a tradition current in the Talmud, in the fathers, and in Oriental literature, that Isaiah suffered martyrdom in the reign of Manasseh by being sawn asunder. It is thought that an allusion to this tradition is found in the Epistle to the Heb 11:37, in the expression they were sawn asunder (ἐπρίσθησαν), which seems to harmonize with 2Ki 21:16, “Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much.”

(3.) The authenticity of the second portion of the prophecies of Isaiah being admitted (see below), the nature of this portion would seem to confirm the idea that its author had lived under Manasseh. The style of the second portion, it is asserted, is so different from that of the first that both could not well have been composed by the same author, except under the supposition that a considerable time intervened between the composition of the first and second portion. The contents of the latter-such as the complaints respecting gross idolatry, the sacrifice of children to idols, the wickedness of rulers, etc. seem to be applicable neither to the times of the exile, into which the prophet might have transported himself in the spirit, nor to the period of the pious Hezekiah, but are quite applicable to the reign of Manasseh. This last argument, however, is too subjective in its character to be of much weight; the difference of style referred to may be more readily accounted for by the difference in the topics treated of, and it is a gratuitous supposition that the national sins rebuked in the later prophecies had ceased during the reign of Hezekiah. The other arguments may be admitted so far as to allow a survivorship on the part of the prophet beyond the sickness of Hezekiah, and sufficiently into the reign of Manasseh to have suffered: martyrdom at the order of the latter, but it does not appear that he uttered any predictions during the fifteen added years of Hezekiah; at least none are found extant that seem to belong to that period (except ch. 40 to end, which may be assigned to the year ensuing Hezekiah's recovery); his great age and the absence of any special occasion may well account for his silence, and he may naturally be supposed to have occupied the time in writing down his former predictions. Nor will this view, which seems to meet all the requirements in the case, require to be extended a life-time; for if Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was called to the prophetical office in his youth, perhaps at twenty years of age, he would  have been but eighty years old at the accession of Manasseh (B.C. 696), an age no greater than that of Hosea, whose prophecies extend over the same period of sixty years (Hos 1:1).

III. Historical Works of Isaiah. — Besides the collection of prophecies which has been preserved to us, Isaiah also wrote two historical works (comp. Isa 36:3; Isa 36:22). It was part of the vocation of the prophets to write the history of the kingdom of God, to exhibit in' this history the workings of the law of retribution, and to exhort to the true worship of the Lord (see Augusti, Einleit. p. 290; Bertholdt, Einleit. 4, 1349). Most of the historical books in the Old Testament have been written by prophets. The collectors of the canon placed most of these books under the head prophets; hence it appears that, even when these historical works were remodeled by later editors, these editors were themselves prophets. The Chronicles are not placed among the prophetical books so called: we may therefore conclude that they were not written by a prophet. But their author constantly indicates that he composed his work from abstracts taken verbatim from historical monographies written by the prophets; consequently the books of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah and Esther are the only historical books of the Old Testament which did not originate from prophets.

The first historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Uzziah (comp. 2Ch 26:22), “Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write.” The second historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Hezekiah, which was subsequently inserted in the annals of Judah and Israel. These annals consisted of a series of prophetic monographies, which were received partly entire, partly in abstracts, and are the chief source from which the information contained in the Chronicles is derived. In this work of Isaiah, although its contents were chiefly historical, numerous prophecies were inserted. — Hence it is called in 2Ch 32:32, חֲזון יְשֵׁעְיָהוּ, The Vision of Isaiah. In a similar manner, the biography of Solomon by Ahijah is called in 2Ch 9:29, “the prophecy of Ahijah.” The two historical works of Isaiah were lost, together with the annals of Judah and Israel, into which they were embodied. Whatever these annals contained that was of importance for all ages, has been preserved to us by being received into the historical books of the Old Testament, and the predictions of the most distinguished  prophets have been formed into separate collections. After this was effected, less care was taken to preserve the more diffuse annals, which also comprehended many statements, of value only for particular times and places.

The so-called “Ascension of Isaiah” is a pseudepigraphal work of later times, originally written, it would seem, in Greek (Α᾿ναβατικὸν ᾿Ησαίου), of which only an old Latin translation (Ascensio Isaiae) was known to scholars, until Bp. Laurence discovered and published the Ethiopic version (Oxford, 1819, 8vo). It has also been edited with notes, etc., by Dillmann (Leips. 1877. 8vo). See Carpzov, Introduct. 3, p. 90; Gesenins, Comment. at Isaiah 1, 3 sq.; Knobel, Prophet. 2, 176 sq.; Stickel, in the Hall. Encyklop. II, 15:371 sq.; Stuart's Comment, on the Apocalypse, Introd.; Whiston, Authentic Records, 1:470; Gieseier, Visio Jesaiae illustrata (Gott. 1832); Gfrorer, Prophete veteres (Stuttg. 1840); Jolowicz, Himmefahrt u. Vision des Proph. Jes. (Lpz. 1854); De heemelvaart van den profeet Jesa.ja, in the Godgeleerde Bijdragen for 1862, pt. 7, p. 529- 601. SEE APOCRYPHA; SEE REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

IV. Integral Authenticity of the Prophecies of Isaiah. — The Jewish synagogue, and the Christian Church during all ages, have considered it as an undoubted fact that the prophecies which bear the name of Isaiah really originated from that prophet. Even Spinoza did not expressly assert, in his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus (8, 8), that the book of Isaiah consisted of a collection originating from a variety of authors, although it is usually considered that he maintained this opinion. But in the last quarter of the 18th century this prevailing conviction appeared to some divines to be inconvenient. All those who attack the integral authenticity of Isaiah agree in considering the book to be an anthology, or gleanings of prophecies, collected after the Babylonian exile, although they differ in their opinions respecting the origin of this collection. Koppe gave gentle hints of this view which was first explicitly supported by Eichhorn in his Introduction. Eichhorn advances the hypothesis that a collection of Isaian prophecies (which might have been augmented, even before the Babylonian exile, by several not genuine additions) formed the basis of the present anthology, and that the collectors, after the Babylonian exile, considering that the scroll on which they were written did not form a volume proportionate to the size of the three other prophetic scrolls containing Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the minor prophets, annexed to the Isaian collection all other oracles at hand whose authors were not-known to the editors. In this supposition of  the non-identity of date and authorship, many German scholars, and lately also Hitzig and Ewaid, followed Eichhorn. Gesenius, on the contrary, maintained, in his introduction to Isaiah, that all the non-Isaian prophecies extant in that book originated from one author, and were of the same date. Umbreit and Koster on the main point follow Gesenius, considering chaps. 40 to 66 to be a continuous whole, written by a pseudo-Isaiah who lived about the termination of the Babylonian exile.

In reference to other portions of the book of Isaiah, the authenticity of which has been questioned, Umbreit expresses himself doubtingly, and Kostor assigns them to Isaiah. Gesenius declines to answer the question how it happened that these portions were ascribed to Isaiah, but Hitzig felt that an answer to it might be expected. He accordingly attempts to explain why such additions were made to Isaiah, and not to any of the other prophetical books; by the extraordinary veneration in which Isaiah was held. He says that the great authority of Isaiah occasioned important and distinguished prophecies to be placed in connection with his name. But he himself soon after destroys the force of this assertion by observing that the great authority of Isaiah was especially owing to those prophecies which were falsely ascribed to him. A considerable degree of suspicion must, however, attach to the boasted certainty of such critical investigations, if we notice how widely these learned men differ in defininm what is of Isaian origin and what is not, although they are all linked together by the same fundamental tendency and interest. There are very few portions in the whole collection whose authenticity has not been called in question by some one or other of the various impugners. Almost every part has been attacked either by Derlein, or by Eichhorn (who, especially in a later work entitled Die Hebraischen Propheten, Götting. 1816 to 1819, goes farther than all the others), or by Justl (who, among the earlier adversaries of the integral authenticity of Isaiah, uses, in his Vermischte Schriften [vols. 1 and 2], the most comprehensive and, apparently, the best-grounded arguments), or by Paulus, Rosenmüller,-Bauer, Bertholdt. De Wette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald. Umbreit, or others.' The only portions left to Isaiah are chaps. 1, 3- 9; 17, 20, 28, 31, and 33. All the other chaps. are defended by some and rejected by others; they are also referred to widely different dates. In the most modern criticism, however, we observe an inclination again to extend the sphere of Isaian authenticity as much as the dogmatic principle and system of the critics will allow. Recent critics are therefore disposed to admit the genuineness of chaps. 1 to 23 with the only exception of the two  prophecies against Babylonian chaps. 13 and 14, and in chap. 21:1-10. Chapters 28-33 are allowed to be Isaian by Ewald, Umbreit, and others.

Divines who were not linked to these critics by the same dogmatical interest undertook to defend the integrity of Isaiah, as Hensler (Jesaias neu übersetzt 1788), Piper (Integritas esaiae. 1793), Beckhaus (Ueber die Integritat der Prophelischen Schriften, 1796), Jahn, in his Einleitung, who was the most able among the earlier advocates, Dereser, in his Bearbeitung des Jesaias, 4, 1, and Greve (Vaticinia Jesaice, Amsterdam, 1810). All these works have at present only a historical value, because they have been surpassed by two recent monographs. The first is by Jo. Ulrich Muller (De Authentia Oernalorum Jesaiae, chap. 40-46, Copenhagen, 1 1825). Although this work professedly defends only the latter portion of the book of Isaiah, there occur in it many arguments applicable also to the first portion. The standard work on this subject is that of Kleinert (Die Aechtheit des Jesaias, vol. 1, Berlin, 1829). It is, however, very diffuse, and contains too many hypotheses. The comprehensive work of Schleier ( Wirdigung der Einwürfe gegen die Altestamenflichen Weisscagungen in Jesaias, chap. 13 and 14) of course refers more especially to these chapters, but indirectly refers also to all the other portions whose authenticity has been attacked. Since the objections against the various parts of Isaiah are all of the same character, it is very inconsistent in Koster, in his work Die Propheten des alten Testamentes, to defend, in page 102, the genuineness of chaps. 13, 14, and 21, but nevertheless, in pages 117 and 297, to ascribe chaps. 40-66 to a pseudo Isaiah.

We have space here only to indicate the following reasons as establishing the integrity of the whole book, and as vindicating the authenticity of the second part:

1. Externally. — The unanimous testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition-Sir 48:24-25, which manifestly (in the words παρεκάλεσε τοὺς πενθοῦντας ἐν Σιών and ὑπέδειξε-τα ὑπόκρυφα πρὶν ἢ παραγενέσθαι αὐτά) refers to this second part. The use apparently made of the second part by Jeremiah (Jer 10:1-16; Jer 5:25; Jer 25:31), Ezekiel (Eze 23:40-41), and Zephaniah (Zep 2:15; Zep 3:10). The decree of Cyrus in Ezr 1:2-4, which plainly is founded upon Isa 44:28; Isa 45:1; Isa 45:13, accrediting Josephus's statement (Ant. 11:1, 2) that the Jews showed Cyrus Isaiah's predictions of him. The inspired testimony of the N.T., which often (Mat 3:3, and the parallel  passages; Luk 4:17; Act 8:28; Rom 10:16; Rom 10:20) quotes with specification of Isaiah's name prophecies found in the second part.

2. Internally. — The congruity of topic and sentiment in the last twenty- seven chapters with the preceding parts of the book. The oneness of diction which pervades the whole book. The peculiar elevation and grandeur of style which, as is universally acknowledged, distinguishes the whole contents of the second part as much as of the first, and which assigns their composition to the golden age of Hebrew literature. The absence of any other name than Isaiah's claiming the authorship. At the time to which the composition is assigned, a Zechariah or a Malachi could gain a separate name and book; how was it that an author of such transcendent gifts as “the great Unnamed” who wrote 40-66 could gain none? The claims which the writer makes to the foreknowledge of the deliverance by Cyrus, which claims, on the opposing view, must be regarded as a fraudulent personation of an earlier writer. Lastly, the predictions which it contains of the character, sufferings, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ: a believer in Christ cannot fail to regard those predictions as affixing to this second part the broad seal of divine inspiration, whereby the chief ground of objection against its having been written by Isaiah is at once annihilated.

For a full vindication of the authenticity of Isaiah, besides the above works, see professor Stuart On the Old Testam. Canon, p. 103 sq., and Dr. Davidson in the new edit of Horne's Introduction, 2, 835 sq., in which latter, especially, copious references are made to the latest literature on the subject. Other writers who have taken the same side are especially Hengstenberg in his Christology, vol. 2; Havernick, Einleitung vol. 3 (1849); Stier, in his Jesaias nicht Pseudo-Jesaias (1850); and Keil, in his Einleitung (1853), in which last the reader will find a most satisfactory compendium of the controversy, and of the grounds for the generally received view.

V. Origin, Contents, and Style of the Compilation. — No definite account respecting the method pursued in collecting into books the utterances of the prophets has been handed down to us. Concerning Isaiah as well as the rest, these accounts are wanting. We do not even know whether he collected his prophecies himself. But we have no decisive argument against this opinion. Those critics who reject the authenticity of the book are compelled to invent other authors, and, of course, different theories with  respect to compilers. None of these have proved satisfactory. (See the authorities above referred to.) According to the Talmudists, the book of Isaiah was collected by the men of Hezekiah. But this assertion rests merely upon Pro 25:1, where the men of Hezekiah are said to have. compiled the Proverbs. To us it seems impossible that Isaiah left it to others to collect his prophecies into a volume, because we know that he was the author of historical works, and it is not likely that a man accustomed to literary occupation would have left to others to do what he could do much better himself.

Chaps. 1-5 contain a series of rebukes, threatenings, and expostulations with the nation, especially Jerusalem its head, on account of the prevalent sins, and particularly idolatry. Chap. 6 describes a theophany and the prophet's own call, in the last year of Uzziah (to which the preceding chapters may also be assigned, with the exception of chap. Isa 1:2-31, which appears to belong to the first of Ahaz). What follows next, up to chap. Isa 10:4, belongs to the reign of Ahaz, and consists of a sublime prediction of the future consolation of Israel, in the first instance by the deliverance from surrounding enemies (especially Damascus and Samaria), and eventually by the Messiah, who is prefigured by historical signs. The same subject is- treated in a similar manner in the succeeding chapters (x-12), the deliverance from Assyria being there the historical type; this is the first portion appertaining to the reign of Hezekiah. Then follows a series of prophecies against foreign nations, in which the chronological arrangement has been departed from, and, instead of it, an arrangement according to contents has been adopted. In the days of Hezekiah, the nations of Western Asia, dwelling on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, more and more resembled a threatening tempest. The prophetic gift of Isaiah was more fully unfolded in sight of the Assyrian invasion under the reign of Hezekiah. Isaiah, in a series of visions, describes what Assyria would do, as a chastising rod in the hand of the Lord, and what the successors of the Assyrians, the Chaldees, would perform, according to the decree of God, in order to realize divine justice on earth, as well among Israel as among the heathen. The prophet shows that mercy is hidden behind the clouds of wrath. This portion comprises chaps. 13-35, the several prophecies of which were uttered at various times prior to the Assyrian invasion, although isolated portions appear to belong to previous reigns (e.g. chap. 17 to the occasion of the alliance of Ahaz. with Tiglath-pileser; chap. Isa 14:28-32, to the death of Ahaz). With the termination of this war  terminated also the public life of Isaiah, who added a historical section in chaps. 36-39, in order to facilitate the right understanding of the prophecies uttered by him during the most fertile period of his prophetic ministry. Then follows the conclusion of his work on earth (chaps. 40 to the end), composed during the peaceful residue of Hezekiah's reign, and containing a closely connected series of the most spiritual disclosures touching the future history of the nation under the Messiah. This second part, which contains his prophetic legacy, is addressed to the small congregation of the faithful strictly so called; it is analogous to the last speeches of Moses in the fields of Moab, and to the last speeches of Christ in the circle of his disciples, related by John.

The proclamation of the Messiah is the inexhaustible source of consolation among the prophets. In Isaiah this consolation is so clear that some fathers of the Church were inclined to style him rather evangelist than prophet. The following are the outlines of Messianic prophecies in the book of Isaiah: A scion of David, springing from his family, after it has fallen into a very low estate, but being also of divine nature, shall, at first in lowliness, but as a prophet filled with the spirit of God, proclaim the divine doctrine, develop the law in truth, and render it the animating principle of national life; he shall, as high-priest, by his vicarious suffering and his death, remove the guilt of his nation, and that:of other nations, and finally rule as a mighty king, not only over the covenant-people, but over all nations of the earth who will subject themselves to his peaceful scepter, not by violent compulsion, but induced by love and gratitude. He will make both the moral and the physical consequences of sin to cease; the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and all enmity, hatred, and destruction shall be removed even from the brute creation. This is the survey of the Messianic preaching by Isaiah, of which he constantly renders prominent those portions which were most calculated to impress the people under the then existing circumstances. The first part of Isaiah is directed to the whole people, consequently the glory of the Messiah is here dwelt upon. The fear lest the kingdom of God should be overwhelmed by the power of heathen nations is removed by pointing out the glorious king to come, who would elevate the now despised and apparently mean kingdom of God above all the kingdoms of this world. In the second part, which is more particularly addressed to the ἐκλογή, the elect, than to the whole nation, the prophet exhibits the Messiah more as a divine teacher and high priest. The prophet here preaches righteousness through the blood  of the servant of God, who will support the weakness of sinners, and take upon himself their sorrows.

Isaiah stands pre-eminent above all other prophets, as well in the contents and spirit of his predictions, as also in their form and style. Simplicity, clearness, sublimity, and freshness, are the never-failing characters ‘of his prophecies. Even Eichhorn mentions, among the first merits of Isaiah, the concinnity of his expressions, the beautiful outline of his images, and the fine execution of his speeches. In reference to richness of imagery he stands between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Symbolic actions, which frequently occur in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, seldom occur in Isaiah. The same is the case with visions, strictly so called, of which there is only one, namely, that in chap. 6, and even it is distinguished by its simplicity and clearness above that of the later prophets. But one characteristic of Isaiah is, that he likes to give signs-that is, a fact then present, or near at hand-as a pledge for the more distant futurity, and that he thus supports the feebleness of man (comp. 7-20; 37:30; 38:7 sq.). The instances in chaps. 7 and 38 show how much he was convinced of his vocation, and in what intimacy he lived with the Lord, by whose assistance alone lie could effect what he offers to do in the one passage, and what he grants in the other. The spiritual riches of the prophet are seen in the variety of his style, which always befits the subject. When he rebukes and threatens it is like a storm, and when he comforts his language is as tender and mild as (to use his own words) that of a mother comforting her son. With regard to style, Isaiah is comprehensive, and the other prophets divide his riches.

Isaiah enjoyed an authority proportionate to his gifts. We learn from history how great this authority was during his life, especially under the reign of Hezekiah. Several of his most definite prophecies were fulfilled while he was yet alive; for instance, the overthrow of the kingdoms of Syria and Israel; the invasion of the Assyrians, and the divine deliverance from it; the prolongation of life granted to Hezekiah; and several predictions against foreign nations. Isaiah is honorably mentioned in the historical books. The later prophets, especially Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, clearly prove that his book was diligently read, and that his prophecies were attentively studied. The authority of the prophet greatly increased after the fulfillment of his prophecies by the Babylonian exile, the victories of Cyrus, and the deliverance of the covenant-people. Even Cyrus (according to the account in Josephus, Ant. 11:1, 1 and 2) was induced to set the Jews at liberty by  the prophecies of Isaiah concerning himself. Jesus Sirach (Sir 48:22-25) bestows splendid praise upon Isaiah, and both Philo and Josephus speak of him with great veneration. He attained the highest degree of authority after the times of the New Testament had proved the most important part of his prophecies, namely, the Messianic, to be divine. Christ and the apostles quote no prophecies so frequently as those of Isaiah, in order to prove that he who had appeared was one and the same with him who had been promised. The fathers of the Church abound in praises of Isaiah. — Kitto; Smith. SEE MESSIAH.

VI. The following are express commentaries on the whole of the book of Isaiah, the most important being designated by an asterisk (\*) prefixed: Origen, Fragmenta (in Opp. 3:104); also Homiliea (in Jerome, Opp. 4:1097); Eusebius, Commentar-2 (in Montfaucon's Collectio Nova); Ephrem Syrus, Enarratio (from the Syr. in Opp. I, 2, 535); Basil, Enarratio (Gr. in his Op 6. I, 2, 535; tr. in Lat., Basle, 1518, 4to); Jerome, Commentarii (in Opp. 4:1); also Adbreviatio (ib. 4:1131); Chrysostom, Interpretatio [on 1-8] (Gr. in Opp. 6:1); Cyril, Commentarii (Gr. in. Opp. 2, 1 sq.); Theodoret, Interpretation [in Greek] (in Opp. II, 1); Procopius, Epitome (Gr. and Lat., Par. 1580, fol.); Rupertus, In Esaianm (in Opp. 1, 429); Herveus, Commentarii (in Pez, Thesaur. III, 1); S. Jarchi [i.e. “Rashi”], Commentarius (from the Heb. edit. Breithaupt, Goth. 1713, 1714, 3 vols. 4to); D. Kimchi, Commentarius (from the Heb. by Malamineus, Florence, 1774, 4to); Abrabanel, פֵּרוּש ׁ (ed. L'Empereur, Lugd. B. 1631, 8vo); Aquinas, Commentarii (Lugd. 1531, 8vo; also in Opp. 2); Luther, Enarrationes (in Opp. 3:294); Melancthon, Argumentum (in Opp. 3:398); (Ecolampadius, Hyponematon (Basil. 1525, 1567, 4to); Zuinglius, Complanatio (Tigur. 1529, fol.; also in Opp. 3. 163); Dieterich, Auslegug (Norimb. 1543,4to); Calvin, Commentarii (Genesis 1551, 1559, 1570, 1583, 1587, 1617, fol.; in French, ib. 1552, 4to; 1572, fol.; in English by Colton, Lond. 1609, fol. by Pringle, Edinb. 1850,4 vols. 8vo); Day, Exposition (London, 1654, fol.); Musculus, Commentarius (Basil. 1557, 1570, 1600, 1623, fol.); Borrhasius, Commentarii (Basil. 1561. fol.); Draconis, Commentarius (Lipsiae, 1563, fol.); Strigel, Conciones (Lipsice, 1563, 12mo); Forerius, Commentaria (Venice, 1563, fol.; Antwerp, 1565, 8vo; also in the Critici Sacri, 4); Sasbouth, Commentarius (Argent. 1563, 8vo); Marloratus, Expositio (Par. 1564; Genesis 1610, fol.); Pintus, Commentaria (Lugd. 1561,1567; Antw. 1567,1572, fol.); Gualtherus, Homiliae (Tigur. 1567, folio); Bullinger, Expositio (Tigur. 1567, folio);  Selnecker, Erklar. (Lpz. 1569, 4to); Castri, Commentaria (Salam. 1570, folio); De Palacios, Dilucidationes (Salam. 1572,3 vols. fol.); Schnepf, SchoIac (Tub. 1575, 1583, fol.); Osorius, Paraphrasis (Bonon. 1576, 4to; Col. Agr. 1579, 1584, 8vo); Ursinus, Commentarius (in Opp. 3); Wigand, Adnotationes (Erford. 1581, 8vo); Guidell, Commentarius (Perus. 1598- 1600, 2 vols. 4to) Montanus; Commentarii (Antw. 1599, 2 vols. 4to); D. Alvarez, Commentarii (Rome, 1599-1702, 2 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1716, fol.); Arcularius, Commentarius (ed. Mentzer, Frankfort, 1607; Lips. 1653, 8vo); Arama, וְתֻמַּים אוּרַים (Ven. 1608, 8vo; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible); Sancius, Commentarius (Lugd. 1615; Antwerp and Mogunt. 1616, fol.); Heshusius, Commentarius (Hal. 1617, fol.); Forster, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1620, 1664, 1674, 1679, 4to); Oleastre, Commentarii (Par. 1622, 1656, fol.); a Lapide, In Esaiam (Antw. 1622, folio); G. Alvarez, Expositio (Lugd. 1623, fol.); De Arcones, Elucidastio (Lugd. 1642, 2 vols. folio); Di Marino, תַּקּוּן עוֹלָם (Verona, 1652, 4to); Laisne, Commentaire (Paris, 1654, fol.); Lafiado, כְּלַי פָּז (Ven. 1657, fol.); Varenus, Commentarius. (Rost. 1673, 1708, 4to); Brentius, Commentarius (in Opp. 4, Tub. 1675); Jackson, Annotations (London, 1682, 4to); S. Schmid, Commentarius (ed. Sandhagen, Hamb. 1693,1695,1702, 1723, 4to); Sibersma, Commentarius (Anst. 1700,4to); Cocceius, Commentarius (in Opp. 2, Amst. 1701); Dorsche, Commentarius (ed. Fecht, Hamb. 1703, 4to); Hellenbroek, Erklarung (Rotterdam, 1704, 4 vols. 4to) Schmuck, Praelectiones (edit. Vlich, Dresd. 1708, 4to); White, Commentary (Lond. 1709, 4to); Kortum, Untersuchung (Lpz. 1709, 4to); \*Vitringa, Commentarius, Louv. 1714-20, 1724, 2 vols. fol.; in German, Herb. 1715-22, 2 vols. fol.; the last abridged by Busching, Hal 1749, 4to); Petersen, Erklarung. (Frckft. 1719, 4to); Leigh. Commentar (Brunsw. 1725-34, 6 vols. 4to); Hoheisel, Observationes (Gedan. 1729, 8vo); Le Clerc, Commentarius (an abstract, Amsterdam, 1731, fol.); Woken, Erklarung. (Lpz. 1732, 8vo); Duguet, Explication (in French, Paris, 1734,5 vols. 121no); Rambach, Erklarung (Zür. 1741, 4to); Reichel, Erlaut. (Lpz. and Gorl. 175559, 16 pts. 8vo); Vogel, Unsschreibung (Hal. 1771, 8vo); Struensee, Uebers. (Halb. 1773, 8vo); Crusius, Hypomnenzata (Lips. 1773, 8vo); \*Lowth, Commentary (Lond. — 1774, 1778, 4to; and frequently since in many forms; finally in connection with the notes of Bp. Patrick and others, in 4 vols. 8vo, Lond. and Philadelphia); Walther, Anmerk. (Hal. 1774, 4to); \*Doderlein, Notae (Altd. 1775, 1780, 1783, 8vo); Holden, Paraphrase (Chelmsf. 1776, 2  vols. 8vo); Rambach, Anmersk. [to tr. of Matt. Henry's] (Lpz. 1777,8vo); Sponsel, Abhandlung (Nurenb. 177980,2 vols. 4to); Koppe, Anmerk. Cto Lowth] (Lpz. 177981,4 vols. 8vo); Moldenhauer, Anmerk. (Quedlinb. 1780, 4to); Weise, Redan (Halle, 1780, 8vo); \*Seiler. Erldut. (Erl. 1783, 8vo); Cube, Anmerk. (Berlin, 1785-6, 2 vols. 8vo); Rieger, Scholien (Memming. 1788, 8vo); Henssler, Anmerk. (Hamb. and Kiel, 1788, 8vo); Berthier, Notes [French] (Paris, 1789, 5 vols. 12mo); Kocher, Vindicie (Tribing. 1790, 8vo); Dodson, Notes (Lond. 1790, 8vo); Krigelius, Bearbeitung (Brem. 1790, 8vo); Macculloch. Lectures (Lond. 1791-1805, 4 vols. 8vo); Paulus, Clavis (Jena, 1793,8vo); Fraser, Commentary (Edinburgh, 1800, 8vo); Bp. Stock. Translation (Bath, 1805, 4to);Van der Palm, Anmerk. [Dutch] (Amst. 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); Ottensosser, בַּאוּר (Firth, 1807, 8vo); Dereser, Erklarung (Frckft. a. M. 1808, 8vo); \*Gesenius, Commentar (Lpz. 1821-9, 3 vols. 8vo); Horsley, Notes (in Biblical Criticism, 1, 229); Möller, Anmerk. [Danish] (Copenh. 1822, 8vo); De Liere, Traduction (Paris, 1823, 8vo); Knas, Enodatio (Upsal. 1824,8vo); Jones, Translation (Oxford, 1830, 8vo; 1842, 12mo); Jenour, Notes (London, 1830, 2 vols. 8vo); Hendewerk, Erklarung. (Konigsberg, 1830-44, 2 vols. 8vo); Möller, Erklarung. (Brem. 1831, 8vo, pt. 1); Hitzig, Auslegung (Heidelb. 1833, 8vo); Maurer, Commentarius (Lpz. 1836, 8vo); Barnes, Notes (Bost. 1840, 3 vols. 8vo; abridged, N. Y. 1848, 2 vols. 12mo); \*Henderson, Commentary (London, 1840, 1857,. 8vo); Govett, Notes (Lond. 1841, 8vo); \*Umbreit, Commentar (Hamb. 184142, 2 vols. 8vo); Heinemann, מַקְרָא מְפֹרָש ׁ (Berl. 1842, 8vo); \*Knobel, Erklarung (Lpz. 1843. 8vo); Dreschler, Erklar. (Stuttg. 1845-9, 3 vols. 8vo); \*Alexander, Commentary (N. Y. 1846-7, 1865, 2 vols: 8vo; Glasgow, 1848, 8vo; abridged, N. York, 1851,2 vols. 12mo); Stier, Nicht Pseudo- Jesaias (Barmen, 1850, 2 pts. 8vo); Smithson, Translation (Lond. 1860,8vo); Keith,Commentary (London, 1850, 8vo); Meier, Erklar. (pt. 1, Pforzh. 1850, 8vo); Whish, Paraphrase (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Williams, Commentary (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Diedrich, Erklar. (Lpz. 1859, 8vo); Renner, Auslegung (Stuttg. 1865, 8vo); Luzatto, Commenti [in Heb.] (Padova, 1865-7, 2 vols. 8vo); Second, Commentaire (Genev. 1866, 8vo); \*Delitzsch, Commentar (in Keil and Delitzsch's series, Lpz. 1866; tr. in Clarke's Library, Edinb. 1867,2 vols. 8vo); Cheyne, Notes (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Ewald, Commentary (chaps. 1-33, transl. from the Germ. by Glover, London, 1869, 12mo); Neteler, Grundlage (Munst. 1869, 8vo); Birks, Commentary (Lond. 1871, 8vo). SEE PROPHET.

## Isauites[[@Headword:Isauites]]

             SEE OBADIAH (ABU-ISA).

## Isbraniki[[@Headword:Isbraniki]]

             a sect of Russian dissenters, which arose about the middle of the 16th century. The name which they assumed means the company of the elect, but they were reckoned by the adherents of the established religion among the Raskolniks (q.v.) or Schismatics. The cause of their separation was a difficulty concerning the revision of the church books. These books were printed in 1562, under the czar, John Basilides, from manuscript copies, which, being considered incorrect, were somewhat altered in their printed form. The changes introduced were regarded by some as teaching unsound doctrine, and a sect arose who adhered to the former books, and called themselves Starovertsi, or believers in the old faith. These dissenters, however, were comparatively few in number till about the middle of the following century, when, in consequence of a revision of the church books by the patriarch Nikon, the cry of unsound doctrine was again raised, and the number of dissenters increased. This sect was tolerated by the state under Alexander I.

## Iscah[[@Headword:Iscah]]

             (Heb. Yiskah', יַסְכָּה, spy; Sept. Ι᾿εσχά), the daughter of Haran, and sister of Milcah and Lot (Gen 11:29; comp. Gen 11:31). Jewish tradition, as in Josephus (Ant. 1, 6, 5), Jerome (Qucest. in Genesin), and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, identifies her with SARAH SEE SARAH (q.v.).

## Iscariot[[@Headword:Iscariot]]

             (Ι᾿σκαριώτης, probably from Heb. קְרַיּוֹת אַישׁ, man of Kerioth), a surname of Judas the traitor, to distinguish him from others of the same name (Mat 10:4, and often). SEE KERIOTH; SEE JUDAS.

## Isdael[[@Headword:Isdael]]

             (Ι᾿σδαήλ,Vulg. Gaddahel), the name of one of the heads of families of “Solomon's servants” that returned from the captivity (1Es 5:33); evidently the GIDDEL SEE GIDDEL (q.v.) of the Heb. texts (Ezr 2:56; Neh 7:58).

## Ise[[@Headword:Ise]]

             (or Isje), the name of a central province of Japan, to which the religious sect of the Shiutrists requires each of its adherents to make a pilgrimage once a year, or at least once in their life. In Isje is the grand Mia or temple of Teusio-Dai-Jin, which is the model after which all the other temples are built. Isje is a place of no natural attractions. It is rather regarded as a monument of antique poverty and simplicity. The Mia where the pilgrims pay their devotions is a low wooden edifice with a flat thatched roof, and on entering nothing is to be seen but a metallic mirror, which is regarded as a symbol of the deity, and some white paper, which is considered the emblem of purity of heart. The worshippers do not presume to enter this temple, but look through a lattice window from without while they say their prayers.

## Iselin, Isaac[[@Headword:Iselin, Isaac]]

             a German philosopher and philanthropist, was born at Basle March 27, 1728. He was educated at the university for the law profession, but much of his time was devoted to the study of philosophy, and he deserves our notice as the author of a Geschichte d. Menschheit (Frkf. and Lpz. 1764, 2 vols. 8vo. and often), and Tratüme eines Menschenfreundes (Zurich, 1758, 8vo, and often). He was a very conspicuous helper of Basedor (q.v.) in the philosophic efforts of the latter, founded a “society for the public good” at Basle aided in founding the Helvetic Society (1761), in which Hirzel, Sarasin, Pfeffel, and others took part, and was, in short, one of the most prominent leaders in the humanitarianism or philanthropism which flourished in, the second half of last century in Germany, and more especially in Switzerland. Isaac Iselin died June 15, 1782. See Hurst's Hagenbach, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Cent. 1, sect. 14; professor Vischer, Program (Basle, 1841, 4to). (J. H. W.)

## Iselin, James Christopher[[@Headword:Iselin, James Christopher]]

             a Swiss Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Basle June 12, 1681. After he had acquired a good knowledge of the classics, and especially of Greek, he. applied himself to the study of Hebrew and theology. He was ordained in 1701, and in 1705 was appointed professor of history and rhetoric at Marburg. In 1707 he returned to Basle, and became successively professor of history, of antiquities, and finally (1711) of theology, in the university of that place. In 1716 he visited France (he had previously made a journey there in 1698), and was warmly received at Paris by chancellor D'Aguesseau. In 1717 he was elected member of the Academie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Iselin died April 14,1737. He had been in relation with some of the most eminent men of his day, such as cardinal Passionei, the archbishop of Canterbury, Wake, the marquis Beretti Laudi, ambassador of Spain, etc. He wrote In Sententiam Jac. Benj. Bossuet de Babylone bestiisque et meretrice Apocalypseos (Basle, 1701, 4to): — Specimen observationum atque conjecturaruna ad orientalem philologiam et criticen pertinentium (Basle, 1704, 4to): — De Magorum in Persia Dominatione (Marb. 1707,4to): — issertatio qua mndi ceternitas argumentis historicis confutatur (1709,4to):De Canone Novi Testamenti (in Miscellanea Groningana, vl. 3), against Dodwell: etc. He also contributed a number of articles to the Mercure Suisse (1-734-5), etc. See Beck, Vita Iselini (Tempe Helvetica, vol. 3): Eloge d'lselin (Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscriptions, vol. 6); Schelhorn, Lebensbeschr. Iselin's (Acta Hist. Eccles. vol. 2; 3:1156; 4:1160); Moreri, Dict.; Chauffepie, Dict.; J. R. Iselin, Laudatio Iselini. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 26:50 (J. N. P.)

## Isenbiehl, Johann Laurenz[[@Headword:Isenbiehl, Johann Laurenz]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born on the Eichsfeld in 1744. Of his early history we know nothing, but in 1773 we find him appointed to the position of professor of the Oriental languages and exegetical literature at Mentz. As his first theme before the students over whom he had been chosen to preside, he selected the interpretation of Isa 7:14. He advanced the opinion that it was erroneous to attribute any connection to this passage with Mat 1:23, and asserted that it did not at all refer to Immanuel the Christ, or to Mary, the mother of Christ; that Matthew only alluded to this passage because of its similarity with the circumstances of the birth of Christ. Of course he was at once deposed from his position,  and as is customary among Roman Catholics, deprived of his personal liberty on account of propagating and cherishing heretical opinions. He was returned to the theological seminary for further instruction, and released two years after. In 1778, however, he appeared before the public, defending his original opinion under the title of Neuer Versuch uber d. Weissgungen v. Immanuel (Coblenz). He had meanwhile been reappointed to the professional dignity, and his persistency in defending his peculiar interpretations again deprived him of his position, and he was once more imprisoned and put on trial. His book was forbidden to all good Roman Catholics by all archbishops and bishops, and in 1779 a bull was issued against it by the pope. In the interim he had made his escape from prison, but, finding the ecclesiastical authorities all opposed to him, he recalled his former opinion, and was honored with ecclesiastical dignity (1780). In 1803 his income was reduced to a small pension, and he lived in want until his death in 1818. Isenbiehl also wrote on the diacritical points under the title of Corpus decisionum dogmaticarum. See Walch, Neueste Relig. Geschichte, 8, 9 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. s. d. Ref. 7, 203 sq.; Henke, Kirchengesch. 7, 199 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handw. d. Kirchengesch. 2, 507. (J. H. W.)

## Ish-bosheth[[@Headword:Ish-bosheth]]

             [many Ish'-bosheth,' (Heb. Ish-bo'sheth, אַישׁאּבּשֶׁת, man of shame, i.e. bashful, otherwise disgraceful; Sept. Ι᾿σβόσεθ v. r. Ι᾿εβοσθέ, Joseph. Ι᾿έβοσθος, Vulg. Isboseth), the youngest of Saul's four sons, and his legitimate successor, being the only one who survived him (2 Samuel 2-4).. His name appears (1Ch 8:35; 1Ch 9:39) to have been originally. ESHBAAL, אַשׂאּבִּעִל, “the man of Baal.” Whether this indicates that Baal was used as equivalent to Jehovah, or that the reverence for Baal still lingered in Israelitish families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name (Ish-bosheth, “the man of shame”) by which he is commonly known must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandalous sound of Baal from the name of an Israelitish king see Ewald, Isr. Gesch. 2, 383), and superseding it by the contemptuous word (Bosheth. — ”shame”) which was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (Jer 3:24; Jer 11:13; Hos 9:10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (Jdg 8:35) into Jerubbesheth (2Sa 11:21); Meri-baal (2Sa 4:4) into Mephibosheth (1Ch 8:34; 1Ch 9:40). The last three cases all occur in Saul's family. SEE SAUL.

He is thought by some to be the same with ISHUI (יַשְׁוַי, 1 14:49), these two names having considerable resemblance; but this is forbidden by 1Sa 31:2, comp. with 1Ch 8:33. SEE ABINADAB.

He appears to have been forty years of age at the time of the battle of Gilboa (B.C. 1053), in which he was not himself present, but in which his father and three older brothers perished; and therefore, according to the law of Oriental, though not of European succession, he ascended the throne, as the oldest of the royal family, rather than Mephibosheth, son of his elder brother Jonathan, who was a child of five years old. Too feeble of himself to seize the scepter which had just fallen from the hands of Saul, he was immediately taken under the care of Abner, his powerful kinsman, who brought him to the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim, on the east of the Jordan, beyond the reach of the victorious Philistines, and he was there recognized as king by ten of the twelve tribes (2Sa 2:8-9). There was a momentary doubt even in those remote tribes whether they should not close with the offer of David to be their king (2Sa 2:7; 2Sa 3:17). But this was overruled in favor of Ish-bosheth by Abner (2Sa 3:17), who then for five years slowly but effectually restored the dominion of the house of Saul over the trans-Jordanic territory, the plain of Esdraelon, the central mountains of Ephraim, the frontier tribe of  Benjamin, and eventually “over all Israel” (except the tribe of Judah, 2Sa 3:9). In 2Sa 2:10 Ish-bosheth is said to have reigned two years, which some understand as the whole amount of his reign. As David reigned seven and a half years over Judah before he became king of all Israel upon the death of Ish-bosheth, it is conceived by the Jewish chronologer (Seder Olam Rabba, p. 37), as well as by Kimchi and others, that there was a vacancy of five years in the throne of Israel. ‘It is not, however, agreed by those who entertain this opinion whether this vacancy took place before or after the reign of Ish-bosheth. Some think it was before, it being then a matter of dispute whether he or Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, should be made king; but others hold that after his death five years elapsed before David was generally recognized as king of all Israel. If the reign of Ish-bosheth be limited to two years, the latter is doubtless the best way of accounting for the other five, since no ground of delay in the succession of Ish-bosheth is suggested in Scripture itself; for the claim of Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, which some have produced, being that of a lame boy five years old, whose father never reigned, against a king's son forty years-of age, would have been deemed of little weight in Israel. Besides, our notions of Abner do not allow us to suppose that under him the question of the succession could have remained five years in abeyance. But it is the more usual, and perhaps the better course, to settle this question by supposing that the reigns of David over Judah, and of Ish-bosheth over Israel, were nearly contemporaneous, namely, about seven years each; and that the two years named are only the first of this period, being mentioned as those from which to date the commencement of the ensuing events--namely, the wars between the house of Saul and that of David. This appears to be the view taken by Josephus (Ant. 7, 1, 3; comp. 2, 1).

Ish-bosheth thus reigned seven, or, as some will have it, two years-if a power so uncertain as his can be called a reign. Even the semblance of authority which he possessed he owed to the will and influence of Abner, who kept the real control of affairs in his own hands. The wars and negotiations with David were entirely carried on by Abner (2Sa 2:11; 2Sa 3:6; 2Sa 3:12). After various skirmishes between the forces of the rival kings, a pitched battle was fought, in which the army of David under Joab was completely victorious. After this the interest of David continually waxed stronger, while that of Ish-bosheth declined (2Sa 3:1). At length Ish-bosheth accused Abner (whether rightly or wrongly does not appear) of an attempt on his father's concubine, Rizpah, which, according to Oriental usage, amounted to treason (2Sa 3:7;  comp. 1Ki 2:13; 2Sa 16:21; 2Sa 20:3). Although accustomed to tremble before Abner, even Ish-bosheth's temper was roused to resentment by the discovery that Abner had thus invaded the harem of his late father Saul, which was in a peculiar manner sacred under his care as a son and a king. By this act Abner exposed the king to ‘public contempt, if it did not indeed leave himself open to the suspicion of intending to advance a claim to the crown on his own behalf Abner resented this suspicion in a burst of passion, which vented itself in a solemn vow to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul to the house of David, a purpose which from this time he appears steadily to have kept in view. Ish- bosheth was too much cowed to answer; and when, shortly afterwards, through Abner's negotiation, David demanded the restoration of his former wife, Michal, he at once tore his sister from her reluctant husband, and committed her to Abner's charge (2Sa 3:14-15). It is, perhaps, right to attribute this act to his weakness; although, as David allows that he was a righteous man (2Sa 4:10), it may have been owing to his sense of justice. This trust seems to have given Abner a convenient opportunity to enter into negotiations with David; but in the midst of them he himself fell a victim to the resentment of Joab for the death of Abishai. The death of Abner deprived the house of Saul of their last remaining support. SEE ABNER.

When Ish-bosheth heard of it, “his hands were feeble, and all the Israelites were troubled” (2Sa 4:1). In this extremity of weakness he fell a victim, probably, to a revenge for a crime of his father. The guard of Ish-bosheth, as of Saul, was taken from their own royal tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 12:29). But among the sons of Benjamin were reckoned the descendants of the old Canaanitish inhabitants of Beeroth, one of the cities in league with Gibeon (2Sa 4:2-3). Two of those Beerothites, Baana and Rechab, in remembrance, it has been conjectured, of Saul's slaughter of their kinsmen the Gibeonites, determined to take advantage of the helplessness of the royal house to destroy the only ‘representative that was left, excepting the child Mephibosheth (2Sa 4:4). They were “chiefs of the marauding troops” which used from time to time to attack the territory of Judah (comp. 2Sa 4:2; 2Sa 3:22, where the same word גְּדוּדis used; Vulg. princim es latronum). They knew the habits of the king and court, and acted accordingly. In the stillness of ail Eastern noon they entered the palace, as if to carry off the wheat which was piled up near the entrance. The female slave,' who, as usual in Eastern houses, kept the door, and was herself sifting the wheat, had, in the heat of the day, fallen asleep at her  task (2Sa 4:5-6, in Sept. and Vulg.). They stole in, and passed into the royal bedchamber, where Ish-bosheth was asleep on his couch during his midday siesta. They stabbed him in the stomach, cut off his head, made their escape, all that afternoon, all that night, down the valley of the Jordan (Arabah, A.V. “plain;” 2Sa 4:7), and presented the head to David as a welcome present. B.C. 1046. They met with a stern reception from the monarch, who-as both right feeling and good policy required- testified the utmost horror and concern. He rebuked them for the cold- blooded murder of an innocent man, and ordered them to be executed; their hands and feet were cut off, and their bodies suspended over the tank at Hebron. The head of Ish-bosheth was carefully buried in the sepulchre of his great kinsman Abner, at the same place (2Sa 4:9-12). SEE DAVID. I'shi (Heb. Yishi', יַשְׁעַי, salutary; Sept. Ι᾿εσεί, ῎Ες, Ι᾿εσεϊv), the name of four men.

1. The son of Appaim, and father of Sheshan, the eighth in descent from Judah (1Ch 2:31). B.C. prob. post 1612.

2. The father of Zoheth and Ben-zoheth, a descendant of Judah, but through what line does not appear (1Ch 4:20). The name is possibly a corruption for the ISMIBAH of 1Ch 4:17. B.C. perh. cir. 1017.

3. Father (progenitor) of several (four only are named) Simeonites who invaded Mt. Seir and dispossessed the Amalekites (1Ch 4:42). B.C. ante 726.

4. One of the chiefs of Manasseh East, of famous valor (1Ch 5:24). B.C. cir. 720.

## Isham, Chester[[@Headword:Isham, Chester]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in 1798, and, after a course of preparatory study at the Latin Grammar School in Hartford, Conn., entered Yale College, where he graduated in 1820. Shortly afterwards he went to Andover Seminary to prepare for the ministry, upon which he had decided soon after his conversion while at Yale College. In 1824. on the completion of his theological course of study, he accepted a call to a newly-formed church at Taunton, where he had been preaching during the latter part of the last year spent at Anidover. But the great exertions which the work demanded of him were too severe upon his constitution, and the symptoms of consumption appearing shortly after, he went South in the hope of recovering his health. He continued failing, however, and returned to Boston April 19th, to die among his friends. Dr. Leonard Bacon, who was a classmate of Chester Isham at Yale, speaks very highly of his attainments and religious bearing, in Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, 2, 704 sq.

## Ishaneki[[@Headword:Ishaneki]]

             (elect band), a Russian sect which arose in 1666, under the fear that the printed Church books were tainted with error, since they differed from the old MS. copies which had been so long in use. They stoutly adhere to the letter of Scripture, deny different orders among the clergy, and any gradation of rank among the people, but under Alexander I obtained toleration, though they had previously been exposed to constant persecution. See Eckardt, Modern Russia, S. V.

## Ishbah[[@Headword:Ishbah]]

             (Hebrew Yzshbach, יַשְבָּח, praiser; Sept. Ι᾿εσαβά), a descendant of Judah, and founder (“father”) of Eshtemoa (q.v.); he probably was a son of Mered by his wife Hodiah (1Ch 4:17). B.C. post 1612. SEE MEFRED. He is perhaps the same as ISHI SEE ISHI (q.v.) in 1Ch 4:20, and apparently identical with the NAHAM SEE NAHAM (q.v.) of 1Ch 4:19.

## Ishbak[[@Headword:Ishbak]]

             (Heb. Yishbak', יַשְׁבָּק, leaner; Sept. Ι᾿εσβώκ, Ι᾿εσβόκ), one of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen 25:2; 1Ch 1:32). B.C. post 2024. We are told that Abraham “gave gifts” to the sons of Keturah, “and sent them away from Isaac his son eastward, unto the east country” (Gen 25:1-6). They settled in the region east of the Arabah, in and near Mount Seir, and southward in the peninsula of Sinai (Gen 37:28; Gen 37:36; Exo 3:1; Num 31:9-10). SEE KETURAH.

The settlements of this people are very obscure, and Poole (in Smith's Dict. of the Bible, s.v.) suggests as possible that they may be recovered in the name of the valley called Sabdk, or, as it is also called, “Sibdk, in the Dahnk” (Maarasid, s.v.). The Heb. root precisely corresponds to the Arabic (sabaq) in etymology and signification. The Dahna, in which is situate Sabiak, is a fertile and extensive tract belonging to the Beni-Temim. in Nejd, or the highland of Arabia, on the northeast of it, and the borders of the great desert, reaching from the rugged tract (“hazn”) of Yensf'ah to the sands of Yebrin. It contains much pasturage, with comparatively few wells, and is greatly frequented by the Arabs when the vegetation is plentiful (Mushtarak and Mardsid, s.v.). There is, however, another Dahna, nearer to the Euphrates (ib.), and some confusion may exist regarding the true position of Sabak; but either Dahna is suitable for the settlements of  Ishbak. The first-mentioned Dahna lies in a favorable portion of the widely stretching country known to have been peopled by the Keturahites. They extended from the borders of Palestine even to the Persian Gulf, and traces of their settlements must be looked for all along the edge of the Arabian peninsula, where the desert merges into the cultivable land, or (itself a rocky undulating plateau) rises to the wild, mountainous country of Nejd. Ishbak seems from his name to have preceded or gone before his brethren: the place suggested for his dwelling is far away towards the Persian Gulf, and penetrates also into the peninsula. SEE ARABIA.

There are many places, however, of an almost similar derivation (root shabak), as Shebek, Shibdk, and Esh-Shobak; the last of which has especially been supposed (as by Schwarz, Palest. p. 215; Bunsen, Bibelwerk, I, 2, 53) to preserve a trace of Ishbak. It is a fortress in Arabia Petraea, and is near the well- known fortress of the Crusaders' times called El-Karerk. This great castle of Shobek “stands on the top of the mountain range which bounds the valley of Arabah on the east, and about twelve miles north of Petra, on the crest of a peak commanding a wide view. It was built by Baldwin, king of Jerusalem, in A.D. 1115, on the site of a much more ancient fortress and city, and it was one of the chief strongholds of the Crusaders. The name they gave it was Mons Regalis; but by the Arabs, both before and since, it has been uniformly called Shobek. It was finally taken from the Franks by Saladin in A.D. 1188 (Gesta Dei Per Fancos, p. 426, 611, 812; Bohadin, Vita Saladini, p. 38, 54, and Index Geographicus, s.v. Sjanbachum). The castle is still in tolerable preservation, and a few families of Arabs find within its walls a secure asylum for themselves and their flocks. It contains an old church, with a Latin inscription of the crusading age over its door (Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 416; Hand-book for Syr. and Pal. p. 58; see Forster, Geogr. of Arabia, 1, 352; Robinson, Bib. Res. 2, 164)” SEE IDUMEA.

## Ishbi-benob[[@Headword:Ishbi-benob]]

             (Heb. Yishbi'-Beznob', יַשְׁבַּי בְנבmy seat is at Nob, as in the margin, for which the text has , יַשְׁבּוֹ בְנב, Yishbo'-Benob', his seat is at Nob; Sept. Ι᾿εσβὶ ἀπὸ Νώβ, Vulg. Jeshi-benob), one of the Rephaim, a gigantic warrior who bore a spear of 300 shekels' weight, and came near slaying David in a personal rencounter, but was slain by Abishai (2Sa 21:16). B.C. cir. 1018. SEE GIANT.

## Ishi[[@Headword:Ishi]]

             (Heb. Ishi', אַישַׁי, my husband; Sept. ὁ ἀνὴρ μου, Vulg. Vir meus), a metaphorical name prescribed for himself by Jehovah, to be used by the Jewish Church, expressive of her future fidelity and privilege of intimacy, in contrast with the spirit of legalism indicated by the title Baali, “my master” (Hos 2:16).

## Ishiah[[@Headword:Ishiah]]

             (Hebrew Yishshiyah', יַשַּׁיָּה, once יַשַּׁיָּהוּ, 1Ch 12:6; lent by Jehovah), the name of several men, differently Anglicized.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εσία, Vulg. Jesia, Author. Vers. “Isshiah.”) The fifth son of Uzzi (grandson of Issachar), a valiant chieftain of his tribe (1Ch 7:3). B.C. cir. 1618; but in 1Ch 7:2 he is apparently made nearly contemporary with David. See Uzzi.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εσσιά v.r. Ι᾿σιά, Ι᾿σία; Vulg. Jesia; Auth. Vers. “Jesiah,” “Isshiah.”) The second son of Uzziel (grandson of Levi), and father of Zechariah (1Ch 23:20; 1Ch 24:25). B.C. cir. 1618; although the context seems to place this one also in the time of David.

3. (Sept. Ι᾿εσία, Vulg. Jesias, Auth. Vers. “Isshiah.”) The first of the sons of Rehabiah, and great-grandson of Moses (1Ch 24:21; compare 23:17; 26:25, where he is called JESHAIAH). B.C. post 1618. SEE REHABTAH.

4. (Sept. Ι᾿εσσία, Vulg. Jesia, Author. Vers. “Jesiah.”) A Korhite, and one of the braves that joined David at Ziklag (1Ch 12:6). B.C. 1055.

5. (Sept. Ι᾿εσσία, Vulg. Josute, Auth. Vers. “Ishijah.”) One of the “sons” of Harim, who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (Ezr 10:31). B.C. 459.

## Ishijah[[@Headword:Ishijah]]

             (Ezr 10:31). SEE ISHIAH, 5. Ish'ma (Heb. Yishmna', ישְׁמָא, desolation, otherwise high; Sept. Ι᾿εσμά), a descendant of Judah, apparently named (with two brothers and a sister) as a son of the founder (“father”) of Etam (1Ch 4:3). B.C. prob. cir. 1612.

## Ishmael[[@Headword:Ishmael]]

             (Heb. Yishmael', יַשְׁמָעֵאל, heard by God; Sept. Ι᾿σμαήλ, Joseph. Ι᾿σμάηλος), the name of several men.

1. Abraham's eldest son, born to him by the concubine Hagar (Gen 16:15; Gen 17:23). SEE ABRAHAM; SEE HAGAR.

It may here be remarked that the age attributed to him in Gen 21:14 is not inconsistent with Gen 17:25 (see Tuch, Comm. p. 382). The story of his birth, as recorded in Genesis 16, is in every respect characteristic of Eastern life and morals in the present age. The intense desire of both Abraham and Sarah ‘for children; Sarah's gift of Hagar to Abraham as wife; the insolence of  the slave when suddenly raised to a place of importance; the jealousy and consequent tyranny of her high-spirited mistress; Hagar's flight, return, and submission to Sarah-for all these incidents we could easily find parallels in the modern history of every tribe in the desert of Arabia. The origin of the name Ishmael is thus explained. When Hagar fled from Sarah, the angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water in the wilderness in the way of Shur… and he said, “Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael (‘God hears'), because the Lord hath heard thy affliction” (Gen 16:11). Hagar had evidently intended, when she fled, to return to her native country. But when the angel told her of the dignity in store for her as a mother, and the power to which her child, as the son of the great patriarch, would attain, she resolved to obey his voice, and to submit herself to Sarah (Gen 16:10-13).

1. Ishmael was born at Mamre, in the eighty-sixth year of Abraham's age, eleven years after his arrival in Canaan, and fourteen before the birth of Isaac (Gen 16:3; Gen 16:16; Gen 21:5). B.C. 2078. No particulars of his early life are recorded, except his circumcision when thirteen years of age (Gen 17:25). B.C. 2065. His father was evidently strongly attached to him; for when an heir was promised through Sarah, he said, “Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!” (Gen 17:18). Then were renewed to Abraham in more definite terms the promises made to Hagar regarding Ishmael: “As for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold, I have blessed him, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great nation” (Gen 21:20). Before this time Abraham seems to have regarded his first-born child as the heir of the promise, his belief in which was counted unto him for righteousness (Gen 15:6); and although that faith shone yet more brightly after his passing weakness when Isaac was first promised, his love for Ishmael is recorded in the narrative of Sarah's expulsion of the latter: “And the thing was very grievous in Abraham's sight because of his son” (Gen 21:11).

Ishmael seems to have remained in a great measure under the charge of his mother, who, knowing his destiny, would doubtless have him trained in such exercises as would fit him for successfully acting the part of a desert prince. Indulged in every whim and wish by a fond father, encouraged to daring and adventure by the hardy nomads who fed and defended his father's flocks, and having a fitting field on that southern border-land for the play of his natural propensities, Ishmael grew up a true child of the desert-a wild and wayward boy. The perfect freedom of desert life, and his  constant intercourse with those who looked up to him with mingled feelings of pride and affection as the son and heir-apparent of their great chief, tended to make him impatient of restraint, and overbearing in his temper. The excitement of the chase — speeding across the plains of Beersheba after the gazelles, and through the rugged mountains of Engedi after wild goats, and bears, and leopards, inured him to danger, and trained him for war. Ishmael must also have been accustomed from childhood to those feuds which raged almost incessantly between the “trained servants” of Abraham and their warlike neighbors of Philistia, as well as to the more serious incursions of roving bands of freebooters from the distant East. Such was the school in which the great desert chief was trained. Subsequent events served to fill up and fashion the remaining features of Ishmael's character. He had evidently been treated by Abraham's dependents as their master's heir, and Abraham himself had apparently encouraged the belief. The unexpected birth of Isaac, therefore, must have been to him a sad and bitter disappointment. And when he was afterwards driven forth, with his poor mother, a homeless wanderer in a pathless wilderness; when, in consequence of such unnatural harshness, he was brought to the very brink of the grave, and was only saved from a painful death by a miracle; when, after having been reared in luxury, and taught to look forward to the possession of wealth and power, he was suddenly left to whi a scanty and uncertain subsistence by his sword and bow--we need scarcely wonder that his proud spirit, revolting against injustice and cruelty, should make him what the angel had predicted, “a wild-ass man; his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him” (Genesis 16:32).

2. The first recorded outbreak of Ishmael's rude and wayward spirit occurred at the weaning of Isaac. B.C. 2061. On that occasion Abraham made a great feast after the custom of the country. In the excitement of the moment, heightened probably by the painful consciousness of his own blighted hopes, Ishmael could not restrain his temper, but gave way to some insulting expressions or gestures of mockery. Perhaps the very name of the child, Isaac (“laughter”), and the exuberant joy of his aged mother, may have furnished subjects for his untimely satire. SEE ISAAC. Be this as it may, Sarah's jealous eye and quick ear speedily detected him; and she said to Abraham, “Expel this slave and her son; for the son of this slave shall not be heir with my son, with Isaac” (Gen 21:10). Now Abraham loved the boy who first, lisping the name “father,” opened in his  heart the gushing fountain of paternal affection. The bare mention of such an unnatural act made him angry even with Sarah, and it was only when influenced by a divine admonition that he yielded. The brief account of the departure of Hagar, and her journey through the desert, is one of the most beautiful and touching pictures of patriarchal life which has come down to us: “And Abraham rose early in the morning, and took bread, and a skin of water, and gave it to Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the lad (הִיֶלֶד), and sent- her away;. and she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beersheba. And when the water was spent in the skin, she placed the lad under one of the shrubs. And she went and sat down opposite, at the distance of a bowshot; for she said, I will not see the death of the lad. And she sat opposite, and lifted up her voice and wept” (Gen 21:14-16).

Isaac was born when Abraham was a hundred years old (Gen 21:5), and as the weaning, according to Eastern usage, probably took place when the child was about three years old, Ishmael himself must have been then about sixteen years old. The age of the latter at the period of his circumcision, and at that of his expulsion, has given occasion for some literaty speculation. A careful consideration of the passages referring to it fails, however, to show any discrepancy between them. In Gen 17:25, it is stated that he was thirteen years old when he was circumcised; and in 21. 14 (probably two or three years later) “Abraham took bread, and a bottle- of water, and gave [it] unto Hagar, putting [it] on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away.” Here it is at least unnecessary to assume that the child was put on her shoulder the construction of the Hebrew (mistranslated by the Sept., with whom seems to rest the origin of the question) not requiring it; and the sense of the passage renders it highly improbable: Hagar certainly carried the bottle on her shoulder, and perhaps the bread: she could hardly have also thus carried a child. Again, these passages are quite irreconcilable with Gen 17:20 of the last quoted chapter, where Ishmael is termed הִנִּעִר, A.. “lad” (comp., for use of this word, Gen 34:19; Gen 37:2; Gen 41:12). It may seem strange to some that the hardy, active boy, inured to fatigue, should have been sooner overcome by thirst than his mother; but those advanced in life can bear abstinence longer than the young, and, besides, Ishmael had probably exhausted his strength in vain attempts to gain a supply of food by his bow. Again Hagar is saved by a miracle: “God heard the voice of the lad .. and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well  of water” (Gen 41:17; Gen 41:19). And again the cheering promise is renewed to her son, “I will make of him a great nation” (Gen 41:18).

3. The wilderness of Paran, lying along the western side of the Arabah, between Canaan and the mountains of Sinai, now became the home of Ishmael (see Baumgarten, Comm. I, 1, 22): “And God was with him, and he became a great archer” (Gen 41:20). Some of the border tribes with which the shepherds of Abraham were wont to meet and strive at the wells of Gerar, Beersheba, and En-Mishpat probably received and welcomed the out cast to their tents. A youth of his warlike training and daring spirit would soon acquire a name and a high position among nomads. (See Prokesch, Spec. Hist. Arab. p. 46.) His relationship to Abraham also would add to his personal claims. It would seem to have been the original intention of his mother to return to Egypt, to which country she belonged; but this being prevented, she was content to obtain for her son wives from thence (Gen 21:9-21; on which latter verse the Targum of Jonathan adds traditionally that he divorced his first wife Adisha, and then married an Egyptian Phatima). His mother, accordingly, as soon as she saw him settled, took for him an Egyptian wife-one of her own people, and thus completely separated him from his Shemitic connections. This wife of Ishmael is not elsewhere mentioned; she was, we must infer, an Egyptian; and this second infusion of Hamitic blood into the progenitors of the Arab nation, Ishmael's sons, is a fact that has generally been overlooked. No record is made of any other wife of Ishmael, and failing such record, the Egyptian was the mother of his twelve sons and daughter. This daughter, however, is called the “sister of Nebajoth” (Gen 28:9), and this limitation of the parent-age of the brother- and sister certainly seems to point to a different mother for Ishmael's other sons. The Arabs, probably borrowing from the above Rabbinical tradition, assert that he twice married; the first wife being an Amalekite, by whom he had no issue; and the second a Joktanite, of the tribe of Jurhum (Mir-dt et-Zemdn, MS, quoting a tradition of Mohammed Ibn-Is-hak). Though Ishmael joined the native tribes of Arabia, his posterity did not amalgamate with them. The Joktanites have left traces of their names and settlements chiefly in the southern and southeastern parts of the peninsula, while the Ishmaelites kept closer to the borders of Canaan (see Forster's Geography of Arabia, 1, 77. sq.).

4. Although their lots were cast apart, it does not appear that any serious alienation existed between Ishmael and Isaac; for when Abraham died, we  read that “his sons Isaac and Ishmael buried him in the cave of Machpelah.” The rival brothers then met, in the vale of Mamre, at their father's tomb (Gen 25:9). B.C. 1989. (The Talmud states [Baba Bathra, 16] that prior to Abraham's death Ishmael had forsaken the nomadic mode of life.) That must have been a strange and deeply interesting scene at the burial of the great patriarch. All his own old “trained servants.” with Isaac, the peaceful shepherd chief, at their head, were assembled there; while Ishmael, surrounded by the whole body of his wild retainers and allies, as was and still is the custom of Bedawy sheiks, stood there too. As funerals in the East take place almost immediately after death, it is evident that Ishmael must have been called from the desert to the death-bed of his father, which implies that relations of kindness and respect had been kept up, although the brevity. of the sacred narrative prevents any special notice of this circumstance. Ishmael had, probably, long before received an endowment from his father's property similar to that which had been bestowed upon the sons of Keturah (Gen 25:6).

5. Of Ishmael's personal history after this event we know nothing. The sacred historian gives us a list of his twelve sons, tells us that Esau married his daughter Mahalath, the sister of Nebajoth (Gen 28:9), and sums up the brief simple sketch in these words: “These are the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirtyseven years; and he died, and was gathered to his people” (Genesis 25, 17). B.C. 1941. Where he died, or where he was buried, we know not.

6. It has been shown, in the article ARABIA, that Ishmael had no claim to the honor, which is usually assigned to him, of being the founder of the Arabian nation. That nation existed before he was born. He merely joined it, and adopted its habits of life and character; and the tribes which sprung from him formed eventually an important section of the tribes of which it was composed. (See also Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 210.) At this period the Arabian desert appears to have been thinly peopled by descendants of Joktan, the son of Eber, “whose dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east” (Gen 10:25-30). The Joktanites, or Bene-Kahtan, are regarded by Arab historians as the first and most honorable progenitors of the Arab tribes (D'Herbelot, Bibliotheque Orientale, s.v. Arabes). SEE JOKTAN.

Ishmael had twelve sons: Nebajoth, Kedar, Abdeel, Mibsam, Mishma, Dumah, Massa, Hadar, Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. To the list of  them, the sacred historian appends (Gen 25:16) an important piece of information: “These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, by their cities (חצריהם, “fortified towns”), and their camps (טירתם); twelve princes according to their nations” (לאמתם). Every one of the twelve sons of Ishmael, therefore, like the children of Jacob, was the head of a tribe, and the founder of a distinct colony or camp. In this respect the statements in the Bible exactly accord with the ancient traditions and histories of the Arabs themselves. Native historians divide the Arabs into two races: 1. Pure Arabs, descendants of Joktan; and, 2. Mixed Arabs, descendants of Ishmael. Abulfeda gives a brief account of the several tribes and nations which descended from both these original stocks (Historia Anteislamica, ed. Fleischer, p. 180, 191 sq.). Some of the tribes founded by sons of Ishmael retained the names of their founders, and were well known in history. The Nabathceans, who took possession of Idumaea in the 4th century B.C., and constructed the wonderful monuments of Petra, were the posterity of Nebajoth, Ishmael's eldest son. SEE NABATHIEANS.

The descendants of Jetur and Naphish disputed with the Israelites possession of the country east of the Jordan, and the former, described by Strabo as κακοῦργοι πάντες (Gen 16:2), gave their name to a small province south of Damascus, which it bears to this day. SEE ITUREA.

The black tents of Kedar were pitched in the heart of the Arabian desert, and from their abundant flocks they supplied the marts of Tyre (Jer 2:10; Isa 60:7; Eze 27:21). The district of Tema lay south of Edom, and is referred to by both Job and Isaiah (Job 6:19; Isa 21:14; Forster's Geogr. of Arabia, 1, 292; Heeren's Historical Researches, 2, 107). Dumah has left his name to a small province of Arabia. Since the days of Abraham the tents of the Ishmaelites have been studded along the whole eastern confines of Palestine, and they have been scattered over Arabia from the borders of Egypt to the banks of the Euphrates. As friends and foes, as oppressors and oppressed-but ever as freemen-the seed of Ishmael have “dwelt in the presence of their brethren.”

Of this last expression various explanations have been given, but the plainest is the most probable; which is, that Ishmael and the tribes springing from him should always be located near the kindred tribes descended from Abraham. This was a promise of benefit in that age of migration, when Abraham himself had come from beyond the Euphrates, and was a stranger and sojourner in the land of Canaan. There was thus, in fact, a relation of some importance between this promise and the promise of the heritage of  Canaan to another branch of Abraham's offspring. It had seemingly some such force as this-The heritage of Canaan is, indeed destined for another son of Abraham; but still the lot of Ishmael, and of those that spring from him, shall never be cast far apart from that of his brethren. This view is confirmed by the circumstance that the Israelites did, in fact, occupy the country bordering on that in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled-the Ishmaelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. Most interpreters find in this passage a promise that the descendants of Ishmael should never be subdued. But we are unable to discover this in the text; and, moreover, such has not been the fact, whether we regard the Ishmaelites apart from the other Arabians, or consider the promise made to Ishmael as applicable to the whole Arabian family. The Arabian tribes are in a state of subjection at this moment; and the great Wahaby confederacy among them, which not many years ago filled Western Asia with alarm, is now no longer heard of.

The prophecy which drew their character has been fulfilled with equal minuteness of detail. “He shall be a wild ass of a man (פֶּרֶא אָדָם); his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him.” This means, in short, that he and his descendants should lead the life of the Bedouins of the Arabian deserts; and how graphically this description portrays their habits may be seen in notes on these verses in the Pictorial Bible, and in the works of Niebuhr, Burckhardt, Lane, etc.; and, more particularly, in the Arabian romance of Antar, which presents the most perfect picture- of real Bedouin manners now in existence. A recent commentator on the passage has illustrated the prophecy with equal force and beauty. “The character of the Ishmaelites, or the Bedouins, could not be described more aptly or more powerfully. Against them alone time seems to have no sickle, and the conqueror's sword no edge. They have defied the softening influence of civilization, and mocked the attacks of the invader. Ungovernable and roaming, obeying no law but their spirit of adventure, regarding all mankind as their enemies, whom they must either attack with their spears or elude with their faithful steeds, and cherishing their deserts as heartily as they despise the constraint of towns and communities, the Bedouins are the outlaws among the nations. Plunder is legitimate gain, a daring robbery is praised as valor” (Kalisch, ad loc.). SEE ISHMAELITE.

7. The notions of the Arabs respecting Ishmael (Ismail) are partly derived from the Bible, partly from the Jewish Rabbins. and partly from native traditions. The origin of many of these traditions is obscure, but a great  number may be ascribed to the fact of Mohammed's having, for political reasons, claimed Ishmael for his ancestor, and striven to make out an impossible pedigree; while both he and his followers have, as a consequence of accepting this assumed descent, sought to exalt that ancestor. Another reason may be safely found in Ishmael's acknowledged headship of the naturalized Arabs, and this cause existed from the very period of his settlement. SEE ARABIA.

Yet the rivalry of the Joktanite kingdom of Southern Arabia, and its intercourse with classical and medieval Europe, the wandering and unsettled habits of the Ishmaelites, their having no literature, and, as far as we know, only a meager oral tradition, all contributed, till the importance it acquired with the promulgation of El-Islam, to render our knowledge of the Ishmaelitic portion of the people of Arabia, before Mohammed, lamentably defective. That they maintained, and still maintain, a patriarchal and primitive form of life, is known to us. Their religion, at least in the period immediately preceding Mohammed, was in Central Arabia chiefly the grossest fetishism, probably learnt from aboriginal inhabitants of the land; southwards it diverged to the cosmic worship of the Joktanite Himyerites (though these were far from being exempt from fetishism), and northwards (so at least in ancient times) to an approach to that true faith which Ishmael carried with him, and his descendants thus gradually lost. This last point is curiously illustrated by the numbers who, in Arabia, became either Jews (Karaites) or Christians (though of a very corrupt form of Christianity), and by the movement in search of the faith of the patriarchs which had been put forward, not long before the birth of Mohammed, by men not satisfied with Judaism or the corrupt form of Christianity with which alone they were acquainted. This movement first aroused Mohammed, and was afterwards the main cause of his success.

The Arabs believe that Ishmael was the first-born of Abraham, and the majority of their doctors (but the point is in dispute) assert that this son, and not Isaac, was offered by Abraham in sacrifice. The scene of this sacrifice is Mount ‘Armafat, near' Mecca, the last holy place visited by pilgrims, it being necessary to the completion of pilgrimage to be present at a sermon delivered there on the 9th of the Mohammedan month Zu-l- Hejjeh, in commemoration of the offering, and to sacrifice a victim on the following evening after sunset, in the valley of Mini. The sacrifice last mentioned is observed throughout the Muslim world, and the day on which it is made is called “The Great Festival” (Lane's Mod. Egypt. Ch. 3).  Ishmael, say the Arabs, dwelt with his mother at Mekkeh, and both are buried in the place called the “Hejr,” on the north-west (termed by the Arabs the north) side of the Kaabeh, and enclosed by a curved wall called tlJ, “Hatim.” Ishmael was visited at Mekkeh by Abraham, and they together rebuilt the temple, which had. been destroyed by a flood. At Mekkeh, Ishmael married a daughter of Mudad or El-Mudad, chief of the Jokanite tribe Jurhum, and had thirteen children (Mir-at ez-Zemdn, MS.), thus agreeing with the Biblical number, including the daughter.

Mohammed's descent from Ishmael is totally lost, for an unknown number of generations, to ‘Adnan, of the twenty-first generation before the prophet: from him downwards the latter's descent is, if we may believe the genealogists, fairly proved. But we have evidence far more trustworthy than that of the genealogists; for, while most of the natives of Arabia are unable to trace up their pedigrees, it is scarcely possible to find one who is ignorant of his race, seeing that his very life often depends upon it. The law of blood-revenge necessitates his knowing the names of his ancestors for four generations, but no more; and this law, extending from time immemorial, has made any confusion of race almost impossible. This law, it should be remembered, is not a law of Mohammed, but an old pagan law that he endeavored to suppress, but could not. In casting doubt en the prophet's pedigree, we must add that this cannot affect the proofs of the chief element of the Arab nation being Ishmaelitish (and so, too, the tribe of Kureysh, of whom was Mohammed). Although partly mixed with Joktanites, they are more mixed with Keturahites, etc.; the characteristics of the Joktanites, as before remarked, are widely different from those of the Ishmaelites; and, whatever theories may be adduced to the contrary, we believe that the Arabs, from physical characteristics, language, the concurrence of native traditions (before Mohammedanism made them untrustworthy), and the testimony of the Bible, are mainly and essentially Ishmaelitish.

2. The father (or ancestor) of Zebadiah, which latter was “ruler of the house of Judah” under Jehoshaphat (2Ch 19:11).. B.C. cir. 900.

3. Son of Jehohanan, and captain of a ‘hundred” under the regency of- Jehoiada (2Ch 23:1). B.C. 877.

4. One of the six sons of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin (1Ch 8:38; 1Ch 9:44). B.C. ante 588.

5. The son of Nethaniah, whose treachery forms one of the chief episodes of the history of the period immediately succeeding the first fall of Jerusalem (Jer 40:7; Jer 41:15, with a short summary, in 2Ki 25:23-25). B.C. 587. His full description is “Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishama, of the seed royal” of Judah (Jer 41:1; 2Ki 25:25). Whether by this is intended that he was actually a son of Zedekiah, or of one of the later kings, or, more generally, that he had royal blood in his veins--perhaps a descendant of Elishama, the son of David (2Sa 5:16) —we cannot tell. Jerome (Qu. Hebr. on 2Ch 28:7) interprets this expression as meaning “of the seed of Molech.” He gives the same meaning to the words “the king's son” applied to Maaseiah in the above passage. The question is an interesting one, and has recently been revived by Geiger (Urschriff, etc., p. 307), who extends it to other passages and-persons. — SEE MOLECH.

Jerome (as above) further says-perhaps on the strength of a tradition that Ishmael was the son of an Egyptian slave, Gera: as a reason why the “seed royal” should bear the meaning he gives it. During the siege of the city he had, like many others of his countrymen (Jer 40:11), fled across the Jordan, where he found a refuge at the court of Baalis, then king of the Bene- Ammon (Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 2). Ammonitish women were sometimes found in the harems of the kings of Jerusalem (1Ki 11:1), and Ishmael may have been thus related to the Ammonitish court on his mother's side. At any rate, he was instigated by Baalis to the designs which he accomplished but too successfully (Jer 40:14; Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 3). Several bodies of Jews appear to have been lying under arms in the plains on the southeast of the Jordan, during the last days of Jerusalem, watching the progress of affairs in Western Palestine, commanded by “princes” (שָׂרַים), the chief of whom were Ishmael, and two brothers, Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah. Immediately after the departure of the Chaldean army these men moved across the Jordan to pay their respects to Gedaliah, whom the king of Babylon had left as superintendent (פקיד) of the province. Gedaliah had taken up his residence at Mizpah, a few miles north of Jerusalem, on the main road where Jeremiah the prophet resided with him (Jer 40:6). The house would appear to have been isolated from the rest of the town. We can discern a high-enclosed courtyard and a deep well within its precincts. The well was certainly (Jer 41:9; comp. 1Ki 15:22), and the whole residence was probably, a relic of the military works of Asa, king of Judah. Ishmael made no secret of his intention to kill the superintendent and usurp his position. Of this Gedaliah  was warned in express terms by Johanan and his companions; and Johanan, in a secret interview, foreseeing how irreparable a misfortune Gedaliah's death would be at this juncture (Jer 40:15), offered to remove the danger by killing Ishmael. This, however, Gedaliah, a man evidently of a high and unsuspecting nature, would not hear of (Jer 40:16; and see the amplification in Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 3). They all accordingly took leave. Thirty days after (Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 4), in the seventh month (Jer 41:1), on the third day of the month-so says the tradition-Ishmael again appeared at Mizpah, this time accompanied by ten men, who were, according to the Hebrew text, “princes of the king” (רִבֵּי הִמֶּלֶךְ), though this is omitted by the Sept. and by Josephus. Gedaliah entertained them at a feast (Jer 41:1).

According to the statement of Josephus, this was a very lavish entertainment, and Gedaliah became much intoxicated. It must have been a private one, for before its close Ishmael and his followers had murdered Gedaliah and all his attend-ants with such secrecy that no alarm was given outside the room. The same night he killed all Gedaliah's establishment, including some Chaldean soldiers who were there. Jeremiah appears fortunately to have been, absent, and, incredible as it seems, so well had Ishmael' taken his precautions, that for two days the massacre remained perfectly unknown to the people of the town. On the second day Ishmael perceived from his elevated position a large party coming southwards along the main road from Shechem and Samaria. He went out to meet them. They proved to be eighty devotees, who, with rent clothes, and with shaven beards, mutilated bodies, and other marks of heathen devotion, and weeping (Sept.) as they went, were bringing incense and offerings to the ruins of the Temple. At his invitation they turned aside to the residence of the superintendent. Here Ishmael put into practice the same strata-gem which, on a larger scale, was employed by Mehemet Ali in the massacre of the Mamelukes at Cairo in: 1806. As the unsuspecting pilgrims passed within the outer gates (Sept. court-yard) he closed the entrances behind them and there he and his band butchered the whole number ten only escaped by the offer of heavy ransom for their lives. The seventy corpses were then thrown into the well, which (as in the Sepoy massacre at Cawnpore) was within the precincts of the house, and which was completely filled with the bodies. It was the same thing that had been done by Jehu-a man in some respects a prototype of Ishmael, with the bodies of the-forty-two relatives of Ahaziah (2Ki 10:14). This done, he descended to the town, surprised and carried off the daughters of king Zedekiah, who had been sent there by Nebuchadnezzar for safety, with  their eunuchs and their Chaldean guard (Jer 41:14; Jer 41:16), and all the people of the town, and made off with his prisoners to the country of the Ammonites Which road he took is not quite clear; the Hebrew text and Sept. say by Gibeon, that is north; but Josephus, by Hebron; round the southern end of the Dead Sea. The news of the massacre had by this time got abroad; and Ishmael was quickly pursued by Johanan and his companions.

Whether north or south, they soon tracked him and his unwieldy booty, and found them reposing by some copious waters (רִבַּים מִיַם). He was attacked, two of his bravoes slain, the whole of the prey recovered, and Ishmael himself, with the remaining eight of his people, escaped to the Ammonites, and thenceforward passes into the obscurity from which it would have been well if he had never emerged. Johanan's foreboding was fulfilled. The result of this tragedy was an immediate panic. The small remnants of the Jewish commonwealth-the captains of the forces, the king's daughters, the two prophets Jeremiah and Baruch, and all the men, women, and children-at once took flight into Egypt (Jer 41:17; Jer 43:5-7), and all hopes of a settlement were for the time at an end. The remembrance of the calamity was perpetuated by a fast the fast of the seventh month (Zec 7:5; Zec 8:19), which is to this day strictly kept by the Jews on the third of Tisri. (See Reland, Antiq. 4:10: Kimchi on Zec 7:5). The part taken by Baalis in this transaction apparently brought upon his nation the denunciations both of Jeremiah (Jer 49:1-6) and the more distant Ezekiel (Eze 25:1-7), but we have no record to-show him these predictions were accomplished. SEE GEDALIAH.

6. One of the “sons” of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezr 10:22). B.C. 459.

## Ishmael (2)[[@Headword:Ishmael (2)]]

             (as a later name). SEE ISMAEL.

## Ishmaelite[[@Headword:Ishmaelite]]

             (Heb. Yishmeeli', ישְׁמְעֵאלַי, 1Ch 2:17; 1Ch 28:3, etc., plur.

יַשְׁמְעֵילם, usually Anglicized “Ishmeelites.” q.v.), a descendant of Ishmael, the son of Abraham by Hagar. Ishmaelites carried on a traffic with Egypt (Gen 37:25; Gen 37:27; Gen 39:1), and lived a wandering life as nomades at the eastward of the Hebrews and of Egypt as far as to the Persian Gulf  and Assyria, i.e. Babylonia (Gen 25:18), which same limits are elsewhere assigned to the Amalekites (1Sa 15:7); so also the names “Ishmaelites” and “Midianites” appear to be sometimes applied to the same people (Gen 37:25; Gen 37:27-28; Jdg 8:22; Jdg 8:24). In Gen 25:18, it is said, “And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria: and he died in the presence of all his brethren.” As Ishmael's death had already been mentioned, and as the Hebrew term נָפִל, naphal-rendered “he died,” properly he fell — is seldom used in the Scriptures in reference to “dying,” except in cases of sudden and violent death, as when one “falls” in battle, the probability is that naphal here signifies that his territory or possession fell to him in the presence of all his brethren, or immediately contiguous to the borders of the territories in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled the Israelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. This interpretation is countenanced by the Sept. and Targums which have dwelt, and by the promise in Gen 16:12 (comp. the similar phraseology in Jos 23:4; Psa 16:6). “The twelve sons of Ishmael, somewhat like the twelve sons of Jacob, then came so many heads of tribes (Gen 25:13-15), which implies that in the next generation they spread themselves pretty widely abroad. It appears (Gen 25:18) that the head-quarters of the race lay in the northern parts of the Arabian peninsula; but in process of time they would naturally stretch more inland, eastward and southward. That they also extended their journeying northwards is evident from the fact that the brethren of Joseph espied “a company of Ishmaelites coming from Gilead, with their camels bearing spicery, and balm, and myrrh, to carry it down to Egypt” (Gen 37:25).

The company has afterwards the name of Midianites applied to it (Gen 37:28), probably on account of its consisting of more than one class of people, Midianites also in part; but being first called Ishmaelites, we can have no reasonable doubt that these formed a considerable portion of the caravan party. The trade of inland carriers between the countries in the north of Africa on the one side, and those in southern and western Asia (India, Persia, Babylonia, etc.) on the other, is one in which sections of the Ishmaelitish race have been known from the remotest times to take a part. It suited their migratory and unsettled habits; and they became so noted for it, that others, who did not belong to the same race, were not infrequently called Ishmaelites, merely because they followed the Ishmaelitic traffic and manners. It is impossible to say how far the descendants of Ishmael penetrated into Arabia, or acquired settlements  in its southern and more productive regions. As it is certain the Ishmaelitish mode of life has been always less practiced there, and a modified civilization is of old standing, the probability is that the population in those regions has little in it of Ishmaelitish blood. But, with all their regard to genealogies, the Arabic races have for thousands of years been so transfused into each other, that all distinct landmarks are well-nigh lost. The circumstance of Mohammed having, for prudential reasons, claimed to be a descendant of the son of Abraham, has led to an extension of the Ishmaelitish circle far beyond what the probable facts will bear out” SEE ISHIMAL, 1.

## Ishmaelite (2)[[@Headword:Ishmaelite (2)]]

             occurs in the A.V. at Gen 37:25; Gen 37:27-28; Gen 29:1, as a general name of the Abrahamic peoples of the “east country”' or BENE-KEDEL SEE BENE-KEDEL (q.v.); but elsewhere (1Ch 2:17) in the strict sense of the proper ISHMAELITES (as Anglicized in Jdg 8:24 : Psa 83:6), with which the Heb. name corresponds.

## Ishmaiaah[[@Headword:Ishmaiaah]]

             (Heb. Yishmmzayah', יַשְׁמִעְיָה, and in 1Ch 27:19 in the paragogic form Yishlnaya'hu, יַשְׁמִעְיָהוּ, heard by Jehovah), the name of two of David's officers.. See DA T1.

1. (Sept. Σαμαϊvας, ulg. Samarjcs, Auth. Vers. “Ismaiah.”) — A Gibeonite, one of the chiefs of those warriors who relinquished the cause of Saul, the head (of their tribe, and joined themselves to David-when he was at Ziklag (1Ch 12:4). B.C. 1046. he is described as “a hero (gibbor) among the thirty and over the thirty” — i.e. David's body-guard; but his name does not appear in the lists of the guard in 2 Samuel 23 and 1 Chronicles 11. Possibly he was killed in some encounter before David reached the throne.

2. (Sept. Σαμαϊvας, Vulg. Jesnmujas, Auth. Vers. “Ishmaiah.”) Son of Obadiah, and viceroy of Zebulon under David and Solomon (1Ch 27:19). B.C. 1014.

## Ishmerai[[@Headword:Ishmerai]]

             (Heb. Yishmmeray', יַשְׁמְרִיfor יַשְׁמִּרְיָה, preserved by Jehovah; Septuag. Ι᾿εσαμαρί), one of the sons” of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:18). B.C. ante 588.

## Ishod[[@Headword:Ishod]]

             (Heb. Jshhod', אַישְׁהוֹד, man of splendor, i.e. in countenance or in fame; Sept. simply Σούδ, Vulg. translates vir decorus), a son of Hammoleketh, the sister of Machir of Gilead (1Ch 7:18). B.C. cir. 1658.

## Ishpan[[@Headword:Ishpan]]

             (Heb. Yishpan', יַשְׁפָּן, prob. hid, but Gesenius bald, Ftrst strong; Sept. Ι᾿εσφάν, Vulg. Jespham one of the “sons” of Shashak, a Benjamite chief resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:22). B.C. ante 588. Ish'-tob (Heb.Ish-Tob', אַישׁאּטוֹב, man of Tüb [i.e. good]; Sept. Ι᾿στώβ; Josephus ῎Ιστωβος; Vulg. Ishtob), apparently one of the small kingdoms or states which formed part of the general country of Aram, named with Zobah, Rehob, and Maacah (2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8). In the parallel account of 1 Chronicles 19 Ishtob is omitted. By Josephus (Ant. 7:6, 1) the name is given as that of a king. But though in the ancient versions the name is given as one word, it is probable that the real signification is “the men of Tob” (q.v.), a district mentioned also in connection with Ammon in the records of Jephthah (Jdg 11:35), and again, perhaps, under the shape of TOBIE or TUBIENI, in the history of the Maccabees (1Ma 5:13; 2Ma 12:17).

## Ishtar[[@Headword:Ishtar]]

             one of the chief deities of the Assyrians and Babylonians alike, although she was generically one of the deities of the second rank. She was the daughter of the moon-god Sin, and was identified by the Chaldaeans with the planet Venus. She was essentially a warlike goddess, and was called the "Goddess of Battles and of Victories," in which attribute she was often represented as giving a bow to the Assyrian king in token of his victories over his foes. She was also, as, the goddess of productive nature, the keeper of all the treasures of the earth, and hence was figured as Allat, the "Queen of the Spear or Divining-rod." In another form of the same principle she was the goddess of sensual indulgence. She was the special protectress of Erech, and in her character of Anna, or Nana, of Nineveh, while she was distinguished also at Arbela, another great seat of her worship, as Ishtar of Arbela. Her offices, names, and attributes were very various, and there appears to have been two Ishtars, mother and daughter, one the great nature goddess, the other the heroine of one of the mythical legends, called the "Descent of Ishtar into Hades." There is a considerable amount of confusion yet remaining to be cleared away with regard to the relations of Ishtar to Davcina, Bilit, Ashtaroth, and Izdubar; but generally the mythologies agree in making her the goddess most brought into contact with men and the under world.

## Ishtuai[[@Headword:Ishtuai]]

             (1Ch 7:30). SEE ISHUI, 1.

## Ishuah[[@Headword:Ishuah]]

             (Heb. Yishvah', יַשְׁוָה, uniform; Septuag. Ιεσούα, but Ι᾿εσσουά in Genesis; Vulg. esua), the second named of the sons of Asher (Gen 46:17; 1Ch 7:30, in which latter passage it is Anglicized “Isuah”). B.C. 1856. He appears to have left no issue (compare Num 26:44).

## Ishui[[@Headword:Ishui]]

             (Heb. Yishvi', יַשְׁוַי, uniform), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. in Gen 46:17, Ι᾿εύλ; Vulg. Jessui, Auth. Vers. “Isui;” in Num 26:44, Ι᾿εσού, Jessui, “Jesui;” in 1Ch 7:30, Ι᾿ησουϊv, Jessui, “shuai”). The third named of the sons of Asher, and founder of a family that bore his name (“Jesuites,” Num 26:44). B.C. 1856.

2. (Septuag. Ι᾿εσσουί, Josephus Ι᾿εσούς, Ant. 6. 6, 6; Vulg. Jessui, Auth.Vers. “Ishui”). The second named of the three oldest sons of king Saul (1Sa 14:49); probably the same with ABINADAB (1Sa 31:2; comp. 1Ch 8:33). SEE ISH-BOSHETIT.

## Isidore Mercator[[@Headword:Isidore Mercator]]

             (or Peccator), the supposed ( name of a compiler who, towards the middle of the 9th century, published the famous collection of canons known as the Pseudo-Isidorian. SEE CANONS; SEE DECRETALS. It is pretty generally conceded that this writer lived in the dominions of Charles the Bald, but his real name is a matter of doubt. As for his collection, it is evidently based on that of Isidore of Seville, numerous copies of which. were at the time circulating in France; but it contains besides a vast number of apocryphal additions. Some of these pieces had already been in circulation for years, and they were not all made up by the Pseudo-Isidore. The collection of capitularies of Benedict Levita, a deacon of Mayence (who has by some been considered as the author of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection), which was written about 840, contains already numerous extracts of the fictitious documents of the work of Mercator. They circulated at first only in Southern France. They remained unknown in Spain until the 16th century, and in Germany and Italy but few copies of them are to be found. They are compiled from the histories of Rufinus and Cassiodorus, the Liber Pontificalis, the works of the fathers, decisions of the councils, regular decretals, the Bible (which, according to Richter, he quotes from the Vulgate, revised by Rhabanus Maurus), and, finally, the Roman law, of which he possessed a compendium in the Visigoth language. These two latter circumstances go far to prove that the writer must have been either a native, or at least, at the time, a resident of France. Mavence has sometimes been considered as the place where the pseudo-decretals were written, and Riculf or Otgar, archbishops of that city, or even Benedict Levita, above alluded to, as their author; but this seems unlikely, the more since Rhabanus Maurus, who succeeded Otgar in 847, appears entirely unacquainted with their existence. It must have been written about the middle of the 9th century, for it contains the decrees of the council held at Paris in 829, shows a knowledge of Rhabanus Maurus's work against the chor-bishops written in 847-849, and was first made public at the Synod of Chiersy in 857. The history of this collection has never been fully traced out; much may perhaps be done for it by a careful comparison of the numerous MS. copies of it which are still extant. Among these copies, one of the most important is the — Codex Vaticanus, No. 630, written in 858- 867. It is thought that the Capitula Angilrami, another apocryphal  document of canon law, must also be considered as the work of the so- called Isidore Mercator. See, besides the works already referred to under DECRETALS SEE DECRETALS, Centuriatores, Ecclesiastica historia, vol. 6, cap. 7, and vol. 3, cap. 7; Blondel, Pseudo-Isidorus et Turrianus vapulantes; Van Espen, De Collectione Isidori, Opera, vol. 3; Zaccaria, Antifebronio, vol. 1, diss. 3; Spittler, Gesch. des canonischen Rechts, p. 243; Kunstmann, Fragmente über Pseudo-Isidor (Neue Sion, 1855); Gfrorer, Untersuchung. über Alter. Ursprung und Zweck d. Dekretalen d. falschen Isidorus (Friburg, 1848); Same, Gesch. d. Carolinger, 1, 71; Rosshirt, Zu den Kirchenrechtlichen Quellen u. z. den Pseudo-lsidorischen Decretalen (Heidelberg, 1849); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 16, 71; Mlilman. Latin Christianity, 2, 370 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 12, 337; Hefele, in Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 8. 859. (J. H. W.)

## Isidore Of Moscow[[@Headword:Isidore Of Moscow]]

             a distinguished Russian bishop, was born at Thessalonica towards the close of the 14th century. He became successively archimandrite of the convent of St. Demitri at Constantinople, coadjutor of the archbishop of Illyria, and, finally (in 1437, metropolitan bishop of Russia. In this capacity he at tended, at the head of a hundred Russian bishops and priests, the Council of Florence, at which the union of the Latin and Greek churches was effected. SEE FLORENCE, COUNCIL OF.

Isidore and Bessarion played the most important part in that council. In June 1439, having fulfilled his task, he returned to Moscow to proclaim the news. But the grand duke Vasili, who was displeased with the results of the council, had him thrown into prison, and condemned to be burned alive; but on the day appointed for the execution he made his escape, and fled to Rome, where Eugene IV welcomed him as a martyr. As the union affected by the Council of Florence in 1439 was of very short duration, Isidore vas selected by the Roman pontiff, Nicholas V, as messenger to Constantinople, to attempt again a union of the churches, but in this mission he failed. Isidore died it Rome April 27, 1463. Having witnessed the establishment of Islamism at Constantinople, he gave an account of it in two letters, one of which was published in the lettres Turques of Reisner, vol. 4; the second, which is dated Candia, July 7, 1453, was never printed, and is probably contained in the Riccardini Library at Florence. Some Russian annalists, especially Nikon, give extracts of some of his sermons and commandments. — See Nanamnukre sckoba Opcoba; Drevnaia Rosjeiskaia Bibliotheca, vol. 11; Strahl, Der Russische Metropolit Isidor u. sein Versuch d. russisch-  griechische Kirche zit d. Romisch-Katolischen zuvereinen (Tibinlgen, 1823); Claconii et Oldoini Vitae et Res gestae Pontificum et Carlinalium (Romae, 1677), 2, 903; Statuta Concilii Florentini (Florence, 1518); Maimbourg, Histoire du Schism des Grecs; Theiner, Vicissitudes de l'Eglise en Pologne et en Russie, 1, 33; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26, 73; Neale's History of the Council of Florence, p. 59; Covel, Account of the Greek Church, p. 117.

## Isidore of Alexandria, St[[@Headword:Isidore of Alexandria, St]]

             was born in Egypt about the year 318, and led for a time the life of a hermit in the wilderness of the Thebaid and in the desert of Nitria. St. Athanasius ordained him priest, and give him the charge of a hospital, whence Isidore is also called the Hospitaller. After the death of Athanasius, Isidore courageously defended his works and his memory against the attacks of the Arians. Having got into difficulties with Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, Isidore was obliged to flee to Constantinople, where he died in 403. The Greek Church commemorates him on the 15th of January. See Palladius, Hist. Lausiaca; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 16, 56. (J. N. P.)

## Isidore of Pelusium[[@Headword:Isidore of Pelusium]]

             (or Pelusiota), ST., an ecclesiastical writer, was born at Alexandria about the year 370. He spent his life in the neighborhood of Pelusium, in a monastery of which he was abbot, and where he practiced strict asceticism. He was a great admirer of St. Chrysostom, of whom, according to some, he-was a pupil, and whom he defended against the attacks of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Theophilus and Cyril. In the controversy waged by Cyril against Nestorius, Isidorus Pelusiota favored the Cyrillian party, his counsels of moderation contrasting greatly with the passion and ambition of Cyril. He was a firm adherent to the doctrines of the Greek Church, and vigorously opposed all heretical inroads. Of his writings, which “discuss, with learning, piety, judgment, and moderation, nearly all the theological and practical questions of his age,” there remain to us yet a collection of his-letters, forming five volumes, though they are probably not all (there are more than 2000 of them) his own. These letters treat almost all on the interpretation of Scripture. The first three volumes were published, with a Latin translation and notes, by J. de Billy (Paris, 1585, fol.), and reprinted, together with the fourth volume, by Conrad Rittershausen (Heidelb. 1605, fol.), and the fifth by the Jesuit Schott (Antw. 1623, 8vo). A complete, though rather faulty edition was finally published at Paris in 1638, folio, and in Migne's edition of the fathers, vol. 58 (Paris, 1860). See Photius, Bibliotheca (cod. 228, 232); Schröckh, Christlichen Kirchengesch. 17:520, 529; Heumann, Dissertatio de Isidoro Pelusiota ejusque epistolis (Göttingen, 1737, 4to); Fabricius, Bibliotheca Grceca, 10:480, 494; H. A. Niemeyer, De Isid. Pel. vita, scriptis et doctrina (Halle, 1825); Tillemont, Mem. Ecclesiastiques, vol. 15; Du Pin, Nouv. Bibl. des aut. Ecclesiastes 4, 5 sq.; Ceillier, Fist. des aut. sac. 13, 600 sq.; Neander, Kirchengesch. 2, 2, 361 sq.; Schaff; Ch. Hist. 3, 941; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7, 85; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 26, 57.

## Isidore of Seville, or Isidorus Hispaliensis[[@Headword:Isidore of Seville, or Isidorus Hispaliensis]]

             surnamed also “the young” to distinguish him from Isidore of Cordova, one of the most distinguished ecclesiastics of the 7th century, was born at Carthagena about the year 560 or 570. He was a son of Severianus and Theodora, and brother of St. Leander, his predecessor in the bishopric of Seville, and of St. Fulgentius, bishop of Carthage. He was brought up by his brother Leander, and it was therefore natural that he should have been favored in the selection of a successor for the bishopric of Seville, but it was not principally owing to his relationship to Leander that he was honored with this distinguished position. His abilities fully entitled him to this distinction. When he ascended to the bishopric the Goths had been masters of Spain for a century and a half. The north and west of Europe were shrouded in moral darkness. Germany, occupied by a number of adverse tribes, was yet given to idolatry; Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Scotland, were almost unknown; England and Ireland had just received the first faint glimpse of Christianity; France was torn by the dissensions of petty monarchs, and the East itself was on the eve of the inroads of Mohammedanism.

To counteract these influences, and to build up the Christian faith among his countrymen, was his first care. To this end he established schools to properly train the young, entered into closer relations with the bishop of Rome (Gregory the Great), and made every effort. to bring the doctrinal and moral system of Christianity into harmony with the habits and institutions of those various races and nationalities which at that time composed the Hispano-Gothic kingdom; and so successful was he in his efforts that he is considered one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of Spain. His abilities were further recognized by his contemporaries in permitting him to preside over the two Councils-half ecclesiastical, half civil of Seville (619) and Toledo (Dec., 633). On both occasions he showed great zeal for the orthodox side, and strict opposition to all heretical manifestations; especially, however, was he opposed to Arianism. So able was the conduct of Isidore at these councils that the canons of them may be said to have served as a basis even for the constitutional law of the Spanish kingdom, both in Church and State, down to the time of the great constitutional changes of the 15th century. Isidore of Seville died at Seville April 4, 636, and was canonized by the Church soon after his death. We have but few particulars of his life from his writings, except that in a letter, about the authenticity of which there is much doubt, he invites some bishop to join him in a synod to depose the  bishop of Cordova for luxuriousness and worldliness.

The great reputation which Isidore enjoyed among his colleagues may be best inferred from the fathers of the 8th Council of Toledo, who call him Doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimum, decus, praecedentibus cetate postremus, doctrilae comparatione non imfimus, atque, et quod majus esf,jan saeculorum finiforum doctissimus, cum reverentia nominandus, Isidorus. According to the testimony of his disciple, St. Ildefonse, he was a man of wonderful eloquence. The same authority names him as the author of De Genere Oficiorum (generally called De Offciis ecclesiasticis), Liber Proemiorum: — De Ortu et Obitu Patrum (sanctorum): — Liber Synonymormums (sive lamentationis): — De Natura rerum: — Liber Sententiarum Liber Etymologiarum (Origines), probably the last work of Isidore. The first edition of his works, which display very extensive learning, and cover the various departments of literature-theological, ascetical, liturgical, scriptural, historical, philosophical, and even philological-and thus amply account for the admiration of his contemporaries, was published by Michael Somnius (Paris, 1580, folio); another, very complete, was taken principally from the MSS. of Alvar. Gomez, and augmented by notes by J. B. Perez and Grial (Madrid, 1599, 2 vols. fol.). The edition of James Dubreuil (Paris, 1601, folio) and that of Cologne (1667) are taken from that of Madrid. The latest, which is also considered the best, is due to Arevoli (Rome, 1797-1803, 7 vols. 4to). See St. Ildefonse, De Viris Illustribus; Sigebert de Gembloux, De Script. Ecclesiast. (c. 55); Tritheim, De Script. Eccles.; M'Crie, Reformation in Spain, p. 52; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gezer. 26:57 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 7:89 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biography, 2, 627 sq. ‘(J. H.W.)

## Isidore, St[[@Headword:Isidore, St]]

             bishop OF CORDOVA, and an eminent Spanish theologian and historian, who flourished in the 4th century, is supposed to have died about 380. The chronicle of Flav. Dexter mentions him as having continued St. Jerome's Chronicon to the year 380; Sigebert de Gembloux attributes to him also a Commentarius in Orosii Libros Regum; but Florez and Antonio show good grounds for discrediting this assertion. Antonio even gives very strong reasons for considering this Isidore an imaginary individual, as well as another Isidore, likewise supposed to have been bishop of Cordova in 400-430, whom Dexter considers to be the author of a Liber Alleyoriarsum and a Commentarius in Lucam. See Bivarius, Note ad Dextrum; Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispana vetus, 1, 249; Fabricius, Bibl.  Med. et Infimae Latinitatis; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:56. (J. N. P.)

## Isidorus Hispaliensis[[@Headword:Isidorus Hispaliensis]]

             SEE ISIDORE OF SEVILLE.

## Ising, Johann Christian[[@Headword:Ising, Johann Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian. of Germany, was born October 24, 1617, in Austria. He studied at Konigsberg, and died there, July 4, 1684, cathedral deacon. Hewrote Exercitationes Histor. Crhonol. Geograph. et Philol. in Pentateuchun et Josuam. See Arnold, Historic der konigsbergischen Universiadt; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Isis[[@Headword:Isis]]

             (Ισις), an Egyptian deity, sister and wife of Osiris (q.v.), is called by the Egyptians His, and is by them said to have been born on the 4th day of the Epagomena. or five days added to the Egyptian year of 360 days. The history of the worship of Isis is very obscure, all the information we possess on the subject being derived from Greek writers. Tradition said that her brother Osiris having married her, they together undertook the  task of civilizing men, and taught them agriculture; their marriage produced Horus. Their other brother, Typhon, being at enmity with them. succeeded once in surprising Osiris, murdered him, and deposited the body in a box, which he threw into the sea (Nile). Isis, while wandering about in mourning, seeking Osiris, heard that Osiris, before his departure, had been enamored with her sister Nephthys, who had had a son, now abandoned by the mother for fear of Typhon. By the aid of some dogs Isis succeeded in discovering that son, Anubes by name; she at once adopted him, and brought him up, and he became her faithful follower. In the mean time, the box containing Osiris drifted in the sea towards Byblos, Phoenicia, and was arrested by a bush, which soon grew into a tree, the box remaining enclosed in the wood. The king of Byblos caused a column to be made of this tree for his palace. Isis hastened thither to investigate the rumor, and, to avoid recognition, offered her services to ‘the queen as nurse. At nightfall she put one of the children placed under her care in the fire, to divest it of all that was mortal, while she herself, in the form of a swallow, flew around the column which contained Osiris. The queen, seeing her child in the fire, cried out loudly, and thus deprived him of immortality. The goddess now revealed herself amidst thunder and lightning, and at one blow broke down the column, out of which the box containing Osiris fell. This she carried to her son Horus, who had been brought up in Butos, and he hid it. Typhon, however, discovered it, recognized the body, and tore it into 14 pieces (according to others, into 26 or 28 pieces). By means of magic, Isis succeeded in gathering all these pieces with the exception of the genitals, to replace which she made artificial ones. This is the reason why the Egyptians considered the Phallus as sacred. The body was now interred at Philae, which became the principal burial-place of the Egyptians. Osiris, however, returned from Hades to educate his son, and Isis bore him again another son, Harpocrates. As, however, she allowed Typhon, who had been captured by Horus, and whom she was to have killed to escape, Horns took the crown from her, and in its place Hermes placed bulls' horns on her head, since which Isis has generally been represented under the form of a woman with the horns of a cow. Isis was originally for the Egyptian a personification of the valley of the Nile, fecundated by Osiris, the god of the Nile. In after times, when, under the influence of foreign notions, Osiris came to be considered as the god of the sun, Isis was transformed into the goddess of the moon, and consequently as a friendly and life-imparting deity. She was also considered as the goddess of the lower world, of which she was said to hold the keys, and to be the ruler and judge. She  subsequently came to be regarded as the ruler of the sea, the law-giver and protector of marriage, the support of the state, the foundress of religion and the mysteries; and she finally obtained such importance that she was considered by the philosophers as the fundamental principle of the world, the divine power which is the cause of all the phenomenon of nature, and the source of divine and human life.

In the monuments Isis is called the goddess-mother, the mistress of heaven, sister and wife of Osiris, and nurse of Horus, the mourner of her brother, the eye of the sun, and regent of the gods. In her terrestrial character she wears upon her head the throne which represented her name; in her celestial, the disc and horns, or tall plumes. She is often seen nursing Horus (q.v.); sometimes also with the head of a cow (indicating her identity with the cow Athor, the mother of the sun), having a ball between her horns, the lotus on the top of her head, and the sistrum in her hand. She mostly wore a cloak fastened on her bosom by a knot; other images represent her with a spear, or, again, with the head of a hawk and wings, a spear in her right hand and a snake in the left, or with a flowing mantle and spreading a sail. Isis was worshipped throughout Egypt, and especially at Memphis. There was an image of her at Sais with the inscription,” I am the all, that has been, is, and shall be, and my cloak has no mortal lifted yet.” All annual festival of ten days' duration commemorated the victory of Isis over Typhon by means of the sistrum: on this occasion a solemn fast was succeeded by processions, in which sheaves of wheat were carried about in honor of Isis, etc. After Alexander the Great, the worship of Isis was propagated throughout all the countries inhabited by the Greeks; in Greece temples were erected to her at Phlius, Megara, Tithorea, and Phocis. The worship of Isis was also introduced into Rome in the time of Sulla (B.C. 86), but her temples were often closed on account of the licentiousness of her priests. (Josephus tells a story about the demolition of her temple at Rome by order of the emperor on account of an intrigue by one Mundus to secure the gratification of his passion for a Roman matron, Ant. 18, 3, 4). Yet, under the emperors, it found credit, and Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla were themselves among her priests. Writers of those times say that it was in their day still the custom of the Greeks and Romans to carry a boat in solemn procession in honor of Isis on the opening of spring (March 5th). Hence, in the Roman calendar, the 5th of March is designated as Isidis navilium. As similar processions were also made by some of the German nations in honor of their deities, Tacitus claims that they also  worshipped Isis; yet her name nowhere appears among them, neither is it exactly known what goddess he thus designated.

“The myth of Isis, as given by Plutarch (De Iside), appears to be a fusion of Egyptian and Phoenician traditions, and the esoterical explanations offered ‘by that writer and others show the high antiquity and unintelligibility of her name. She was thought to mean the cause or seat of the earth, to be the same as the Egyptian Neith or Minerva, and Athor or Venus; to be the Greek Demeter or Ceres, Hecate, or even Io. Many monuments have been found of this goddess, and a tern. pie at Pompeii, and a hymn in her honor at Antioch. The representations of her under the Roman empire are most numerous, Isis having, in the pantheistic spirit of the age, been compared with and figured as all the principal goddesses of the Pantheon” (Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s.v.).

The fable was adopted and incorporated in the mysticism of the Gnostics. Accordingly, among other representations, we find a gem containing a beetle, with Isis on the opposite side, holding two children, the emblem of maternal fecundity. SEE MADONNA. On another gem the beetle is not cut on the stone, but the stone is formed into the shape of the insect, and on the convex back is represented Isis, or the Egyptian Ceres, reclining beside the Nile, with two vases of Egyptian corn, the emblem of vegetable prolificness, naturally expressed by the emblem of the sun's rays and the Nile: from the head issues the lotus, and in one hand is held a nilometer, or perhaps a spade. It is the exact form of the same agricultural instrument as used at this day in the East. An amulet of Isis was held in great sanctity. SEE EGYPT.

See Herod. 2, c. 59; Ovid, Metam. 9, 776; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, 1, 413; Wilkinson, Manners and Cust. 3, 276; 4:366; Birch, Gall. Ant. p. 31; Reichel, De Isis apud Romanos cultu (Berlin, 1849); Pierer, Universal Lexikon, 9, 82; Smith, Dict. of Class. Mythol. s.v.

## Isites[[@Headword:Isites]]

             the name of a Mohammedan sect, who derive their name from their founder. Isa-Alerdad. They hold that the Koran was created, notwithstanding the opposition of Mohammed himself against such a statement, for he held that it was eternal, and in his day anathematized he  who dared to dissent from his assertion. The Isites, however, really avow the same belief, ‘though they clothe it in very different language. They say that the copy of the Koran delivered by the Almighty to his Prophet was only a transcription of the original, and that the reference of eternal could not therefore be to any copy possessed by man. But their real heresy consists in their declaration that the Koran does not contain that matchless eloquence which Mohammedans generally claim as evidence of the inspiration of the book. See Broughton, Biblioth. Histor. Sac. 1, 547.

## Islam or Eslam[[@Headword:Islam or Eslam]]

             (Arab.), the proper name of the religion known as Mohammedanism, designates complete and entire submission of body and soul to God, his will and his service, as well as to all those articles of faith, commands and ordinances revealed to and ordained by Mohammed his prophet. Islam, the Mohammedans say, was once the religion of all men; but wickedness and idolatry came into the world either after the murder of Abel, or at the time which resulted in the flood, or only after Amru Ibn-Lohai, one of the first and greatest Arabian idolaters. Every child, they believe, is born in Islam, or the true faith, and would continue faithful to the end were it not influenced by the wickedness of its parents, “who misguide it early, and lead it astray to Magismi, SEE PIAKSEISS, Judaism, or Christianity.” SEE MOHAMMEDANISM.

## Island or Isle[[@Headword:Island or Isle]]

             is the invariable rendering in the ‘Auth. Vers. of the Heb. word אַי(Sept. νῆσος, Vulg. izsula), which occurs in the following senses, chiefly in poetry: First, that of dry or habitable land in opposition to water: as. “I will make the rivers islands” (Isa 42:15 : comp. 43:19; 52:2). Especially is it a maritime region or sea-coast, like the East-Indian Dsib, which means both shore and island. In Isa 20:6, the isle of Ashdod means the country, and is so rendered in the margin, particularly as this was a sea- shore. In Isa 23:2; Isa 23:6, ‘the isle'? means the country of Tyre and in Eze 27:6-7, that of Chittim and Elisha, both being maritime regions. (In Job 22:30', אַיאּנָקַיmeans the non-guiltless.) In this sense it is more particularly restricted to the shores of the Mediterranean, sometimes in the fuller expression “islands of the sea” (Isa 11:11), or “isles of the Gentiles” (Gen 10:5; comp. Zep 2:11), and sometimes simply as “: isles” (Psa 72:10; Eze 26:15; Eze 26:18; Eze 27:3; Eze 27:35; Eze 39:6;  Dan 11:18): an exception to this, however, occurs in Eze 27:15, where the shores of the Persian Gulf are intended. Secondly, it is used both in Hebrew and English, according to its geographical meaning, for an island proper, i.e. a country surrounded by water, as in Jer 47:4, “the isle (margin) of Caphtor,” which is probably that of Cyprus. “The isles of the sea” (Est 10:1) are evidently put in opposition to “the land” or continent. Thirdly, the word is used by the Hebrews to designate all those countries divided from Palestine by water, as fully described in Jer 25:22,” the isles which are beyond the sea,” which were hence regarded as the most remote regions of the earth (Isa 24:15; Isa 42:10; Isa 59:18; compare the expression in Isa 66:19, “the isles afar off”), and also as large and numerous (Isa 40:15; Psa 97:1). (See J. D. Michaelis, Spicileqium, 1, 131-142.) In Isa 11:11, after an enumeration of countries lying on their own continent, the words “and the islands of the sea” are added in order to comprehend those situate beyond the ocean. It is observed by Sir I. Newton (on Daniel, p. 276), “By the earth the Jews understood the great continent of all Asia and Africa, to which they had access by land; and by the isles of the sea they understood the places to which they sailed- by sea, particularly all Europe. (See Gestnius, Thes. Heb. p. 38.) —Kitto; Smith. SEE WILD BEAST. Islands of the Blessed were, according to a very old Greek myth, certain happy isles situated towards the edge of the Western Ocean, where the favorites of the gods, rescued from death. dwelt in joy, and possessed everything in abundance that could contribute to it.

## Islebians[[@Headword:Islebians]]

             is the name by which the followers of John Agricola (q.v.) are designated, in distinction from all other Antinomians (q.v.). The name is derived from their master, who was also known as the meagister Islebius, because a native of Eisleben, also the birthplace of Luther, with whom he was a contemporary, Sometimes the Islebians are called Nomomachi (q.v.).

## Islip, Simon[[@Headword:Islip, Simon]]

             an English prelate, flourished in the 14th century. But little is known of his early history. He became archbishop in 1349, having previously been canon of St. Paul's, dean of the Arches, and a member of the privy council of the king. He is especially celebrated as the founder of the college of Canterbury (now a part of Christ Church, Oxford). “He built it,” says  bishop Godwin, in his account of Islip, “and endowed it with good possessions, appropriating unto the same the parsonages of Pagham and Mayfield.” Perhaps more noteworthy still is his conduct towards Wickliffe, related by Neander (Ch. Hist. 5, 135-6, where the name is by mistake spelled Islep, and so even in the English translation by Torrey). Islip, says Neander, was a firm friend of the reformer, and in 1363 showed his predilections for Wickliffe by appointing him overseer over the Canterbury college, characterizing him “as a man in whose circumspection, fidelity, and activity he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he gave this post on account of his honorable deportment and his learning.” Of course, after Islip's death in 1366 (Apr. 26), Wickliffe was deprived of his place (comp. Levis, Life of Wickliffe, 1820, p. 9 sq.). See Hook, Ecclesiastical Biography, 6, 265. (J. H. W.)

## Ismachiah[[@Headword:Ismachiah]]

             (Heb. Yismakyah', but only in the prolonged form Yisnzachya'hu, יַסְמִכְיָהוּ, supported by Jehovah; Sept. Σαμαχία), one of the Levites charged by Hezekiah with the superintendence of the sacred offerings under the general direction of the high-priest and others (2Ch 31:13). B.C. 726.

## Ismael[[@Headword:Ismael]]

             a Graecized form of the name ISHMAEL SEE ISHMAEL (q.v.), found in the A.V. of the Apocrypha.

1. (Ι᾿σμαήλ) The son of Abraham (Jdt 2:23).

2. (Ι᾿σμαῆλος) One of the priests who relinquished their Gentile wives after the Captivity (1Es 9:22).

## Ismael (2)[[@Headword:Ismael (2)]]

             the elder son of Jaafer Saduk, the sixth imaum, in a direct line, from Ali Ben-Ali Taleb (who married Mohammed's daughter Fatima, and founded the Ali sect, also known as Fatimites, and more generally as the Shiites. q.v.), was to have been the seventh imaum of the Shiites, but, as he died during his father's lifetime. Jaafer appointed as his successor his younger son Kauzim. This many of the Shiites opposed, holding that, as the imaum is an incarnate emanation of the Deity, only a descendant of the direct line could assume the responsibilities of this high office, and claimed the  distinction for the sons of Ismael, who alone, of the descendants of Jaafer, were entitled to be imaum. This contention caused a schism among the Shiites about the 2nd century of the Hegira (8th century of our sera), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAETES, or ISMAETANS. The Abbassidae (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the powerful Shiites, in order to assume the government themselves, sided with the Ismaelites. But the Persians, among whom the Ismaelites at first mainly prospered (generally known as Talimis, from talimi, “learning,” because they afterwards held, contrary to the orthodox Mussulmans, that man can arrive at the truth of anything only by continued study), soon comprehended the designs of the Abbassidae, and they warred alike against the Abbassidae caliphs and the other Mussulmans.

Missionaries were sent through all the territories settled by the followers of Mohammed, at this time torn in pieces by scores of sects, to advocate the claims of the house of Ismael. They flourished in the 9th and 10th centuries under the name of Karmatians (q.v.), and constituted a secret band, governed by laws very much like the freemasons, admitting, however, some very dangerous tenets, and advocating the extirpation of their enemies by the sword. They received additional strength in the 11th century of our era, when a family of chiefs, through the means of superstition, established an influence over the minds of the Ismaelians that enabled them for two centuries to control the affairs of Persia. The first of these chiefs was Hussun Subah (from whose name the Ismaelites of this period are often called Hussuni or Hossoni--a title, however, having no connection [as has been erroneously supposed by some] with the English word assassin, which is really equivalent to “hashish-eaters;” SEE ASSASSINS ), who, after many years of persecution, succeeded in obtaining a stronghold, and, there fortifying himself, founded upon the Ismaelitic model a sect of his own. Besides maintaining the principles of the Ismatelites so far as regarded their rights of succession to the office of imaum, he also “introduced many new tenets more conformable to the opinions of the Suffis, or philosophical deists, than to those of orthodox Mohammedans. The Koran, he admitted, was a holy volume; but he insisted that its spirit, and not its literal meaning, was to be observed. He rejected the usual modes of worship, as true devotion, he said, was seated in the soul, and prescribed forms might disturb, though they could never aid, that secret and fervent adoration which it must always offer to its Creator (Malcolm, from a Persian MS.).

But the principal tenet which Hussun Subah inculcated was a complete and  absolute devotion to himself and to his descendants. His disciples were instructed to consider him more as their spiritual than their worldly leader. The means he took to instill this feeling into their minds must have been powerful, from the effect which: was produced. “When an envoy from Malik Shah came to Allahamout, Hussun commanded one of his subjects to stab himself, and another to cast himself headlong from a precipice. Both mandates were- instantly' obeyed! ‘Go,' said he to the astonished envoy, ‘and explain to your master the character of my followers' (Malcolm, Hist. of Persia, 1, 399). One reason which may be assigned for this control of Hussun over his adherents is that he formed them into a secret order and, besides, promised them advancement from one degree to another, in the highest of which a foretaste of the life that is to come was given them. This extraordinary mode of procuring the devotion of his disciples he is said to have produced by drugs. “A youth who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand prior; he was then intoxicated with hashish (the hemp-plant), and carried into the garden-a true Eastern Paradise where the music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonized with the murmurs of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality, and this, on awakening, he believed to be Paradise; everything around him, the hour is in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of Paradise, which the Prophet had promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit-after quaffing enervating delight from the eyes of the hour is, and intoxicating wine from glittering goblets, he sank into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavored to convince him that corporeally he had not left his side, but that spiritually he had been rapt into Paradise, and had there enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youths blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly seek an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a Paradise of sensual pleasure.

What Mohammed had promised in the Koran to the Moslem, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell (Madden, Turkish Empire. 2, 185, based on a Hammer's Gesch. ider Assassinen). Malcolm  thinks this an improbable tale, invented by the orthodox Mohammedans, who hold the Assassins in great abhorrence, because “the use of wine was strictly forbidden them, and they were enjoined the most temperate and abstemious habits.” But this seems to us only an additional reason why we should believe it to be true; for if Hussun used the hashish to intoxicate his followers when their nerves needed strengthening for some atrocious deed, we could not expect him to advocate the free use of intoxicating beverages. Nay, its truth is further confirmed by the revelations which the fourth successor of Hussun as grand master made of the imposture. The- use also to this day at Constantinople and at Cairo of opium with henbane shows what an incredible ‘charm they exert on the drowsy indolence of the Turk and the fiery imagination of the Arab.

Hussun, on account of several hill forts which he had seized, “was styled ‘Sheik el-Jebel,' an Arabic title which signifies ‘the chief of the mountains,' and which has been literally, but erroneously, translated ‘the old man of the mountain'”(Malcolm, 1 401). The Ismaelites in his time spread extensively. They flourished not only in Persia, but also in Syria and Arabia, until A.D. 1253 when their atrocities became unbearable, and a general massacre against them was inaugurated. A command was issued by the reigning prince, Mangu Khan, in the 651st year of the Hegira, “to exterminate all the Ismaelites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother's breast… Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatal sentence without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismaelites they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of-Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated.... Twelve thousand of these wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age…The ‘devoted to murder' were not now the victims of the order's vengeance, but that of outraged humanity.

The sword was against the dagger [the weapon the Assassins most generally used to murder their opponents], the executioner destroyed the murderer. The seed sowed for two centuries was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin's dagger was reaped by the sword of the mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment” (Madden, 2, 187; comp. Milman's Gibbon [Harper's edition], Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, 6, 215). But, with all these persecutions, they still struggled on for many years, and even in our own day “remains of the Ismaelites still exist both in Persia and Syria, hut merely as one of the many sects and heresies of  Islamism, SEE MOHAMMEDANISM, without any claims to power, without the means of retaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state- subverting doctrine which animated the followers of Hussun,' and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to them. Their writings are a shapeless mixture of Ismaelitic and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of a mystical theology. Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Iraq, and at the foot of the anti Lebanon” (Madden, 2, 190, 191). At present many students of Eastern history incline to the opinion that “the Druses” (q.v.), generally supposed to be the descendants of the Hivites, to whom they bear some characteristic resemblances (comp. Chasseaud [a native of Syria, and a very able scholar], Druses of the Lebanon. p. 361 sq.), “must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ismaelian sect of the followers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived” (Madden, 2, 196). Some also hold to a connection of the Ansarians with the Assassins, especially Mr.Walpole (Travels in the further East in 1850-51 [London, 2 vols. 8vo]; compare also his Travels in the East, 3, 3 sq.). Even in India the Ismaelites are believed to have followers, and as such “the Borahs, an industrious race of men, whose pursuits are commercial, and who are well known in the British settlements of India, who still maintain that part of the creed of Hussun Subah which enjoins a complete devotion to the mandate of the highpriest” (Malcolm, 1, 407, 408), are mentioned. See, besides the works already cited, J. F. Rousseau, Memoire sur les Ismaelis et les Nosairis, with notes by De Sacy; the Rev. Samuel Lyde, The Ansireeh and Ishmaleeh, a Visit to the secret Sects of Northern Syria (Lond. 1858, 8vo); Asiatic Researches, 11 43 sq. SEE MOHAMMEDANS; SEE SHIITES. (J.H.W.)

## Ismael, Haji[[@Headword:Ismael, Haji]]

             a Mussulman reformer, was born on the 28th of Shawal, 1196 of the Hegira (Sept. 11, 1781), in the village of Pholah, district of Delhi. His family had furnished quite a number of distinguished theologians, and Ismael began early to preach and write against the superstitious practices which had been introduced into the Mohammedan worship in Hindustan. In 1819 he became connected with Ahmed Shah, a Mohammedan of a family of Syeds of Bareilly, in Upper India, who was at this time attracting a great deal of attention at Delhi by superior sanctity, and by his denunciations of the corrupt forms of worship then prevalent. In 1822, he and another  Miussulman of some learning set out with Ahmed Shah on a visit to Arabia and Turkey. In all the great cities large congregations gathered about these new reformers, who sought to enforce attention to the precepts of the Koran independent of the opinions Of the high dignitaries of the Moslem Church. After traveling about for more than four years they returned to Delhi, determined to establish a theocratic form of government in India, and to restore Islamism to its original simplicity. The reformers inaugurated a general war against the unbelieving, and laying particular stress on the doctrine of the unity of God, they soon succeeded in gaining considerable power by the great number of their adherents. The Sikhs (q.v.) became their chief opponents, and with them a protracted struggle ensued. Driven from Delhi by the civil authorities, they retired in 1827 to Punjtar (situated in the Eusofzai hills, between Peshawur and the Indus), where they found an ally in Omar, khan Afghan of Punjtar. At first these united forces were successful in their wars against the Sikhs, but the Afghans soon grew weary of these conquests for strange allies, and Ahmed and Ismael being left alone, removed to the left bank of the Ildus, and there, amid rugged mountains, continued for a time the desultory warfare. Early in May 1831, however, they were surprised at a place called Balakot, in the mountains of Pahkli, and slain.

The followers of Ahmed and Ismael are called Tharicati Mohammediyat, and bear some resemblance in their doctrines to the Sunnites (q.v.). Ismael composed for the benefit of the sect, and at the instigation of Ahmed, the Tukvia ul-Inzmi, or “Basis of the Faith,” in the Urdu, or vernacular language of Upper India, and it was printed at Calcutta. “It is divided into two portions, of which the first only is understood to be the work of Ismael, the second part (the Sirat Almostakim, published in. Persian at Calcutta, and translated in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal) being inferior, and the production of another person. In the preface Ismael ‘deprecates the opinion' that the wise and learned alone can comprehend God's Word. God himself had said a prophet had been raised up among the rude and ignorant for their instruction, and that he, the Lord, had rendered obedience easy.

There were two things essential: a belief in the unity of God, which was to know no other, and a knowledge of the Prophet, which was obedience to the law. Many held the sayings of the saints to be their guide, but the Word of God was alone to be attended to, although the writings of the pious which agreed with the Scriptures might be read for edification.' The first chapter treats of the unity of God, and in it the writer  deprecates the supplication of saints, angels, etc., as impious. He declares the reasons given for such worship to be futile, and to show an utter ignorance of God's Word. The ancient idolaters had likewise said that they merely venerated powers and divinities, and did not regard them as the equal of the Almighty; but God himself had answered these heathens. Likewise the Christians had been admonished for giving to dead monks and friars the honor due to the Lord. God is alone, and companion he has none; prostration and adoration are due to him, and to no other.' Ismael proceeds in a similar strain, but assumes some doubtful positions, as that Mohammed says God is one, and man learns from his parents that he was born; he believes his mother, and yet he distrusts the apostle; or that an evil-doer who has faith is a better man than the most pious idolater” (Cunningham, History of the Sikhs, p. 190, foot-note t). The work was translated in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain (1852), 13:317-367. See Garcin de Tassv, Hist. de la Litt. hindoustane, 1, 251; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Géneralé, 26:81. (J.H. W.)

## Ismaelites[[@Headword:Ismaelites]]

             SEE ISHMAEL.

## Ismaiah[[@Headword:Ismaiah]]

             (1Ch 12:4). SEE ISHMAIAH, 1.

## Ismailiyah[[@Headword:Ismailiyah]]

             the followers of Ismail or Ismael (q.v.).

## Ismall ben-Elisa, Ha-Cohen[[@Headword:Ismall ben-Elisa, Ha-Cohen]]

             one of the most celebrated Jewish Rabbis and theologians, was born about A.D. 60 in Upper' Galilee, and when yet a child was carried as a captive to Rome on the destruction of Jerusalem. While he was confined in prison in the Eternal City, the Rabbis Joshua, Azzariah. and Gamaliel II had come to Rome to implore mercy and pardon for the captive Jews of the then reigning emperor Diocdetian (about A.D. 83), and by accident-passing the prison door of this young boy, Rabbi Joshua exclaimed at his door, “Who gave Jacob for a spoil, and Israel to the robbers?” (Isa 42:24) to which Ismael ben-Elisa gave this manly reply: “The Lord, against whom we have sinned, and would not walk in his ways, nor be obedient unto his law” (ibid.). This remarkable reply from the mouth of Ismael so interested the celebrated Rabbis in his behalf that they vowed to secure his liberation before they should quit the city. Ismael ben-Elisa, when liberated, placed himself under the instruction of Rabbi Joshua, and also studied under the celebrated Simon ben-Jochai. At a later period we find Ismael ben-Elisa in Southern Judcea, not far from the Idumsean boundaries, at Kephar-Aziz (כפראּאזיז), occupied in the cultivation and sale of the grape. But while thus employed he was also engaged in the noble effort of maintaining young Jewish maidens, who, by the desolations of the war, had been impoverished, and were suffering terribly from; destitution. Ismael ben-  Elisa is supposed to have suffered martyrdom during the persecutions so frequent at that period (about A.D. 121). His especial service to Judaism was the system of interpretation which he inaugurated in opposition to the system of' Rabbi Akiba. The latter held that “every repetition, figure, parallelism, synonym, word, letter, particle, pleonasm, nay, the very shape, and every ornament of a letter or title, had a recondite meaning in the Scripture, ‘just as every fiber of a fly's wing or an ant's foot has its peculiar significance.'

Hence he maintained that the particles את, גם, א,ִ and רק, as well as the construction of the finite verb with the infinitive, e.g. תעביטנו, העבט, השב תשיב, have a dogmatic significance, and he therefore deduced points of law from them. Philo was of the same opinion (comp. σαφῶς εἰδώς, ὅτι περιττὸν ὄνομα οὐδὲν τίθησιν, ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ πραγματολογεῖν ἀμυθήτου φορᾶς, Deprofugis, ed. Mangey, p. 458), and he even deduced from them ethical and philosophical maxims; and this was also the opinion of the Greek translator of Ecclesiastes in the Septuagint, as may be seen from his anxiety to indicate the Hebrew particle אתby the Greek σύν, which has greatly perplexed the commentators who, being unacquainted with this fact, have been unable to account for this barbarism and violation of grammatical propriety” (comp. Ginsburg, Comment. on Ecclesiastes, p. 496). On the other hand, Rabbi Ismael ben- Elisa held that the Scriptures (of course only the O. T.), being a composition intended for human eyes and comprehension, “used expressions in their common acceptation, and that many of the repetitions and parallelisms are simply designed to render the style more rhetorical and powerful, and cannot, therefore, without violation of the laws of language, be adduced in support of legal deductions.” In accordance with this theory, he established thirteen exegetical rules, which are called עשרה מדות דרבי ישמעאל שלש, The thirteen Rules of R. Ismael, by which alone, as he maintained. the Scriptures are to be interpreted (שהתורה נדרשת בהם). Comp. the very valuable work of Dr. E. M. Pinner, Talmusd Babli (tractat Berachoth) mit deutscher Uebersetzung, etc. (Berlin, 1842, fol.), 1, 17-20, where Ismael's rules are given with lengthy annotations. See also the article MIDRASH SEE MIDRASH.

Rabbi Ismael is also the reputed author of a number of other works. The most important of these are, an allegorical commentary on Exo 12:1 to Exo 23:20, called מכלתא, treating of the ceremonies prescribed by the Torah. ‘Numerous editions of it have been printed; the first at Constantinople, 1515, folio; the last, to our  knowledge, at Wilna, 1844, folio. It has been augmented by notes from several other Jewish writers, and was translated into Latin by Ugolino (Thesaurus Antiquitatum, vol. 14):-- פַּרְקֵי תֵיכָלֹות (or סֵ חֲנוֹךְ), a work on mystic theology, of which extracts have been published in אִרְזֵו לְבָנוֹן (Venice, 1601, 4to; Cracow, 1648, 4to), and in other works. It was printed separately under the title דְּרוּשׁ פַרְקֵי תֵיכָלוֹת (Venice, 1677, 8vo; Zolkiew, 1833, 8vo). It was also inserted in parts in the edition of the Zohar. Ismael also wrote a cabalistic, allegorical treatise on the nature and attributes of God, under the title שַׁעוּר קוֹמָה; also called סְ הִקּוֹמָה. A part of it was published in the סֵ רְזַיאֵלof Eleazar ben-Jehudah of Worms (Amsterd. 1701, 4to, and often). Another small cabalistic treatise on the shape and mystic value of letters, under the title of סֵ הִתְּמוּנָה, was published with a long commentary (Konz, 1774. 4to), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Judaica, 2, 75 sq.; Rossi, Diion. storico degli Autori Ebrei; Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vortrdge der Juden (Berlin, 1832), p. 47 sq.; Gratz, Geschichte der Juden, 4, 68 sq.; Steinschneider, Cataloqus Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodleiana, col. 1160, etc.; Ben Chananja (Szegedin, 1858), 1, 122 sq.

## Isoard, Joachim Jean Xavier D[[@Headword:Isoard, Joachim Jean Xavier D]]

             a French prelate, was born at Aix, in Provence, October 23, 1766. His family originated in Dauphine, and was a very ancient one. He lost his father when he was a child, and was placed into the seminary of Aix by his mother when the Bonapartes took refuge upon the continent, they found  some support in the family of Isoard. About that time he departed for Italy, and connected himself, in 1794, with the count of Provence, at Verona. On his return to his native city in the same year he associated himself with a royalist band, and, it is said, was instrumental in saving the life of Lucien Bonaparte. When Pius VII was brought as a captive to France, Isoard followed him. Napoleon proposed to him some high employments, and even a place in the senate, but he refused. After the death of cardinal Fesel, in May 1839, Isoard was designated to replace him, June 14. He died at Paris, October 8 of the same year. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Isochristme[[@Headword:Isochristme]]

             (from ἴσος, qual, and Χριστός, Christ), some followers of Origen, who were charged with maintaining that the apostles were raised to equal glory with their master. They were condemned by a council at Constantinople in 553.

## Isolani, Giacomo[[@Headword:Isolani, Giacomo]]

             an Italian legislator and cardinal, was born at Bologna. He had obtained a great reputation as a scholar, being well versed both in civil and canonical law, when, after the loss of his wife, he decided to enter the ministry. He soon became distinguished in his new position, and after he had filled several important functions, pope John XIII made him cardinal, in 1414, and left him his vicar at Rome, where he was made prisoner by the troops of Ladislas, king of Naples. Finally he was set at liberty by the efforts of Giacomo Sforga Attendole, and Felippe Maria Visconti made him governor of Genoa. He died at Milan, February 19, 1431, leaving several Consilias and other works on law. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ispah[[@Headword:Ispah]]

             (Heb. Yishpulh', יַשְׁפָּה, prob. bald; Septuag. Ε᾿σφάχ v.r. Ι᾿εσφά), one of the “sons” of Beriah, a chief Benjamite (originally from the neighborhood of Aijalon) resident at Jerusalem (1Ch 8:16). B.C. ante 588.

## Isparetta[[@Headword:Isparetta]]

             was the supreme god of the inhabitants of the coast of Malabar. When the earth was to be created he changed himself into an egg, from which heaven and earth, and all that it contains, sprang.

## Israel[[@Headword:Israel]]

             [not izrcel] (Heb. Yisrael', יַשְׂרָאֵל; Sept. and N.T. Ι᾿σραήλ), the name of the founder of the Jewish nation, and of the nation itself, specially of the kingdom comprising the ten northern tribes after the schism.

The name was originally conferred by the angel-Jehovah upon Jacob after the memorable prayer-struggle at Peniel (Gen 32:28); and the  reason there assigned is that the patriarch “as a prince had power (שָׂרַית) With God and man, and prevailed” (comp. Gen 25:10; Hos 12:4). The etymology is therefore clearly from the root שָׂרָה, with the frequent adjunct אֵל, God. The verb itself occurs nowhere else than in the above passages, where it evidently means to strive or contend as in battle; but derivatives are found, e.g. שָׂרָה, a princess, and hence applied to Abraham's wife in exchange for her former name Sarai. The signification thus appears to be that of a “successful wrestler with God,” a sense with which all the lexicographers substantially coincide; e.g. Gesenius (Heb. Lex. s.v., and Thesaur. p. 1338), pugmator, i.e. miles Dei; Winer (Heb. Lex. p. 1026), luctator, i.e. pugnator Dei; Furst (Heb, Worterb. s. r.), Gott-Beherrscher.

1. JACOB, whose history will be found under that name. Although, as applied to Jacob personally, Israel is an honorable or poetical appellation, it is the common prose name of his descendants, while, on the contrary, the title Jacob is given to them only in poetry in the latter division of Isaiah (after the 39th chapter), many instances occur of the two names used side by side, to subserve the parallelism of Hebrew poetry, as in Gen 41:8; Gen 41:14; Gen 41:20-21; Gen 42:24; Gen 43:1; Gen 43:22; Gen 43:28, etc.; so, indeed, in Gen 14:1. The modern Jews, at least in the East, are fond of being named Israeli in preference to Yahudi, as more honorable. SEE JACOB.

2. The ISRAELITES, i.e. the whole people of Israel, the twelve tribes; often called the children of Israel (Jos 3:17; Jos 7:25; Jdg 8:27; Jer 3:21); and the house of Israel (Exo 16:31; Exo 40:38); so also in Israel (1Sa 9:9); and land of Israel, i.e. Palestine (1Sa 13:19; 2Ki 6:23). Sometimes the whole people is represented as one person: “Israel is my son” (Exo 4:22; Num 20:14; Isa 41:8; Isa 42:24; Isa 43:1; Isa 43:15; Isa 44:1; Isa 44:5). Israel is sometimes put emphatically for the true Israelites, the faithful, those distinguished for piety and virtue, and worthy of the name (Psa 73:1; Isa 45:17; Isa 49:3; Joh 1:47; Rom 9:6; Rom 11:26). Israelites was the usual name of the twelve tribes, from their leaving Egypt until- after the death of Saul. But in consequence of the dissensions between the ten tribes and Judah from the death of Saul onward, these ten tribes, among whom Ephraim took the lead, arrogated to themselves this honorable name of the whole nation (2Sa 2:9-10; 2Sa 2:17; 2Sa 2:28; 2Sa 3:10; 2Sa 3:17; 2Sa 19:40-43; 1Ki 12:1); and on their separation, after the death of  Solomon, into an independent kingdom, founded by Jeroboam, this name was adopted for the kingdom, so that thenceforth the kings of the ten tribes were called kings of Israel, and the descendants of David, who ruled over Judah and Benjamin, were called kings of Judah. So in the prophets of that period Judah and Israel are put in opposition (Hos 4:15; Hos 5:3; Hos 5:5; Hos 6:10; Hos 7:1; Hos 8:2-3; Hos 8:6; Hos 8:8; Hos 9:1; Hos 9:7; Amo 1:1; Amo 2:6; Amo 3:14; Mic 1:5; Isa 5:7). Yet the kingdom of Judah could still be reckoned as a part of Israel, as in Isa 8:14, the two kingdoms are called the two houses of Israel; and hence, after the destruction of the kingdom of Israel at Samaria, the name Israel began again to be applied to the whole surviving people. SEE HEBREW: Israelite, etc.

3. It is used in a narrower sense, excluding Judah, in 1Sa 11:8. It is so used in the famous cry of the rebels against David (2Sa 20:1) and against his grandson (1Ki 12:16). Thenceforth it was assumed and accepted as the name of the northern kingdom, in which the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, Levi, Dan, and Simeon had no share. SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

4. After the Babylonian captivity, the returned exiles although they were mainly of the kingdom of Judah, resumed the name Israel as the designation of their nation, but as individuals they are almost always described as Jews in the Apocrypha arid N.T. Instances occur in the books of Chronicles of the application of the name Israel to Judah (e.g. 2Ch 11:3; 2Ch 12:6), and in Esther of the name Jews to the whole people. The name Israel is also used to denote laymen as distinguished from priests, Levites, and other ministers (Ezr 6:16; Ezr 9:1; Ezr 10:25; Neh 11:3, etc.). — Smith. The twelve tribes of Israel ever formed the ideal representation of the whole stock (1Ki 18:30-31; Ezr 6:17; Jer 31:1, etc.). Hence also in the New Test. “Israel” is applied (as in No. 2 above) to the true people of God, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin (Rom 9:6; Gal 6:16. etc.), being, in fact, comprehensive of the entire Church of the redeemed. SEE JEWS SEE ISRAEL, KINGDOM OF.

The name Israel (q.v.), which at first had been the national designation of the twelve tribes collectively (Exo 3:16, etc.), was, on the division of the monarchy, applied to the northern kingdom (a usage, however, not strictly observed, as in 2Ch 12:6) in contradistinction to the other portion, which was termed the kingdom of Judah. This limitation of the name Israel to certain tribes, at the head of which was that of Ephraim, which, accordingly, in some of the prophetical  writings, as e.g. Isa 17:13; Hos 4:17, gives its own name to the northern kingdom, is discernible even at so early a period as the commencement of the reign of Saul, and affords evidence of the existence of some of the causes which eventually led to the schism of the nation. It indicated the existence of a rivalry, which needed only time and favorable circumstances to ripen into the revolt witnessed after the death of Solomon.

I. Causes of the Division. — The prophet Abijah, who had been commissioned to announce to Jeroboam, the Ephraimite, the transference to him of the greater part of the kingdom of Solomon, declared it to be the punishment of disobedience to the divine law, and particularly of the idolatry so largely promoted by Solomon (1Ki 11:31-35). But while this revolt from the house of David is to be thus viewed in its directly penal character, or as a divine retribution, this does not preclude an inquiry into those sacred causes, political and otherwise, to which this very important revolution in Israelitish history is clearly referable. Such an inquiry, indeed, will make it evident how human passions and jealousies were made subservient to the divine purpose.

Prophecy had early assigned a pre-eminent place to two of the sons of Jacob-Judah and Joseph-as the founders of tribes. In the blessing pronounced upon his sons by the dying patriarch, Joseph had the birthright conferred upon him, and was promised in his son Ephraim a numerous progeny; while to Judah promise was made, among other blessings, of rule or dominion over his brethren-” thy father's children shall bow-down before thee” (Gen 48:19; Gen 48:22; Gen 49:8; Gen 49:26; comp. 1Ch 5:1-2).

These blessings were repeated and enlarged in the blessing of Moses (Deu 33:7; Deu 33:17). The pre-eminence thus prophetically assigned to these two tribes received a partial verification in the fact that at the exodus their numbers were nearly equal, and far in excess of those of the other tribes; and further, as became their position, they were the first who obtained their territories, which were also assigned them in the very center of the land. It is unnecessary to advert to the various other circumstances which contributed to the growth and aggrandizement of these two tribes, and which, from the position these were thus enabled to acquire above the rest, naturally led to their becoming heads of parties, and, as such, the objects of mutual rivalry and contention. The Ephraimites, indeed, from the very first, gave unmistakable tokens of an exceedingly haughty temper, and preferred most arrogant claims over the other tribes as regards questions of  peace and war. This may be seen in their representation to Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh (Jdg 8:1), and in their conduct towards Jephthah (Jdg 12:1). Now if this overbearing people resented in the case of tribes so inconsiderable as that of Manasseh what they regarded as a slight, it is easy to conceive how they must have eyed the proceedings of the tribe of Judah, which was more especially their rival. Hence it was, that while on the first establishment of the monarchy in the person of Saul, of the tribe of Benjamin, the Ephraimites, with the other northern tribes with whom they were associated, silently acquiesced, they refused for seven years to submit to his successor of the tribe of Judah (2Sa 2:9-11), and even after their submission they showed a disposition on any favorable opportunity to raise the cry of revolt: “To your tents, O Israel” (2Sa 20:1).

It was this early, long-continued, and deep-rooted feeling, strengthened and embittered by the schism, though not concurring with it, that gave point to the language in which Isaiah predicted the blessed times of Messiah: The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off; Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim” (Isa 11:13). Indeed, for more than 400 years, from the time that Joshua was the leader of the Israelitish hosts, Ephraim, with the dependent tribes of Manasseh and Benjamin, may be said to have exercised undisputed pre-eminence till the accession of David. Accordingly it is not surprising that such a people would not readily submit to an arrangement which, though declared to be of divine appointment, should place them in a subordinate condition, as when God “refused the tabernacle of Joseph, and chose not the tribe of Ephraim, but chose the tribe of Judah, even the Mount Zion which he loved” (Psa 78:67-68). SEE EPHRAIM.

There were thus, indeed, two powerful elements tending to break up the national unity. In addition to the long-continued and growing jealousy on the part of the Ephraimites to the tribe of Judah, another cause of dissatisfaction to the dynasty of David in particular was the arrangement just referred to, which consisted in the removal of the civil, and more particularly the ecclesiastical government, to Jerusalem. The Mosaic ordinances were in themselves exceedingly onerous, and this must have been more especially felt by such as were resident at a distance from the sanctuary, as it entailed upon them long journeys, not only when attending the stated festivals, but also on numerous other occasions prescribed in the law. This must have been felt as a special grievance by the Ephraimites, owing to the fact that the national sanctuary had been for a very long  period at Shiloh, within their own territory and therefore its transference elsewhere, it is easy to discern, would not be readily acquiesced in by a people who had proved themselves in other respects so jealous of their rights, and not easily persuaded that this was not rather a political expedient on the part of the rival tribe, than as a matter of divine choice (1Ki 14:21). Nor is it to be overlooked, in connection with this subject, that other provisions of the theocratic economy relative to the annual festivals would be taken advantage of by those in whom there existed already a spirit of dissatisfaction. Even within o6 limited a locality as Palestine, there must have been inequalities of climate, which must have considerably affected the seasons, more particularly the vintage and harvest, with which the feasts may in some measure have interfered, and in so far may have been productive of discontent between the northern and southern residents. That there were inconveniences in both the respects now mentioned would indeed appear from the appeal made by Jeroboam to his new subjects, when, for reasons of state policy, and in order to perpetuate the schism by making it religious as well as political, he would dissuade them from attendance on the feasts in Judah: ‘It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem” (1Ki 12:28); and from the fact that he postponed for a whole month the celebration of the feast of tabernacles (1Ki 12:32), a change to which it is believed he was induced, or in the adoption of which he was at least greatly aided, by the circumstance of the harvest being considerably later in the northern than in the southern districts (Pict. Bible, note on 1Ki 12:32).

Again, the burdensome exactions in the form of service and tribute imposed on his subjects by Solomon for his extensive buildings, and the maintenance of his splendid and luxurious court, must have still further deepened this disaffection, which originated in one or other of the causes already referred to. It may indeed be assumed that this grievance was of a character which appealed to the malcontents more directly than any other; and that these burdens, required especially for the beautifying of the capital, must have been exceedingly disagreeable to the inhabitants of the provinces, who did not in any way participate in the glories in support of which such onerous charges were required. The burdens thus imposed were indeed expressly stated to be the chief ground of complaint by the representatives of Israel headed by Jeroboam, who, on the occasion of the coronation at Shechem, waited on the son of Solomon with a view to obtain redress (1Ki 12:4). The long smoldering dissatisfaction could  no longer be repressed, and a mitigation of their burdens was imperiously demanded by the people. For this end Jeroboam had been summoned, at the death of Solomon, from Egypt, whose presence must have had a marked influence on the issue, although it may be a question whether Jeroboam should not be regarded rather as an instrument called forth by the occasion than as himself the instigator of the revolt. With this agrees the intimation made to him from the Lord many years before by Ahijah the Shilonite. The very choice of Shechem, within the territories of Ephraim, as the coronation place of Rehoboam, may have had for its object the repression of the rebellious spirit in the northern tribes by means of so grand and imposing a ceremony.

However this may have been, or in whatever degree the causes specified may have severally operated in producing the revolt, the breach now made was never healed, God himself expressly forbidding all attempts on the part of Rehoboam and his counselors to subjugate the revolted provinces with the intimation, “This thing is from me” (1Ki 12:24). The subsequent history of the two kingdoms was productive, with but slight exceptions, of further estrangement.

II. Extent and Resources of the Kingdom of Israel. The area of Palestine, even at its utmost extent under Solomon, was very circumscribed. In its geographical relations it certainly bore no comparison whatever to the other great empires of antiquity, nor indeed was there any proportion between its size and the mighty influences which have emanated from its soil. Making allowance for the territories on the shore of the Mediterranean in the possession of the Phoenicians, the area of Palestine did not much exceed 13,000 square miles. This limited extent, it might be shown, however, did the present subject call for it, rendered that land more suitable for the purposes of the theocracy than if it were of a far larger area. What precise extent of territories was embraced in the kingdom of Israel cannot be very easily determined, but it may be safely estimated as more than double that of the southern kingdom, or, according to a more exact ratio, as 9 to 4. Nor is it easy to specify with exactness the several tribes which composed the respective kingdoms. In the announcement made by Ahijah to Jeroboam, he is assured often tribes, while only one is reserved for the house of David; but this must be taken only in a general sense, and is to be interpreted by 1Ki 12:23 (compare 1Ki 12:21); for it would appear that Simeon, part of Dan, and the greater part of Benjamin, owing doubtless to the fact that Jerusalem itself was situated within that  tribe, formed portion of the kingdom of Judah (Ewald, Geschichte, 3:409).

It is to be noticed, however, that Judah was the only independent tribe, and therefore it might be spoken of as the one which constituted the kingdom of the house of David. The ten tribes nominally assigned to Israel were probably Joseph (=Ephraim and Manasseh), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, Gad, and Reuben, Levi being intentionally omitted; the ten actually embraced in it seem to have been Ephraim, Manasseh (East and West), Issachar, Zebulon, Asher, Naphtali, Gad, Reuben, and (in part) Dan. With. respect to the conquests of David, Moab appears to have been attached to the kingdom of Israel (2Ki 3:4); as much of Syria as remained subject to Solomon (see 1Ki 11:24) would probably be claimed by his successor in the northern kingdom; and Ammon, though connected with Rehoboam as his mother's native land (2Ch 12:13), and though afterwards tributary to Judah (2Ch 27:5), was at one time allied (2Ch 20:1), we know not how closely or how early, with Moab. The seacoast between Accho and Japho remained in the possession of Israel.

With regard to population, again, the data are even more defective than with respect to territorial extent. According to the uncompleted census taken in the reign of David, about forty years previous to the schism of the kingdom, the fighting men in Israel numbered 800,000, and in Judah 500,000 (2Sa 24:9); but in 1Ch 21:5-6, the numbers are differently stated at 1,100,000 and 470,000 respectively, with the intimation that Levi and Benjamin were not included (comp. 1Ch 27:24). As bearing more directly on this point, Rehoboam raised an army of 180,000 men out of Judah and Benjamin to fight against Jeroboam (1Ki 12:21); and again, Abijah, the son of Rehoboam, with 400,000 men, made war on Jeroboam at the head of an army of 800,000 (2Ch 13:3). According to the general laws observable in such cases, these numbers may be said to represent an aggregate population of from five and a half to six millions, of which about one third, or two millions, may be fairly assigned to the kingdom of Judah at the time of the separation.

Shechem was the first capital of the new kingdom (1Ki 12:25), venerable for its traditions, and beautiful in its situation. Subsequently Tirzah, whose loveliness had fixed the wandering gaze of Solomon (Son 6:4), became the royal residence, if not the capital of Jeroboam (1Ki 14:17) and of his successors (1Ki 15:33; 1Ki 16:8; 1Ki 16:17; 1Ki 16:23). — After the murder of Jeroboam's son, indeed, Baasha seems to have  intended to fix his capital at Ramah, as a convenient place for annoying the king of Judah, whom he looked on as his only dangerous enemy; but he was forced to renounce this plan (1Ki 4:17; 1Ki 4:21). Samaria, uniting in itself the qualities of beauty and fertility, and a commanding position, was chosen by Omri (1Ki 16:24), and remained the capital of the kingdom until it had given the last proof of its strength by sustaining for three years the onset of the hosts of Assyria. Jezreel was probably only a royal residence of some of the Israelitish kings. It may have been in awe of the ancient holiness of Shiloh that Jeroboam forbore to pollute the secluded site of the tabernacle with the golden calves. He chose for the religious capitals of his kingdom Dan, the old home of northern schism, and Bethel, a Benjamite city not far from Shiloh, and marked out by history and situation as the rival of Jerusalem.

III. Political and Religious Relations of the Kingdom of Israel. — But whilst, in extent of territory and of population, and it might be shown also in various other respects, the resources of the northern kingdom were at the very least double those of its southern rival, the latter embraced elements of strength which were entirely lacking in the other. There was first the geographical position of the kingdom of Israel, which exposed its northern frontier to invasions on the part of Syria and the Assyrian hosts. But more than this, or any exposure to attack from without, were the dangers to be apprehended from the polity on which the kingdom was founded. Jeroboam's public sanction of idolatry, and his other interferences with fundamental principles of the Mosaic law, more especially in the matter of the priesthood, at once alienated from his government all who were well affected to that economy, and who were not ready to subordinate their religion to any political considerations. Of such there were not a few within the territories of the new kingdom. The Levites m particular fled the kingdom, abandoning their property and possessions: and so did many others besides; “such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of Israel came to Jerusalem, to sacrifice unto the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah” (2Ch 11:13-17). Not only was one great source of strength thus at once dried up, but the strongly conservating principles of the law were violently shocked, and the kingdom more than ever exposed to the encroachments of the heathenism which extended along its frontier.

One element of weakness in the kingdom of Israel was the number of tribes of which it was composed, more especially after they had renounced those  principles of the Mosaic law which, while preserving the individuality of the tribes, served to bind them together as one people. Among other circumstances unfavorable to unity was the want of a capital in which all had a common interest, and with which they were connected by some common tie. This want was by no means compensated by the religious establishments at Bethel and Dan. But it is in respect to theocratic and religious relations that the weakness of the kingdom of Israel specially appears. Any sanction which the usurpation of Jeroboam may have derived at first from the announcement made to him by the prophet Ahijah, and afterwards from the charge given to Rehoboam and the men of Judah not to fight against Israel, because the thing was from the Lord (1Ki 12:23), must have been completely taken away by the denunciations of the prophet out of Judah against the altar at Bethel (1Ki 13:1-10), and the subsequent announcements of Ahijah himself to Jeroboam, who failed to fulfill the conditions on which the kingdom was given him (1Ki 14:7-16). The setting up of the worship of the calves, in which may be traced the influence of Jeroboam's residence in Egypt, and the consecrating of priests who could have no moral weight with their fellow-subjects, and were chosen only for their subservience to the royal will, were measures by no means calculated to consolidate a power from which the divine sanction had been expressly withdrawn. On the contrary, they led, and very speedily, to the alienation of many who might at the outset have silently acquiesced in the revolution, even if they had not fully approved of it. The large migration which ensued into Judah of all who were favorable to the former institutions must still further have aggravated the evil, as all vigorous opposition would thenceforth cease to the downward and destructive tendency of the anti-theocratic policy. The natural result of the course appears in the fact that the step taken by Jeroboam was never retraced by any of his successors, one after another following the example thus set to them, so that Jeroboam is emphatically and frequently characterized in Scripture as the man “who made Israel to sin,” while his successors are described as following in “the sin of Jeroboam.”

Further, as the calves of Jeroboam are referable to Egypt, so the worship of Baal, which was introduced by Ahab, the seventh of the Israelitish kings, had its origin in the Tyrian alliance formed by that monarch through his marriage with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon. Hitherto the national religion was ostensibly the worship of Jehovah under the representation of the calves; but under this new reign every attempt was  made to extirpate this worship entirely by the destruction of God's prophets and the subversion of his altars. It was to meet this new phase of things that the strenuous agency of Elijah, Elisha, and their associates was directed, and assumed a quite peculiar form of prophetic ministration, though still the success was but partial and temporary. SEE ELIJAH and SEE ELISHA.

IV. Decay and Dissolution of the Kingdom of Israel. — The kingdom of Israel developed no new power. It was but a portion of David's kingdom deprived of many elements of strength. Its frontier was as open and as widely extended as before, but it wanted a capital for the seat of organized power. Its territory was as fertile and as tempting to the spoiler, but its people were less united and patriotic. A corrupt religion poisoned the source of national life. While less reverence attended on a new and unconsecrated king, and-less respect was felt for an aristocracy reduced by the retirement of the Levites, the army which David found hard to control rose up unchecked in the exercise of its willful strength; and thus eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in quick succession, Tyre ceased to be an ally when the alliance was no longer profitable to the merchant city. Moab and Ammon yielded tribute only while under compulsion. A powerful neighbor, Damascus, sat armed at the gate of Israel; and beyond Damascus might be discerned the rising strength of the first great monarchy of the world.

The history of the kingdom of Israel is therefore the history of its decay and dissolution. In no true sense did it manifest a principle of progress, save only in swerving more and more completely from the ‘course marked out by Providence and revelation for the seed of Abraham; and yet the history is interesting as showing how, notwithstanding the ever-widening breach between the two great branches of the one community, the divine purposes concerning. them were accomplished. That a polity constituted as was that of the northern kingdom contained in it potent elements of decay must be self-evident, even were the fact less clearly marked on every page of its history.

There is reason to believe that Jeroboam carried back with him into Israel the good will, if not the substantial assistance of Shishak, and this will account for his escaping the storm from Egypt which swept over Rehoboam in his fifth year (2Ch 12:2-9). During that first period Israel was far from quiet within. Although the ten tribes collectively  had decided in favor of Jeroboam, great numbers of individuals remained attached to the family of David and to the worship at Jerusalem, and in the three first years of Rehoboam migrated into Judah (2Ch 11:16-17). Perhaps it was not until this process commenced that Jeroboam was worked up to the desperate measure of erecting rival sanctuaries with visible idols (1Ki 12:27); a measure which met the usual ill-success of profane state-craft, and aggravated the evil which he feared. Jeroboam had not sufficient force of character in himself to make a lasting impression on his people. A king, but not a founder of a dynasty, he aimed at nothing beyond securing his present elevation. Without any ambition to share in the commerce of Tyre, or to compete with the growing power of Damascus, or even to complete the humiliation of the helpless monarch whom he had deprived of half a kingdom, Jeroboam acted entirely on a defensive policy. He attempted to give his subjects a center which they wanted for their political allegiance, in Shechem or in Tirzah.

He sought to change merely so much of their ritual as was inconsistent with his authority over them. But, as soon as the golden calves were set up, the priests, and Levites, and many religious Israelites (2Ch 11:16) left their country, and the disastrous emigration was not effectually checked even by the attempt of Baasha to build a fortress (2Ch 16:6) at Ramah. A new priesthood was introduced (1Ki 12:31) absolutely dependent on the king (Amo 7:13); not forming, asunder the Mosaic law, a landed aristocracy, not respected by the people, and unable either to withstand the oppression or to strengthen the weakness of a king. A priesthood created and a ritual devised for secular purposes had no hold whatever on the conscience of the people. To meet their spiritual cravings a succession of prophets was raised up, great in their poverty, their purity, their austerity, their self-dependence, their moral influence, but imperfectly organized-a rod to correct and check the civil government, not, as they might have been under happier circumstances, a staff to support it. The army soon learned its power to dictate to the isolated monarch and disunited people. Although Jeroboam, the founder of the kingdom, himself reigned nearly twenty-two years, yet his son and successor Nadab was violently cut off after a brief reign of less than two years, and with him the whole house of Jeroboam.

Thus speedily closed the first dynasty, and it was but a type of those which followed. Eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in rapid succession, the army being frequently the prime movers in these transactions. Thus Baasha, in the midst of the army at Gibbethon,  slew Nadab, the son of Jeroboam; and, again, Zimri, a captain of chariots, slew Elah, the son and successor of Baasha, and reigned only seven days, during which time, however, he smote ail the posterity and kindred of his predecessor, and ended his own days by suicide (1Ki 16:18). Omri, the captain of the host, was chosen to punish the usurper Zimri, and after a civil war of four years he prevailed over his other rival Tibni, the choice of half the people. Omri, the sixth in order of the Israelitish-kings, founded a more lasting dynasty, for it endured for forty-five years, he having been succeeded by his son Ahab, of whom it is recorded that he “did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him” (1Ki 16:33); and he, again, by his son Ahaziah, who, after a reign of less than two years, died from the effects of a fall, and, leaving no son, was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who reigned twelve years, until slain by Jehu, the captain of the army at Ramoth-Gilead, who also executed the total destruction of the family of Ahab, which perished like those of Jeroboam and of Baasha (2Ki 9:9).

Meanwhile the relations between the rival kingdoms were, as might be expected, ‘of a very unfriendly character. “There was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days” (1Ki 14:30); so also between Asa and Baasha (1Ki 15:14; 1Ki 15:32). The first mention of peace was that made by Jehoshaphat with Ahab (1Ki 22:44), and which was continued between their two successors. The princes of Omri's house cultivated an alliance with the contemporary kings of Judah. which was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah, and marked by the community of names among the royal children. Ahab's Tyrian alliance strengthened him with the counsels of the masculine mind of Jezebel, but brought him no further support.

The kingdom of Israel suffered also from foreign enemies. In the reign of Omri the Syrians had made themselves masters of a portion of the land of Israel (1Ki 20:33), and had proceeded so far as to erect streets for themselves in Samaria, which had just been made the capital. Further- incursions were checked by Ahab, who concluded a peace with the Syrians which lasted three years (1Ki 22:1), until that king, in league with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. attempted to wrest Ramoth-Gilead out of their hands, an act which cost him his life. The death of Ahab was followed by the revolt of the Moabites (2Ki 1:4), who were again, however, subjugated by Jehoram, in league with Jehoshaphat. Again the Syrians renewed their inroads on the kingdom of Israel, and even besieged  Samaria, but fled through panic. In the reign of Jehu “the Lord began to cut Israel short: and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel” (2Ki 10:32). Their troubles from that quarter increased still further during the following reign, when the Syrians reduced them to the utmost extremities (2Ki 13:7). To this more prosperous days succeeded, with a reverse to Judah, whose king presumptuously declared war against Israel.

Under Jeroboam II, who reigned forty-two years, the affairs of the northern kingdom revived. “He restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain; he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, which belonged to Judah, for Israel” (2Ki 14:25; 2Ki 14:28). Damascus was by this time probably weakened by the advance of the power of Assyria. This period of prosperity was followed by another of a totally different character. Jeroboam's son and successor Zachariah, the last of the dynasty of Jehu, was assassinated, after a reign of six months, by Shallum, who, after a reign of only one month, was slain by Menahem, whose own son and successor Pekahiah was' in turn murdered by Pekah, one of his captains, who was himself smitten by Hoshea. In the days of Menahem, and afterwards of Pekah, the Assyrians are seen extending their power over Israel; first under Pul, to whom Menahem paid a tribute of threescore talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom hi his hand (2Ki 15:19). Now the Assyrians are found pushing their conquests in every direction; at one time, in the reign of Pekah, leading away into captivity a' part of the inhabitants of Israel (2Ki 15:29), and again coming to the assistance of Ahaz, king of Judah, then besieged in Jerusalem by the Israelites, in conjunction with the Syrians, who had somehow recovered their former ascendency. SEE SYRIA.

This interposition led to the destruction of Damascus, and in the succeeding weak reign of Hoshea, who had formed some secret alliance with Egypt which was offensive to the Assyrian monarch, to the destruction of Samaria, after a three-years' siege, by Shalmaneser, and the removal of its inhabitants to Assyria; and thus terminated the kingdom of Israel, after an existence of 253 years. Some gleanings of the ten tribes yet remained in the land after so many years of religious decline, moral debasement, national degradation, anarchy, bloodshed, and deportation. Even these were gathered up by the conqueror and carried to Assyria, never again, as a distinct people, to occupy their portion of that goodly and pleasant land which their forefathers won under Joshua from the heathen.  (See Ewald, Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel, and Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus, Götting. 1851; also Witsii. Δεκάφυλον, de decent tribubus Israel, in his AEgyptica, p. 303 sq.; J. G. Klaiber, Hist. regni Ephraim., Stuttg. 1833.)

V. Chronological Difficulties of the Reigns as compared with those of Judah. — These will mostly appear by a similar inspection of the annexed table, where the numbers given in the columns headed “nominal” are those contained in the express words of Scripture. These and other less obvious discrepancies will be found explained under the titles of the respective kings in this Cyclopedia, but it may be well here to recapitulate the most prominent of them together.

1. The length of Jeroboam's reign is stated in 1Ki 14:20 to have been twenty-two years, which appear to have been reckoned from the same point as Rehoboam's (i.e. in Nisan); whereas they were only current, since Rehoboam's accession took place somewhat prior to that of Jeroboam. This is confirmed by the fact that the reigns of Rehoboam (seventeen years, 1Ki 14:21), and Abijah (three years, 1Ki 15:2) were but twenty years; and Nadab succeeded Jeroboam ‘in Asa's second year (1Ki 15:25). In like manner Nadab's two nominal years (1Ki 15:25) are current, or, in reality, little over one year; for Baasha succeeded him in Asa's third year (1Ki 15:28; 1Ki 15:33). So, again, Baasha's twenty-four years of reign (1Ki 15:33) must be reduced, for purposes of continuous reckoning, to twenty-three; for Elah succeeded him in Asa's twenty-sixth year (1Ki 16:8). Once more, Elah's two years (1Ki 16:8) must be computed as but one full year, for Zimri slew and succeeded him in Asa's twenty-seventh year (1Ki 16:10; 1Ki 16:15). The cause of this surplusage in these reigns appears to be that at some point during the reign of Jeroboam the beginning of the calendar for the regnal years of the Israelitish reign was changed (see 1Ki 12:32-33) from the spring (the Hebrew sacred year) to the fall (their older and secular year), so that they overlap those of the kings of Judah by more than half a year. The reigns of the line of Judah must therefore be taken as the standard, and the parallel line of Israel adjusted by it. (The numbers thirty- five and thirty-six in 2Ch 15:19; 2Ch 16:1, are evidently a transcriber's error for twenty-five and twenty-six; see 1Ki 16:3).  2. Omri's reign is stated-in 1Ki 16:23 to have lasted twelve years, beginning, not, as the text seems to indicate, in Asa's thirty-first year, but in his twenty-seventh (for Zimri reigned but seven days), since Ahab succeeded him in Asa's thirty-eighth (1Ki 16:29), making these really but eleven full years, computed as above. The thirty-first of Asa is meant as the date of Omri's sole or undisputed reign on the death of his rival Tibni, after four years of contest. His six years of reign in Tirzah (same verse) are dated from this latter point, and are mentioned in opposition to his removal of his capital at the end of this last time to Samaria (1Ki 16:24), where, accordingly, he reigned one full or two current years, still computed as above. This last-named fact is again the key to the discrepancy in the length of his successor Ahab's reign, which is set down in 1Ki 16:29 as twenty-two years “in Samaria;” for they date from the change of capital to that place (Ahab having probably been at that time appointed viceroy), being in reality only a small fraction more than twenty years. This appears from the combination of the residue of Asa's reign (41 38-3; comp. also 1Ki 22:41) and the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat, when Ahaziah succeeded Ahab (1Ki 22:51). Ahaziah's two years (same verse) are to be computed as current, or ‘one full year, on the same principle as above.

The other difficulties relate to minute textual discrepancies, not important to the chronology; some of them involve the supposition of interregna. They will all be found fully discussed under the names of the respective kings to whose reigns they belong. For a complete vindication and adjustment of all the textual numbers (save two or three universally admitted to be corrupt) by means of actual tabular construction,' see the Meth. Quart. Review, Oct. 1856. SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

The chronology of the kings has been minutely investigated by Usher, Chronologia Sacra (in his Works, 12:95-144); by Lightfoot, Order of the Texts of the O.T. (in Works, 1, 77-130); by Hales, New Analysis of Chronology, 2, 372-447; by Clinton. Fasti Hellenici, 3, Append. § 5; by H. Browne, Ordo Saeclorum, chap. 4; and by Wolff, in the Studien u. Krit. (1858, 4.) SEE CHRONOLOGY.

## Israel Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Israel Ben-Moses]]

             a Jewish writer of the 16th century, is the author of יחדיו על תהלים תמים, a cabalistic exposition of the Psalms (Lublin, 1592, preceded by an essay on the soul): — תמים יחדיו על משלי, a cabalistic exposition of  Proverbs (ibid. eod.). The essay on the soul was published separately, with a Latin translation by Voisin (Paris, 1635). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 1:149. (B.P.)

## Israel ben-Samuel Maghrebi[[@Headword:Israel ben-Samuel Maghrebi]]

             a Jewish writer of the Karaitic sect, flourished at the opening of the 14th century, at Kahira. He deserves our notice as the author of works on the Jewish laws and traditions, in which he advanced the peculiar theories of  the Karaites. Thus, in his work הֲלָכוֹת שְׁחַיטָה (written about 1306), he asserts that the animal, if killed according to law, and eaten according to prescription, develops itself in man to a higher state of being. The “shochet” (the person killing the animal) must, however be a believer of the migration of the souls of animals into the souls of men, else it can ‘not only not take effect, but makes the meat unfit for food. But it is also as the interpreter of the matrimonial laws that he ranks high among the Karaites. See Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 7:322. (J.H.W.)

## Israeli, Paul[[@Headword:Israeli, Paul]]

             SEE RICCIUS, PAUL.

## Israeli, Samuel[[@Headword:Israeli, Samuel]]

             SEE MOROCCO, SAMUEL ISRAELI.

## Israelite[[@Headword:Israelite]]

             (Heb.Yisreeli', יַשְׂרְאֵלַי, 2Sa 17:25; once [Num 25:14 -] אַישׁ יַשְׂרָאֵל, man of Israel, i.e. male Israelite; fem. יַשְׂרְאֵלַית, “Israelitish woman,” Lev 24:10; Sept. and New Test. Ι᾿σραηλίτης), a descendant of Jacob, and therefore a member of the chosen nation, for which, however, the simple name ISRAEL SEE ISRAEL (q.v.) is oftener employed in a collective sense, but with various degrees of extension at different times:

(1.) The twelve tribes descended from Jacob's sons, called “Israel” already in Egypt (Exo 3:16), and so throughout the Pentateuch and in the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings, often with the explicit addition “all” Israel.

(2.) The larger portion, or ten northern tribes, after the death of Saul (2 Samuel 2, 9, 10, 17, 28), a distinction that prevailed even under David (2Sa 19:40).

(3.) More definitely the schismatical portion of the nation (consisting of all the tribes but Judah [including Simeon] and Benjamin), which established a separate monarchy at Samaria after the death of Solomon (1Ki 12:19). Seldom does the legitimate kingdom of Judah appear in the sacred narrative under this appellation (2Ch 12:1; 2Ch 15:17).

(4.) After the Exile, the two branches of the nation became again blended, both having been carried away to the same or neighboring regions, and are therefore designated by the ancient title without distinction in Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 Maccabees. Gradually, however, the name “Jews” ‘(q.v.) supplanted this appellation, especially among foreigners.  (5.) In the New Test. the term “Israel” or “Israelite” is used of the true theocracy or spiritual people (2Co 11:22). SEE HEBREW.

## Israelitish[[@Headword:Israelitish]]

             (Lev 24:10 sq.). SEE ISRAELITE.

## Israfil[[@Headword:Israfil]]

             the angel who, according to the Mohammedans, will sound the trumpet which is to summon the world to judgment on the last day.

## Issachar[[@Headword:Issachar]]

             the name of two men in the Bible, and of the descendants of one of them, and the region inhabited by them.

1. The ninth son of Jacob and the fifth of Leah; the first born to Leah after the interval which occurred in the births of her children (Gen 30:17; comp. 29:35). He was born in Padan-Aram early in B.C. 1914. In Genesis he is not mentioned after his birth, and the few verses in Chronicles devoted to the tribe contain merely a brief list of its chief men and heroes in the reign of David (1Ch 7:1-5). At the descent into Egypt four sons are ascribed to him, who founded the four chief families of the tribe (Gen 46:13; Num 20:23; Num 20:25; 1Ch 7:1).

Form and Signification of the Name. — Both are peculiar. The form is יששכר[i.e. Yissaskar'; if pointed as would be regular, ישִּׂשְׂכִּר: such is the invariable spelling of the name in the Hebrew, the Samaritan Codex and Version, the Targums of Onkelos and PseudoJonathan, but the Masoretes have pointed it so as to supersede the second S, יַשָּׂשכָר, Yissa[s]kar'; Sept. Ι᾿σσάχαρ, N.T. Ι᾿σασχάρ, Josephus Ισσάχαρις (Ant. 5, 1, 22), referring to the tribal territory; Vulg. Isachar. (See Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 1331.)

As is the case with each of the sons of Jacob, the name is recorded as bestowed on account of a circumstance connected with the birth. But, as may be also noticed in more than one of the others, two explanations seem to be combined in the narrative, which even then is not in exact accordance with the requirements of the name. “God hath given me my hire (שָׂכָר, sakbr). and she called his name Issachar,” is the recoid; but in 1Ch 7:18 that “hire” is for the surrender of her maid to her husband, while in 1Ch 7:14-17 it is for the discovery and bestowal of the mandrakes. Besides, as indicated above, the name in its original form-Isaskar-rebels against this interpretation, an interpretation which, to be consistent, requires the form subsequently imposed on the word, Is-sachar. The verbal allusion is not  again brought forward, as it is with Dan, Asher, etc., in the blessings of Jacob and Moses. In the former only it is perhaps allowable to discern a faint echo of the sound of “Issachar” in the word shikmo “his shoulder” (Gen 49:15). The words occur again almost identically in 2Ch 15:7, and Jer 31:16 : יֵשׁ שָׂכָר= “there is a reward for;” A.V. “shall be rewarded.” An expansion of the story of the mandrakes, with curious details, will be found in the Testamentum suachar (Fabricius, Cod. Pseudepigr. p. 620-623). They were ultimately deposited “in the house of the Lord” (according to the same legend), whatever that may mean. Tribe of Issachar. Issachar's place during the journey to Canaan was on the east of the tabernacle, with his brothers Judah and Zebulun (Num 2:5), the group moving foremost in the march (Num 10:15), and having a common standard, which, according to the Rabbinical tradition, was of the three colors of sardine, topaz, and carbuncle, inscribed with the names of the three tribes, and bearing the figure of a lion's whelp (see Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Num 2:3). At this time the captain of the tribe was Nethaneel ben-Zuar (Num 1:8; Num 2:5; Num 7:18; Num 10:15). He was succeeded by Igal ben-Joseph, who went as representative of his tribe among the spies (Num 13:7), and he again by Paltiel ben-Azzan, who assisted Joshua in apportioning the land of Canaan (Num 34:26). Issachar was one of the six tribes who were to stand on Mount Gerizim during the ceremony of blessing and cursing (Deu 27:12). He was still in company with Judah, Zebulun being opposite on Ebal. The number of the fighting men of Issachar when taken in the census at Sinai was 54,400. During the journey they seem to have steadily increased, and after the mortality at Peor they amounted to 64,300, being inferior to none but Judah and Dan-to the latter by 100 souls only. The numbers given in 1Ch 7:2; 1Ch 7:4-5, probably the census of Joab, amount in all to 145,600.

The Promised Land once reached, the connection between Issachar and Judah seems to have closed, to be renewed only on two brief occasions, which will be noticed in their turn. The intimate relation with Zebulun was, however, maintained. The two brother-tribes had their portions close together, and more than once they are mentioned in company. The allotment of Issachar lay above that of Manasseh. The specification of its boundaries and contents is contained in Jos 19:17-23. But to the towns there named must be added Daberath (a Levitical city, 21:28: Jarmuth here is probably the Remeth of 19:21) and Ibleam (Jos 17:11). The boundary, in the words of Josephus (Ant. 5, 22), “extended in length from Carmel to the Jordan, in breadth to Mount Tabor.” In fact, it almost exactly consisted of the plain of Esdraelon or Jezreel. The southern boundary we can trace by En-gannim, the modern Jenin, on the heights which form the southern enclosure to the plain; and then further westward by Taanach and Megiddo, the authentic fragments of which still stand on the same heights as they trend away to the hump of Carmel. On the north the territory nearly ceased with the plain, which is there bounded by Tabor, the outpost of the hills of Zebulun. East of Tabor, the hill-country continued so as to screen the tribe from the Sea of Galilee, while a detour on the S.E. included a part of the plain within the territory of Manasseh, near Bethshean and the upper part of the Jordan valley. In a central recess of the plain stood Jezreel, on a low swell, attended, just across the border, on the one hand by the eminence of Mount Gilboa. and on the other by that now called Ed-Duhy, or “Little Hermon,” the latter having Shunem, Nain, and Endor on its slopes-names which recall some of the most interesting and important events in the history of Israel. SEE TRIBE.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe, with their approved or conjectural identifications:

AbezTownUkneifis?Anaharathdo.[Meskatah]??AnemdoSee EN-GANNIMAphekdo.[El-Fuleh]?Beth-gando.See EN-GANNIMBeth-pazzezdo.[Beit-Jenu]??Beth-shemeshdoKaukab-el-Hawa?Chesulloth or Chisloth TabordoIksalDabareh or DaberathdoDeburehEn-gannimdoJeninEn-haddahdo[Ain Mahil]?GurAscent[Mukeibileh]?HapharaimTown[El-Afuleh]?Ibleamdo[Jelameh]?Ittah-kazindo[Kefr Kenna]?JarmuthdoSee RAAMOTHJezreelTownZerin

PlainMerj Ibn-Amer.FountainAin MeyitehJokmeam or JokneamTownEl-KaimonKedeshdoKashaneh?KibzaimdoSee JOKNEAMKishiondoSee KEDESHMaralahdo[Mujeidil]?MerozdoKefr Musr?NaindoNeinNazarethdoEn-NasirahRabbithdo[Sunurieh]?Ramoth or Remethdo[Tell between Sundeoa and Mukeibileh]?Shahazimahdo[Shara]?Shihondo[Esh-Shijrah]?ShunemdoSolamThis territory was, as it still is, among the richest land in Palestine. Westward was the famous plain which derived its name, the “seed-plot of God”-such is the signification of Jezreel-from its fertility, and the very weeds of which at this day testify to its enormous powers of production (Stanley S. and P. p. 348). SEE ESDRAELON; SEE JEZREEL.

On the north is Tabor, which, even under the burning sun of that climate, is said to retain the glades and dells of an English wood (ibid. p. 350). On the east, behind Jezreel, is the opening which conducts to the plain of the Jordan-to that Beth-Shean which was proverbially among the Rabbis the gate of Paradise for its fruitfulness. It is this aspect of the territory of Issachar which appears to be alluded to in the blessing of Jacob. The image of the “sturdy he-ass” (חֲמֹר גֶּרֶם) —-the large animal used for burdens and field- work, not the lighter and swifter she-ass for riding ” couching down between the two stalls,” chewing the fodder of stolid ease and quiet-is very applicable, not only to the tendencies and habits, but to the very size and air of a rural agrarian people, while the sequel of the verse is no less suggestive of the certain result of such tendencies when unrelieved by any higher aspirations: “He saw that rest was good and the land pleasant, and  he bowed his back to bear, and became a slave to tribute” — the tribute imposed on him by the various marauding tribes who were attracted to his territory by the richness of the crops. The blessing of Moses completes the picture. He is not only “in tents”-in nomad or semi-nomad life-but “rejoicing” in them; and it is perhaps not straining a point to observe that he has by this time begun to lose his individuality. He and Zebulum are mentioned together as having part possession in the holy mountain of Tabor, which was near the frontier line of each (Deu 33:18-19). We pass from this to the time of Deborah: the chief struggle in the great, victory over Sisera took place on the territory of Issachar, “by Taanach at the waters of Megiddo” (Judges 5, 19); but the allusion to the tribe in the song of triumph is of the most cursory nature, not consistent with its having taken any prominent part in the action.

One among the judges of Israel was from Issachar Tola (Jdg 10:1) —but beyond the length of his sway we have only the fact recorded that he resided out of the limits of his own tribe — at Shamir, in Mount Ephraim. By Josephus he is omitted entirely (see Ant. 5, 7, 6). The census of the tribe taken in the reign of David has already been alluded to. It is contained in 1Ch 7:1-5, and an expression occurs in it which testifies to the nomadic tendencies above noticed. Out of the whole number of the tribe no less than 36,000 were marauding mercenary troops-” bands” (גְּדוּדַים) —-a term applied to no other tribe in this enumeration, though elsewhere to Gad, and uniformly to the irregular bodies of the Bedouin nations round Israel. This-was probably at the close of David's reign. Thirty years before, when two hundred of the head men of the tribe had gone to Hebron to assist in making David king over the entire realm, different qualifications are noted in them-they “had understanding of the times to know what Israel ought to do and all their brethren were at their commandment.” To what this “understanding of the times” was we have no clew (see Deyling, Observ. 1, 160 sq.). By the later Jewish interpreters it is explained as skill in ascertaining the periods of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, and dates of solemn feasts, and the interpretation of the signs of the heavens (Targum, ad loc.; Jerome, Quaest. Heb.). Josephus (Ant. 7:2, 2) gives it as “knowing the things that were to happen;” and he adds that the armed men who came with these leaders were 20,000. One of the wise men of Issachar, according to an old Jewish tradition preserved by Jerome (Quaest. Heb. on 2Ch 17:16), was Amasiah, son of Zichri, who, with 200,000 men, offered himself to  Jehovah in the service of Jehoshaphat (2Ch 17:16); but this is very questionable, as the movement appears to have been confined to Judah and Benjamin. The ruler of the tribe at this time was Omri, of the great family of Michael (1Ch 27:18; compare 7:3). May he not have been the forefather of the king of Israel of the same name the founder of the “house of Omri” and of the “house of Ahab,” the builder of Samaria, possibly on the same hill of Shamir on which the Issacharite judge, Tola, had formerly held his court? But, whether this was so or not, at any rate one dynasty of the Israelitish kings was Issacharite. Baasha, the son of Ahijah, of the house of Issachar, a member of the army with which Nadab and all Israel were besieging Gibbethon, apparently not of any standing in the tribe (compare 1Ki 16:2), slew the king, and himself mounted the throne (1Ki 15:27, etc.). He was evidently a fierce and warlike man (16:29; 1Ch 16:1), and an idolater like Jeroboam. The Issacharite dynasty lasted during the twenty-four years of his reign and the two of his son Elah. At the end of that time it was wrested from him by the same means that his father had acquired it, and Zimri, the new king, commenced his reign by a massacre of the whole kindred and connections of Baasha-he left him “not even so much as a boy” (16:11).

Distant as Jezreel was from Jerusalem, the inhabitants took part in the Passover with which. Hezekiah sanctified the opening of his reign. On that memorable occasion a multitude of the people from the northern tribes, and among them from Issachar, although so long estranged from the worship of Jehovah as to have forgotten how to make the necessary purifications, yet by the enlightened piety of Hezekiah were allowed to keep the feast; and they did keep it seven days with great gladness-with such tumultuous joy as had not been known since the time of Solomon, when the whole land was one. Nor did they separate till the occasion had been signalized by an immense destruction of idolatrous altars and symbols, “in Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim and Manasseh,” up to the very confines of Issachar's own land — and then “all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities” (2Ch 31:1). Within five years from this date Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, had invaded the north of Palestine, and after three years' siege had taken Samaria, and, with the rest of Israel, ‘had carried,' Issachar away to his distant dominions. The only other scriptural allusion to the tribe is that, with the rest of their brethren of all the tribes of the children of Israel (Dan only excepted), the twelve  thousand of the tribe of Issachar shall be sealed in their foreheads (Rev 7:7).

2. A Korhite Levite, one of the door-keepers (A.V. “porters”) of the house of Jehovah, seventh son of Obed-Edom (1Ch 26:5). B.C. 1014.

## Issbiah[[@Headword:Issbiah]]

             (a, 1Ch 24:21; b, 1Ch 24:25). SEE ISHIAH.

## Isselburg, Heinrich[[@Headword:Isselburg, Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Bremen in 1629, is the author of, Medulla Papismi de Arce ac Judice Controversiarum Theologicarum: — Digeries Praecipuarum Controvers. inter Romanos Pontifices et Protestantes Orthodoxos: — Manuale Pauperum Spiritu: — De Jure Protestantium contra Pontif. Rom. Ejusque Concilia, Imperium atque Anathema: — Catechesis Religionis Christianae Anatomen: — De Charitate Christiana. See Witte, Diarium Biographicum; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Issendorp, Hendrik[[@Headword:Issendorp, Hendrik]]

             belonged to the Evangelical Lutherans of Holland. He was called in 1723 to the charge of a Lutheran church at Purmerend. In 1737 bodily infirmities rendered a colleague necessary. In 1743 he resigned his charge. Though obliged to desist from his ministerial work, he rendered himself eminently useful to his denomination by presenting to the Dutch a translation of some three or four hundred German hymns. See Glasius. Godgeleerde Nederland, 2, 196 sq.; also Gesch Medenis van het godsdienstig Gezang bij de Luiherschen in de Nederlanden door. (J. P.W.)

## Isserlein, Israel ben-Petachya[[@Headword:Isserlein, Israel ben-Petachya]]

             a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars in the 15th century, and one of the representatives of truly learned German synagogal teachers, flourished about 1427-1470. At first he was settled over a congregation at Marburg; later he removed to Neustadt, near Vienna. Isserlein was a very liberal-minded Jew, and did much by his influence to advance the standing of Jewish scholarship in his day. More particularly was his influence felt in the theological schools of his Hebrew brethren all over Germany. From the most distant parts of Europe students flocked to the schools at Erfurt, Nuremberg, Regensburg, and Prague, where the Talmud was expounded in a most masterly manner (comp. Zunz, Zür Gesch. u. Lit. p. 167 sq.). According to Jost (Gesch. d. Judenthums u. s. Sekten, 3, 116), Isserlein died obscurely in 1452, but this seems improbable, as Furst has evidence of Isserlein's activity in 1457, His works are שות תְּרוּמִת הִדֶּשֶׁן, a collection of 354 opinions on the different fields of Rabbinism (Venice, 1519, 4to; Firth, 1778, 4to): — פְּסָקַים וּכְתָבַים, on the Halachoth (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often; Firth, 1778, 4to): —

בַּאוּרַים לְרשי עִל הִתּוֹרָה, or Expositions on Rashi's Commentary to the Pentateuch (Venice, 1519, 4to, and often): — בַּאוּרַים לְסֵ שִׁעֲרֵי דוּרָא, or Commentary on the Book Sha'are Dura of Isaac Duran (Venice, 1548, 4to, and often); etc. See Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 8, 220 sq.; Furst.  Biblioth. Jud. 2, 154; Frankel, Israel Isserlein (Lib. d. Or. 1847), c. 675- 678. (J. H. W.)

## Isserles, Mose ben-Israel[[@Headword:Isserles, Mose ben-Israel]]

             a celebrated Polish Rabbi, was born at Cracow in 1520. The son of a very wealthy man, and a relative of the distinguished savan Meir Katzenellenbogen of Padua, he was afforded peculiar advantages for thorough culture. Of these he readily availed himself, and, in consequence, filled very prominent positions at quite an early age. He was distinguished, however, rather for his early acquisitions and extended knowledge than any great natural abilities. He died in 1573. The writings of Isserles are very varied, covering the departments of theological, exegetical, ecclesiastical, and even historical and philosophical literature. In all of these he was perfectly at home. His most important works are סֵ תּוֹרִת הָעוֹלָה, on Sacrifices and other subjects of Jewish Antiquities (Prague, 1569): — מְחַיר יִיַן, or Commentary on the Book of Esther (Cremona, 1559, 4to; Amsterd. 1769, 8vo). For a list of all his works, see Fiirst, Biblioth. Jud. 2, 155 sq. See Frainkel, Los. b. — Isräel genannt Mose Isserles, in the Oriental Literaturblatt (1847), c. 827-10; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9, 472 sq. (J. H. W.)

## Issue[[@Headword:Issue]]

             besides its ordinary sense of going forth (נְגִד,Chald. to flow, Dan 7:10; also תּוֹצָאוֹת, exit, i.e. source, Pro 4:23, frequently of the direction or terminus of a boundary; ἐκπορεύομαι, to go out, Rev 9:17-18), and progeny מוֹלֶדֶת, Gen 48:6, elsewhere;' kindred; צְפַיעוֹת, shoots, i.e. offspring, Isa 22:24; σπέρμα, seed, Mat 22:25), is the rendering employed by our translators for several terms expressive of a purulent or unhealthy discharge, especially from the sexual organs. The most emphatic of these זוֹב, from זוּב, to flow, both the verb and noun being frequently applied to diseased or unusual secretions, e.g. the monthly courses or catanenia of women, and the seminal flux or gonorrhea benigra of men (Leviticus 15; Num 5:2). SEE DISEASE.

A more intense and chronic form of this  discharge was the “issue of blood,” or uterine hemorrhage of the woman in the Gospels (ῥύσυς αἵματος, Mar 5:25; Luk 8:43-44; αἱμοῤῥέω, Mat 9:20), which, as it made her ceremonially unclean, she was so anxious to conceal when she came in contact with the multitude and with Christ. (See monographs in Volbeding, Index, p. 49; Hase,-Leben Jesu, p. 141.). The term זַרְמָה, Eze 23:20, signifies a pouring, and is applied to the emissio seminis of a stallion, to which the idolatrous paramours of Judaea are compared in the strong language of the prophet. SEE ADULTERY. The only other term so rendered is מָקוֹר, a fountain, applied to the womb, or pudenda muliebra, as the source of the menstrual discharge (Lev 12:7; Lev 20:18; comp. πηγή, Mar 5:29). SEE FLUX.

“The texts Lev 15:2-3; Lev 22:4; Num 5:2 (and 2Sa 3:29, where the malady is invoked as a curse), are probably to be interpreted of gonorrhea. In Lev 15:3 a distinction is introduced, which merely means that the cessation of the actual flux does not constitute ceremonial cleanness, but that the patient must bide the legal time, seven days (Lev 15:13), and perform the prescribed purifications and sacrifice (Lev 15:14). ‘See, however, Surenhusius's preface to the treatise Zabim of the Mishna, where another interpretation is given. As regards the specific varieties of this malady, it is generally asserted that its most severe form (gon. virulenta) is modern, having first appeared in the 15th century. Chardin (Voyages en Perse, 2, 200) states that he observed that this disorder was prevalent in Persia, but that its effects were far less severe than in Western climates.

If this be true, it would go some way to explain the alleged absence of the gon. virul. from ancient nosology, which found its field of observation in the East, Greece, etc., and to confirm the supposition that the milder form only was the subject of Mosaic legislation. But, beyond this, it is probable that diseases may appear, run their course, and disappear, and, for want of an accurate observation of their symptoms, leave no trace behind them. The ‘bed,' ‘seat,' etc. (Lev 15:5-6, etc.), are not to be supposed to have been regarded by that law as contagious, but the defilement extended to them merely to give greater prominence to the ceremonial strictness with which the case was ruled. In the woman's ‘issue,' (5. 19), the ordinary menstruation seems alone intended, supposed to be prolonged (5. 25) to a morbid--extent. The scriptural handling of the subject not dealing, as in the case of leprosy, in symptoms, it seems gratuitous to detail them here: those who desire such  knowledge will find them in any compendium of therapeutics. See Josephus, War, 5, 5, 6; 6:9,3; Mishna, Chelim. 1, 3, 8; Maimon. ad Zabim, 2, 2: whence we learn that persons thus affected might not ascend the Temple mount, nor share in any religious celebration, nor even enter Jerusalem. See also Michaelis, Laws of Moses, 4:282” (Smith). SEE UNCLEANNESS.

## Issus[[@Headword:Issus]]

             or, rather, Isus (῎Ισος), mentioned by Josephus (Ant. 10, 8, 6) as high- priest between Joram and Axioramus; apparently corresponding to the Jehoshaphat of the Seder Olam. SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

## Istalcurus[[@Headword:Istalcurus]]

             “In 1Es 8:40. the son of Istalcurus' (ὁ τοῦ Ι᾿σταλκούρου) is substituted for ‘and ZABBUD' of the corresponding list in Ezr 8:14. The Keri has Zilkkur instead of Zabbud, and of this there is perhaps some trace in Istalcurus.”

## Isthmian Games[[@Headword:Isthmian Games]]

             one of the great national festivals among the ancient Greeks, which derived its name from the isthmus of Corinth, where they were celebrated. They were held every third year, in honor of Poseidon, or, as some allege, every fifth year. SEE GAMES.

## Istio[[@Headword:Istio]]

             in Teutonic mythology, was one of the three sons of Mannus, and the father of one of the three races of the Germans. Ithun, in Norse mythology, is held imprisoned under the ash-tree Ygdrasil. Probably this Ithun is identical with Iduna, who guards the rejuvenating apples of the gods.

## Isuah[[@Headword:Isuah]]

             (1Ch 7:30). SEE ISHUAH.

## Isui[[@Headword:Isui]]

             (Gen 46:17). SEE ISHIR, 1. Itala, a name attributed to the old Latin version, which was the foundation of Jerome's Vulgate. SEE ITALIC VERSION.

## Ita[[@Headword:Ita]]

             SEE JOT.

## Italian[[@Headword:Italian]]

             (Ι᾿ταλικός) occurs but once in Scripture, in the mention of the “Italian band,” i.e. Roman cohort, to which Cornelius belonged (Act 10:1). “This seems to have been a cohort of Italians separate from the legionary soldiers, and not a cohort of the ‘Legio Italica,' of which we read at a later period (Tacitus, Hist. 1, 59, 64; 2, 100; 3:14) as being raised by Nero (Dio Cass. 55, 24; Sueton. Nero, 19). (See Biscoe, On the Acts, p. 300 sq.) Wieseler (Chronol. p. 145) thinks they were Italian volunteers; and there is an inscription in Gruter in which the following words occur: ‘Cohors militum Italicorum voluntaria, quse est in Syria' (see Ackerman, Numismatic Illustrations, p. 34)” (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 1,  113). There is a monograph on the subject: Schwarz, De cohorte Italica et Augusta (Altdorf, 1720). SEE COHORT.

## Italian Versions of the Scriptures[[@Headword:Italian Versions of the Scriptures]]

             The earliest translation of the Bible into the modem Italian is said to have been made by Giacomo da Viraggio (Jacobus de Voragine), archbishop of Genoa, in the beginning of the 13th century. This rests exclusively on the authority of Sixtus Senensis (Biblioth. Sanct. lib. 4), and there is weighty reason for doubting the statement. That at an early period, however, versions of parts, if not of the whole of Scripture into Italian were made, is evinced by the fact that there exist in various libraries MSS. containing them. In the Royal Library at Paris is an Italian Bible in two vols. folio, as well as several codices containing parts of the Bible in that language; in the library at Upsala is a Codex containing a history compiled from the first seven books of the O.T. in Italian; in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is an Italian translation of the N.T., with portions of the Old, and in other libraries like relics are preserved (see Le Long, Bib. Sac. cap. 6:§ 1).

The earliest printed Italian Bible is that of Nicolo di Malermi (or Malherbi). a Venetian Benedictine monk of the order of Camaldoli: it appeared under the title of Biblia Volgare Historiota, etc. (Ven. 1471.) The translation is from the Vulgate, and is pronounced by R. Simon to be executed in a harsh style and carelessly (Hist. Crit. du N.T. p. 487). It was, however, repeatedly reprinted; the best editions are that superintended by Marini (Ven. 1477, 2 vols. fol.), and that issued at Venice in 1567 (1 vol. fol.). In 1530 Antonio Bruccioli issued his translation of the N.T., and in 1532 the first edition of his translation of the entire Bible, containing a revised and corrected translation of the N.T., under the title of La Biblia che contiene Sacri libri del vecchio Testamento tradotto nuovamente de la Hebraica verita in lingua Toscana, con divini libri del N.T. tradotti da Greco in lingua Tosc. con privilegio de oliclito Senato Venetao e letera a Francescol, Rege Christianissimo (fol.Venice, ap. Luc. Ant. Juntae). This  translation is said by Simon to follow in the O.T. the Latin version of Pagnini rather than to be made from the original Hebrew, and to partake of the rudeness and barbarism of Pagnini's style. It was put in the index of the prohibited books among works of the first class. Many editions of it, however, appeared, of which the most important is that of Zanetti (Ven. 1540, 3 vols. fol). Bruccioli's version of the O.T. in a corrected form was printed at Geneva in 1562, along with a new version of the N.T. by Gallars and Beza; to this notes are added, and especially an exposition of the Apocalypse. The translation of Marmochini, though professedly original, is, in reality, only a revised edition of that of Bruccioli, the design of which was to bring it more fully into accordance with the Vulgate. Several translations of the Psalms (some from the Hebrew) and of other parts of Scripture appeared in Italy between the middle and end of the 16th century, and a new translation of the N.T., by a Florentine of the name of Zacharia, appeared in 8vo at Venice in 1542, and at Florence in 1566, copies of which are now extremely rare. The Jew David de Pomis issued a translation of Ecclesiastes with the original Hebrew (Ven. 1578).

In 1607 appeared at Geneva the first Protestant Italian version-that of Giovanni Diodati (La Biblia: Cioè I Libri del Vecchio e del Nuovo Testamento [sm. folio]). To this are appended brief marginal notes. This version was made directly from the original texts, and stands in high esteem for fidelity. It has been repeatedly reprinted. Being in the plain Lucchese dialect, it is especially adapted for circulation among the common people. It is that now adopted by the Bible Societies.

A version affecting greater elegance, but by no means so faithful, is that of Antonio Martini, archbishop of Florence. The N.T. appeared at Turin in 1769, and the O.T. in 1779, both accompanied with the text of the Vulgate, and with copious notes, chiefly from the fathers. This work received the approbation of pope Pius VI. It is made avowedly from the Vulgate, and is in the pure Tuscan dialect. Repeated editions have appeared; one, printed at Livorno (Leghorn), and those issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society (Lond. 1813, 1821), want the notes, and have consequently been placed in the index of prohibited books. To read and circulate this book, though bearing the papal sanction, was, till lately, a grave offense, as the well-known case of the Madiai in Florence proves. SEE VERSIONS.

## Italian-School of Philosophy[[@Headword:Italian-School of Philosophy]]

             By-the Italian school is properly understood the blending of the Pythagorean and Eleatic systems of philosophy into one. It is sometimes, however, used of the Pythagorean system merely. The reason for designating it as the Italian school is because Pythagoras is said to have taught ill Italy. SEE PYTHAGORAS.

## Italic Version[[@Headword:Italic Version]]

             (Veteus Itala), the usual name of the old Latin version of the Scriptures, used prior to the days of Augustine and Jerome, and probably made in Northern Africa in the 2nd century. The Italic, however. is properly a revision of this old Latin version, which was in use in Northern Italy, or around Milan. Fragments of it have been preserved by Blanchini and Sabatier (Eadie, Eccles. Dict. s.v.). Portions containing the books of Leviticus and Numbers have been published by Lord Ashburnham (London, 1870) from an ancient Codex in his library. SEE LATIN VERSIONS.

## Italy[[@Headword:Italy]]

             (Ι᾿ταλία, of uncertain etymology), the name of the country of which Rome was the capital (Act 18:2; Act 27:1; Act 27:6; Heb 13:24). This, like most geographical names, was differently applied at different periods. In the earliest times the name “Italy” included only the little peninsula of Culabrias (Strabo, 5, 1). The country now called Italy was then inhabited by a number of nations distinct in origin, language, and government, such as the Gauls, Ligurians, and Veneti on the north, and the Pelasgi, Sabines, Etrurians, etc., on the south. But, as the power of Rome advanced, these nations were successively annexed to the great state and the name “Italy” extended also, tin it came to be applied to the whole country south of the Alps, and Polybius seems to use it in this sense (1, 6; 2, 14). For the progress of the history of the world, see Smith's Dictionary of Classical Geography, s.v. From the time of the close of the republic it was employed as we employ it now, i.e. in its true geographical sense, as denoting the whole natural peninsula between the Alps and the Straits of Messina. In the New Testament it occurs three or, indeed, more correctly speaking, four times. In Act 10:1, the Italian cohort at Caesarea (ἡ σπεῖρα ἡ καλουμένη Ι᾿ταλικη, A.V. Italian band”), consisting, as it doubtless did, of men recruited in Italy, illustrates the military relations of the imperial peninsula with the provinces. SEE ARMY.

In Act 18:2, where we are told of the expulsion of Aquila and Priscilla with their compatriots ‘; from Italy,” we are reminded of the large Jewish population which many authorities show that it contained. Act 27:1, where the beginning of St. Paul's voyage ‘to Italy' is mentioned, and the whole subsequent narrative. illustrate the trade which subsisted between the peninsula and other parts of the Mediterranean. Lastly, the words in Heb 13:24, “They of Italy (οἰ  ἀπὸ τῆς Ιταλίας) salute you,” whatever they may prove for or against this being the region in which the letter was written (and the matter has been strongly argued both ways), are interesting as a specimen of the progress of Christianity in the West. A concise account of the divisions and history of ancient Italy may be found in Anthon's Class. Dict. s.v. Italia. SEE ROME.

## Italy, Modern[[@Headword:Italy, Modern]]

             a kingdom in Southern Europe, with an area of 112,852 square miles and a population in 1870 of 26,500,000 inhabitants. The name originally belonged to the southern point of the Apennine peninsula alone; at the time of Thucydides it embraced the whole southern coast from the river Laus, on the Tyrrhenian Sea, Metapontium to the Sicilian Straits; after the conquest of Tarentum by the Romans it was extended to all the country from the Sicilian Straits to the Arno or Rubicon; finally, at the time of Augustus, it came to be used of the whole of the peninsula. In a still wider sense it was, under Constantine, the name of one of the four chief divisions of the Roman Empire, being subdivided into three (according to others into four or two) dioceses — Illyria, Africa, and Italy Proper. But this wider significance died out with the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and the name has since been confined to the Apennine peninsula. It denoted a century, the people of which gradually coalesced into one nation, united by the sane language, literature, and habits, but which never, for any length of time, constituted one political commonwealth. Not until 1859 did the national aspirations for unity succeed in erecting by far the larger portion of the peninsula into the kingdom of Italy; in 1866 Venetia was added, and in 1870 the incorporation of Rome completed the structure of national unity.

I. Church History; —

(1.) The planting of Christianity in Italy can be traced to the first years of the Christian sera. The apostle Peter, according to old accounts, visited Rome as early as A.D. 42, but no satisfactory evidence can be adduced for the assertion of Roman theologians that Peter was at any time bishop of the Church of Rome, and still less that he held this office for twenty-five years. In 53 the Christians, together with the Jews, were expelled from Rome by order of the emperor Claudius. The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (about  55) indicates that the Church in Rome was at that time fully organized. Under Nero, Peter and Paul were probably put to death, together with numerous other professors of Christianity. Among those who were put to death under Domitian (81-96) was Flavius Clemens, a man of consular dignity, and belonging to the imperial family. Many other churches in Italy, besides that of. Rome, trace their foundation to ‘assistants of the apostles; thus Barnabas is said to have established the Church of Milan, Mark the Church of Aquileja, Apollinaris the Church at Ravenna. The churches of Lucca, Fiesole, Bologna, Bari, Benevento, Capua, Naples, Palermo, Syracuse, Pavia, Urbino, Mantua, Verona, Pisa. Florence, and Sienna also claim to be of apostolic origin. That many of the churches were really organized during the first century is not doubted, but hardly any of them has a documentary history which ascends beyond the beginning of the 2nd century.

Even the history of the Church of Rome is so involved in obscurity that it is not known in which order the first four bishops succeeded each other. From the beginning of the 2nd century bishoprics rapidly increased, and down to the year 311 there are enumerated many geats of bishops in all the provinces. The first epistle of the Roman bishop Soter (A.D. 175 sq.) was written to the bishops of Campania, and his second to the bishops of Italy. The Roman bishop Zephyrinus (203-221) addressed his first epistle to all the bishops of Sicily, and Eusebius his third to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania. A “Provincial Synod of Rome,” consisting of twelve bishops, was presided over by Telesphorus (142-154); it was followed by a synod under Anicetus (167-175); another in 197, and many more in the 3rd century. At the beginning of the 4th century Christianity was so firmly established throughout Italy that the pagans could make no notable resistance when Christianity under Constantine the Great became the religion of the state. The apostasy of Julian retarded but little the victory of Christianity, which became complete when, towards the close of the 4th century, Theodosius exterminated paganism by fire and sword. As the bishop of Rome was from the earliest period of the Church one of the three great bishops of the Christian Church (Rome, Alexandria. and Antioch), the churches of Italy became subordinate to his superintendence and jurisdiction: only the Church provinces of the metropolitans of Mailan and Aquileia remained independent of the jurisdiction of Rome for many more centuries. The more the power of the bishops of Rome rose, the more the Church history of Italy is absorbed by the history of the papacy and the Roman Church. In no other country of Europe was the unity of faith better preserved and less interrupted than in  Italy. The rule of the Arian Goths (493-563) lasted too short a time to establish Arianism on a firm foundation, and all the following changes in the secular government of the country recognized the predominant Church. The unity of the Italian Church during the Middle Ages was but little disturbed by heretical sects; the Catharists and Pasagii never became powerful, and soon disappeared; only the Waldenses, in the remote valleys of Piedmont, survived all persecution. SEE PAPACY.

(2.) History of the Reformation. — Italy, like other countries, had its forerunners of the Reformation, the most prominent of whom was the Dominican monk Savonarola (q.v.), who fearlessly advocated a radical reform of the Church. The revival of the classical studies on the one hand, and the corruption which prevailed at the papal court on the other, disposed at the beginning of the 16th century many minds towards abandoning the doctrines of Rome. In general, however, the tendency towards freethinking was stronger among the malcontents than the wish for a religious reform. One of the most important efforts in the latter direction was made in the time of Leo X by some twenty earnest men, who formed a society for the purpose of rekindling in the Church a spirit of piety in opposition to the prevailing corruption. Among them were Cajetan, subsequently founder of the order of the Theatines; Caraffa, subsequently pope Paul IV; and Contarini, subsequently cardinal. All of them desired to effect a reformation within the Church, though some of them strongly inclined towards the reformatory doctrine of justification by faith alone. To this class of reformers belonged also Bruccioli, who published an Italian translation of the Bible (1530-1532), which passed through several editions. Among the sympathizers with this movement were also Foscarari, bishop of Modena; San Felice, bishop of Cava; cardinal Morone, Grimanai, patriarch of Aquileia, and Folengo, a pious Benedictine of Monte Casino. In consequence of the frequent intercourse of Upper Italy with Germany and Switzerland, the writings of Luther and other reformers began to circulate in Italy from the beginning of the Reformation. To evade the Inquisition, they were generally published either anonymously, or under the name of other authors.

Venice appears to have been the first city of Italy in which the Reformation took root. This was chiefly due to its constant intercourse with Germany, and to the independent position maintained by that republic towards the see of Rome. As early as 1520 Luther received news from Venice that a great need was felt there of evangelical preachers and books, and in 1528 he was  informed that the cause was making good progress. The fact that Venice was a refuge for all who in other parts of Italy were persecuted for their faith was likewise favorable to the progress of Protestantism. The proceedings of the Diet of Augsburg (1530) excited the attention of the friends of the Reformation at Venice to a high degree, and Lucio Paolo wrote a pressing letter in their name to Melancthon, imploring him to resist to the last.

Even priests were found in the evangelical party, as Valdo Lupetino, provincial of the Franciscans, who advised his relative, M. Flacius, of Illyria, afterwards one of the champions of Protestantism, to go to Germany, where he would learn a better theology than he would find in a convent (1537). Through such men, who were in personal communication with the reformers, Venice remained regularly connected with Wittenberg. In 1539 Melancthon addressed an epistle to Venice which affords most valuable information concerning the position of the evangelical party in that city at that time. The evangelical party increased not oily in the city of Venice, but in the whole territory of the republic, particularly at Vicenza and Treviso, and it does not appear that the government ever interfered with its peaceful development. It is only after 1542 that, at the instigation of Rome, the Protestants of the Venetian republic began to experience serious difficulties. Although very numerous, they had not till then organized themselves into a society. They were obliged to observe the greatest caution and secrecy. They were without a leader, and, besides, there were differences of opinion dividing them. Balthasar Altieri, a native of Aquila, and secretary of the English ambassador, succeeded in uniting them. He also wrote to Luther, asking him to obtain for the Protestants, through the intercession of German Protestant princes, permission from the senate to act according to the dictates of their conscience, at least until the council should decide on the points of difference. He also invoked the mediation of Luther to allay the manifold divisions which weakened the Protestants of Venetia. As Italy had intercourse with Switzerland as well as with Germany. both the Reformed and the Lutheran reformations had found their adherents; and, in particular, disputes arose about the doctrine of the Eucharist. Bucer had in vain endeavored to heal these difficulties, and it was now expected that Luther would be more successful.

The answer of Luther expressed, however, distrust towards the Swiss and their doctrines, and warned the people against the works of Bucer. Melancthon was deeply grieved at the tone of Luther's answer, as he knew the Italians-to be only too prone to indulge in discussions and arguments on disputed points of doctrine. Probably about  this time secret societies began to be formed for the discussion of theological doctrines, principally concerning the Trinity; and those anti- Trinitarian schemes which, in the following century, separated Italian Protestantism from that of other countries, originated-in them. About 1542 the principles of Protestantism were- introduced into Istria by Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d' Istria, and for a while made rapid progress, which, however, was, soon interrupted. After opposing Protestantism for a long while, particularly in Germany, where he was for a while papal legate, and took part as such in the Conference of Worms, Vergerio was, by-the reading of Luther's works, which he had procured for the purpose of refuting them, brought to embrace their views. His first convert was his brother, the bishop of Pola. Both now labored zealously, and with great success, to evangelize their dioceses, until in 1545 the Inquisition finally interfered, and Vergerio was obliged to flee.

Next to Venice, Ferrara became one of the central points of Protestantism. It was introduced there by Renata, wife of Hercules II, duke of Ferrara, and the daughter of Louis XII, king of France. She had become acquainted with the doctrines of the Reformation through Margaret of Navarre, and when she came to Ferrara in 1527, she soon found herself surrounded by persons holding the same views. Some were scholars who held offices in the university or at court, while others were refugees who, persecuted in their own country for their Protestant opinions, found there a safe refuge. Calvin himself spent a few months there in 1536, and ever after remained in active correspondence with the duchess; also Hubert Languet, who distinguished himself in the history of the French Reformation. Among the Italians were Flaminio and Calcagnini, a friend of Contarini and Poole; Peter Martyr Vermigli, Aonio Paleario, and Celio Secundo Curione, who won over Peregrino Morata, the tutor of the duke's brother, to Protestantism. The learned daughter of Morata, Olympia, whose letters express a truly evangelical spirit, was one of the ornaments of the court. and the companion of the young daughter of Renata.

From Ferrara probably the movement spread over to Modena, which belonged also to the duke of Ferrara. Already in 1530 a papal rescript commanded the Inquisition to use every exertion to suppress the heretical tendency among the monks of the diocese of Ferrara. Yet the movement did not really break out until 1540, when the learned Sicilian Paolo Iicci came to Modena and established a congregation there. Ladies of high rank protected the new doctrine, especially a certain countess Rangone. As a  sign of the spirit of opposition against Rome, we may mention the satires which were published, as, for instance, a letter purporting to come from Jesus Christ, and worded in the manner of the papal commandments, announcing that our Lord contemplated resuming the absolute and immediate government of the Church himself. Cardinal Morone, bishop of Modena, although evangelically inclined himself, complained much in his letters (1540-1544), written during his stay in Germany as papal legate, of the progress of Protestantism in his diocese, and said he was told that Modena had become Lutheran. But with the news of the progress of the Reformation came also the information that the differences concerning the Eucharist had arisen, and Bucer wrote to the Protestants of Modena and Bologna to heal the breach (1541). At Bologna, the Germans who came there to attend the university gained many supporters to evangelical views;. the most important among them. was Giovanni Mollio, a Minorite, who labored long as a preacher and professor.

The presence of the Saxon ambassador, John of Planitz, who came to Bologna with Charles V, gave the Protestants an opportunity to present a request in which they asked for the convocation of a synod, and expressed their veneration for the German princes who had protected Protestantism in their states. — They hoped by the council to get freed from the yoke of Rome, and to obtain religious liberty; in the mean time they wished only permission to use their Bibles without being on that account considered as heretics. The movement was propagated also through other parts of the Papal States, at Faenza and Imola; and in Rome itself there were many who privately approved the doctrines of Luther. In Naples, the principles of the Reformation were imported by the German soldiers in 1527, and they appear to have taken root, for an imperial edict was issued in 1536 to counteract the Protestant tendencies by threatening the severest punishments against the so-called heretics. Yet in the same year the emperor himself sent to Naples the man who was destined to play the most important part in the evangelization of' Italy. Juan Valdez came to Naples as secretary of the viceroy. Position, education, intelligence, and character combined to make him influential. A small but eminent circle silently formed around him for reciprocal edification and the promotion of an inner, living Christianity. Among them were count Galeazzo Caraccioli, nephew of pope Paul IV; the martyr Pietro Carnesecchi, Roman protonotary; Giulia Gonzaga, duchess of Trajetto;.Vittoria Colonna, the widow of Pescara; and the noble confessor Isabella Maurica. Valdez only continued his evangelizing labors for four years: he died in 1540. But his work was continued by two of his  followers, Pietro Martyr Vermigli and Bernardino Occhino.

The former, having been sent as prior to an Augustinian convent at Naples, read some of Bucer's and Zwingle's works, and, having become converted to their doctrines, he began working in the same direction as Valdez. He delivered lectures on the epistles of St. Paul, which were attended not only by his own monks, but also by the most distinguished members of the clergy and the laity. In the mean. time the Capuchin Occhino, confessor of Paul III, general of his order, and one of the most eminent men of the Church at the time, was invited to preach the Lent sermons at Naples. first in 1536. and again in 1539. An attentive reading of the Bible had already caused him to regard faith as the only means of salvation; his intercourse with Valdez strengthened him still more in his views; he began preaching justification by faith, and gained many adherents by his fiery eloquence. Although none of these men thought as yet to separate from the Church of Rome, they were soon looked upon with suspicion. The Theatine Cajetan, friend of the zealot Caraffa, was the first to call attention to them. Vermigli was summoned to appear, and to justify himself, but was saved from any annoyance this time by the interference of several cardinals. Soon after, having been at Naples for about three years, he demanded his recall; and having been appointed prior at Lucca, he began to labor for the evangelization of this new field. New persecutions finally decided him to separate openly from the Church of Rome, and to flee the country for safety. Three of his most intimate disciples accompanied him: Paolo Lacisio, afterwards professor at Strasburg, Theodosio Trebellio, and Giulio Terenziano. Eighteen others followed him soon after; among them Gelso Martinengho, who died as pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva; Em. Tremellio, who, after various vicissitudes, became professor of Hebrew at the Academy of Sedan, and H. Zanchi, who occupied a distinguished place among the most eminent theologians of Germany. At Florence Vermigli met with Occhino, who, stimulated by his example, also sacrificed his position, and left Italy. Another champion of the. Reformation, the. learned Celio Secundo Curione, replaced for, a while Martyr in the congregation at Lucca, and afterwards labored at various places, until he. also was obliged to seek safety in flight, and went to Switzerland.

Thus the movement had become general throughout Italy. Many admitted that no reforms were to be expected from the Church or its hierarchy, and separated from it, some silently, others openly; the latter inclined more and  more to a union with the Protestants of Germany. and Switzerland. Still a large number retained the hope that the Church itself would make the necessary reforms, either by the long-wished-for council, or by other concessions. The evangelical tendencies finally acquired such influence, even among the clergy, that pope Paul III thought it best to make apparently some concessions; he appointed Contarini, Sadolet, Poole, and Fregoso (but at the same time also Caraffa), members of the college of cardinals. As a preliminary step towards the convocation of a council, he formed them,-together with some other prelates, into a congregation, with the mission of drawing up a project of the reforms most needed. Soon, however, the uncompromising opponents of all reformatory measures gained the ascendency with the pope, and it was resolved to put down the reformatory movement at any price. A superior tribunal of the Inquisition was established at Rome, with full power of life and death in all cases concerning religion, and acting with the same severity against all, without distinction of rank or person. The bull establishing the new Congregation of the Holy Office was issued July 21,1542.

It was composed of. six cardinals, with Caraffa at their head. They were authorized to appoint envoys, with full power to act for them in the different provinces. The pope alone had the power of pardoning those they had condemned. The new institution was soon adopted in Tuscany, Milan, and Naples; all the Italian states gave it the necessary support. Venice itself was unable to resist its introduction, though here lay judges. were joined to the inquisitors. Books were also subjected to the judgment of the Inquisition; after 1543 no book was permitted to be published without its sanction, and soon there appeared lists of forbidden books. Next to the Inquisition, the Council of Trent proved a heavy blow to Italian Protestantism. Many who were wavering or lacked courage were induced to return to the old fold; many others left their native land for safety, and a great number became martyrs to their faith in dungeons or at the stake. Rome gave the signal of most of the persecutions which-the Protestants suffered in Italy. Caraffa had spies everywhere. Among the first who were obliged to seek safety in flight were Occhino and Vermigli. The congregation which had been established by them and Valdez at Naples was subjected to severe attacks as soon as the latter was dead; many of its members gave way under the persecution, and the others were obliged to use the utmost secrecy. Giovanni Mollio, of Montalcino, a Franciscan, still officiated among them for some time, but he also was obliged to leave Naples in 1543. An Augustinian from Sicily,  Lorenzo Romano, subsequently shared the same fate, and finally became reconciled with Rome.

The congregation founded at Lucca by Peter Vermigli met with the same fate. Rome compelled the senate in 1545 to issue severe edicts against the Protestants, who here also submitted to outward conformity, and by so doing lost the spirit which had animated them, so that when the Inquisition was really established among them the greater number became reconciled to the Church. Manay, however, resisted to the last, and a number of prominent citizens left for Geneva, Berne, Lyon, and other places. SEE INQUISITION.

The countess of Ferrara was no longer able to protect her fellow- Protestants. A papal decree commanded that all suspicious persons should be examined; imprisonment, banishment, death, or, at best, fight, was the usual fate of the accused. Fannio, of Faenza, fell a martyr to his faith. Renata herself was much persecuted by her husband, but remained steadfast, and after her husband's death retired to France, where she showed herself a courageous protector of the Protestants. All Italy was awed into obedience by the Inquisition. The prisons at Rome were filled with prisoners brought from all parts of Italy. Mollio, having returned from Naples to Bologna, was taken, brought to Rome, and executed. The Gospel had made great progress among the Franciscans, especially in Upper Italy; a large number of them were imprisoned, others escaped and most of them were compelled to recant. The persecution became still more violent when Caraffa himself, aged seventy-nine years, ascended the papal throne in 1555 under the name of Paul IV. To purify and restore the Church was his chief aim, and, in order to attain this, he was most zealous in the persecution of all unbelievers and heretics. He spared none-not even the leaders of the moderate reform party. The most distinguished of these (Contarini being dead), cardinal Morone, remained a prisoner until the pope's death, in the castle of St. Angelo. Bishop Foscarari, of Modena, and San Felice, of Cava, were also arrested, while cardinal Poole was summoned to come from England to justify himself.

Among the chief points of accusation against Morone were that he doubted the correctness of the decisions of the Council of Trent, especially in regard to justification; that he rejected the efficiency of good works, and advised his hearers to trust only in the redeeming sacrifice of Christ. The first martyr in the reign of Paul IV was Pomponio Algieri, Who had labored faithfully for the propagation of evangelical views at Padua; he died courageously at the  stake. Under Pius IV, the Inquisition did not relent in its work. He was himself present at an autoda-fe at which Ludovico Pascali, a minister of the Waldenses of Calabria, was executed. When the Dominican Ghislieri, former president of the Inquisition, and a worthy disciple of Caraffa, ascended the papal throne in 1566, under the name of Pius V, the Inquisition entered a new era of prosperity. He accomplished the final suppression of Protestantism in Italy. Prisoners were sent to Rome from all parts of Italy. The duke of Florence himself sent there, as his peace- offering, the eminent apostolical protonotary. Pietro Carnesecchi. whom his learning, piety, and position had heretofore protected, and who now became a martyr. The same fate befel Antonio del Pagliarici (Aonio Paleario), who, as professor of rhetoric at Sienna, Lucca, and Milan, had acquired universal reputation, and who is generally considered as the author of the treatise Del Beneficio di Christo, a truly evangelical work, which, by its clear exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith, gained many adherents to Protestantism.

The numerous Protestants of Venetia also experienced the effects of the papal persecution, although the republic resisted the Inquisition, and sought to counteract it by a number of decrees. Already, in 1542, the papal nuncio Della Casa procured the arrest of a priest, Giulio Milanese, and, soon after, that of the provincial of the Minorites, Baldo Lupetino. The former, however, succeeded in making good his escape. In 1546 pope Paul III gave a fresh impulse to the persecutions, and many fled the country, some recanted, and others were imprisoned for life. The persecution was still more violent in the neighborhood of Venice than in the city itself. The bishop of Bergamo himself, Soranzo, was obliged to go to Rome to give an account of his faith, and was imprisoned. A few only succeeded in hiding themselves in the midst of the greatest dangers. Altieri, who had so often obtained protection for the Italian Protestants from the princes forming the League of Smalcald, was at last in danger himself, and, after many escapes, died poor in the neighborhood of Brescia in 1550. After 1557, foreigners who visited Venice for study or commerce received, however, some degree of protection. This encouraged the native Protestants, who called a minister, and again formed a congregation in private. They were soon betrayed, and most of them imprisoned. The senate now for the first time consented that their offence should be punished by death. They were not burnt, however, but thrown into the sea at night. Baldo Lupetino was among these. The destruction of the little  church of the Waldenses, who, since the end of the 14th century, had settled at St. Pisto and Montalto, in Calabria, is one of the saddest episodes of the sad history of Italian Protestantism. The other evangelical communities of Locarno, etc., met with the same fate.

(3.) Church History from the Suppression of the Reformation until the present Day. — Throughout the 16th, 17th, and 18th centuries, Italy remained dismembered into a number of small states, which prevented the people from becoming one consolidated nation. Its ecclesiastical history during this period is as unimportant as the political. Only once an aera of ecclesiastical reforms appeared to dawn, when Leopold, grand-duke of Tuscany, brother of emperor Joseph IT, attempted, by the agency of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato, to reform the polity of the Church. At a synod of his clergy which Ricci assembled at Pistoia (1786), and which was largely attended, the principles of the Gallican Church and of the most liberal Jansenism were adopted; the prerogatives claimed by the popes, and in particular, the claim of infallibility, were severely denounced, many superstitious ceremonies were abolished, and it was determined that public worship should be conducted in the language of the people, and that the Scriptures should be circulated among them. But these enactments were opposed by most of the bishops of Tuscany, and when Leopold ascended the imperial throne of Austria, the hierarchy obtained a complete victory. The territorial changes which the French republic and the first Napoleon introduced in Italy were not of long duration, but the revolutionary ideas which during this period had been kindled in the minds of many Italians survived.

A secret society, the Catrbonari, which at first aimed at the introduction of a universal republic, but subsequently had the establishment of a national. union and the introduction of liberal reforms, and, in particular, religious toleration, for its chief object, spread with great rapidity throughout the peninsula, and became the rallying-point for all the educated Italians who wished to break the omnipotent influence of the Church upon the political and social affairs of the people. The Carbonari succeeded in 1821 in compelling the government of the Two Sicilies to grant a liberal constitution, but an armed intervention of the Austrians soon restored the absolute power of the king and the despotic influence of the Church. It was, however, apparent that the educated classes of Italy only yielded to brutal force, and that the desire to emancipate the people from the influence of the priests, and, in particular, from the temporal rule of the popes, became stronger every year. In 1830 a new revolution broke out in  the papal provinces, and within a fortnight four fifths of the States of the Church had made themselves free from papal rule, and constituted themselves an independent state. Again it required the armed intervention of Austria to arrest the success of the liberal and anti-papal movement throughout Italy. The accession to the throne of Sardinia of Charles Albert in 1831 gave, however, to Italy one prince who openly adhered to the programme of the national liberal party, and therefore awakened great hopes for the future. In the same year Mazzini organized the secret society Young Italy, which repeatedly attempted insurrections for the purpose of establishing an Italian republic, All these attempts were unsuccessful, but they greatly increased the breach between the Italian people and the Church of Rome. The liberal priest V. Gioberti, in his work on the moral and political primacy of the Italians (1843), endeavored to prove that a reconciliation between the national liberal party and a reformed papacy was possible, and that the best way for securing a political regeneration of Italy was the establishment of a confederation of the several states, with a liberal pope at its head. When, in 1846, Gregory XVI died, and the new pope, Pius IX, seemed to adopt some of the views of Gioberti, the belief in the practicability of the scheme found many adherents among the liberal party, but the large body of the ultramontane party looked upon them with distrust and even regarded many steps taken by the new pope as a mistaken policy.

The revolutionary movements of 1848 at first appeared to have a great influence upon the religious affairs of the country. In Rome a Constituent Assembly was called, which on Feb. 5,1849, abolished the temporal power of the pope, and proclaimed the Roman republic. The greatest enemies of the papacy in Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi, were at the head of the republic, which, however, only a few months later (June 4), was struck down by the French troops, which Louis Napoleon, the president of the French republic, had sent there for the restoration of the temporal power. But, although the revolutionary movements, which, if successful, would have abolished throughout Italy the prerogatives of the Church of Rome, were unsuccessful, one of the state governments, Sardinia, remained favorable to the cause of national union and of a liberal legislation in the province of Church affairs. The Legislature, in 1850, adopted liberal laws, introduced by the minister Siccardi (hence called the Siccardian laws), which provided, 1, that all civil suits must be decided in civil courts and according to the common law; 2, that all priests in criminal cases be subject to the  jurisdiction of the state; 3, that criminals may be arrested in churches and other sacred places. When archbishop Franzoni, of Turin, resisted the new law of the state, he was promptly arrested; and when he refused the sacraments of the Church to the dying minister Santa Rosa, he was deposed from his office (Sept. 26,1850) and exiled. The archbishop of Cagliari shared his fate. In the threatening allocutions of the pope (the first dated Nov. 1,1850), the government replied by sequestrating the revenues of the archbishop. In consequence of the violent opposition made to the government by the monks, the ministry of Cavour (18521858), the greatest Italian statesman of modern times issued the stringent laws of March 2,1855, by which the convents of all monks who did not devote themselves to preaching, to instruction, or to the nursing of the sick were suppressed (331 out of 605). The papal anathema against the authors of these laws remained without the least effect.

On the contrary, when the king of Sardinia, in consequence of the war against Austria and the successful revolutions in central and southern Italy, united all the provinces of Italy, with the only exception of a part of the papal territory and of Venetia, into the kingdom of Italy, the liberal Sardinian laws were not only retained, but made more stringent. Nobody seemed to care about the Church laws against those who spoliated the patrimony of St. Peter (the States of the Church), and on Jan. 1, 1866, the obligatory civil marriage was introduced. The government and the Parliament were fully agreed in the wish to complete, as soon as possible, the unity of Italy, by the annexation of Venetia and the remainder of the papal territory, inclusive of the city of Rome. In accordance with the plan of Cavour, the Parliament, as early as 1861, almost unanimously declared in favor of making Rome the capital of Italy, though they expressed a willingness to give to the pope full guarantees for the free and independent exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. The movements of Garibaldi showed that the inhabitants of the papal provinces alone, aided by volunteers from other parts of Italy, would have been fully able to depose the papal government, and unite the territory with the kingdom of Italy; and it required the presence of a large French army in Rome to maintain the detested papal rule. Venetia was obtained as a result of the war of 1866 but the expedition of Garibaldi against Rome in 1867 led to a new occupation of the papal territory by a French army.

The wretched financial condition of Italy, which had become more threatening than ever by the war of 1866, and the September convention of 1864 by which the government engaged to assume a part of the papal debt,  compelled the ministry in 1867 to bring in a bill for the confiscation of the property of the Church. The subject had been under deliberation since 1865, when a personal correspondence took place between the pope and the king, which induced the latter to make to the Church a few concessions. But the sale of the Church property, though for a time delayed, was urgently demanded by the Parliament and public opinion as the only escape from a general bankruptcy, and the government therefore laid a bill before the Parliament which met on March 22, 1867; but the committee elected by the Parliament rejected the project of the government as too compromising and not sufficiently radical, and in the very first article of its own draft demanded the abolition of all monastic institutions, and the confiscation of the whole property of the Church. The government yielded to the views of the committee, and, after several modifications had been agreed upon by the government and the Parliament, both chambers adopted the ‘bill for the sale of the Church property by an immense majority (the lower chamber, on July 27, by 296 votes against 41; the senate, on Aug. 12, by 84 against 29). The actual sale began at Florence on October 26, 1867, though even before this drafts on the revenue to be realized by the sale had been issued to the amount of 400 million francs. The new excommunications pronounced against all buyers of Church property failed to have any effect; the government and the overwhelming majority of both chambers unwaveringly persisted in carrying out the new laws concerning the Church and her property.

The Ecumenical Council which was opened by the pope at Rome on Dec. 8,1869, was unable to improve the influence and the prospects of the papacy among the Italians. The government, the Parliament, and the people at large repudiated the claims of the council more generally than was done in any other purely Catholic country. The nation became more impatient than ever for the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and the incorporation of his states with the kingdom; and when, in 1870, the Franco-German war caused the withdrawal of the French troops from Rome and ultimately led to the destruction of the French Empire, the Italian government could no longer resist the popular pressure for the annexation of the papal states. In September, 1870, count Ponza di San Martino was sent to Rome, and, in the name of the Italian government, proposed to the pope to renounce the temporal rule and to dissolve his army; he was, in this case, to retain the Leonine part of Rome, a civil list, and the right of diplomatic representation. The government also offered to  guarantee the free exercise, by the pope, the bishops, and the priests, of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the immunity of all cardinals and ambassadors.

When the pope rejected all these offers of compromise, on Sept. 11, the Italian troops, in compliance with numerous petitions from the subjects of the pope, entered the States of the Church, and on Sept. 20, by the occupation of the city of Rome, put an end to the temporal power of the pope. A note from cardinal Antonelli, the secretary of state, to the foreign government, protested against the act; and the bishops and the ultramontane party in all the countries re-echoed the protest, and many princes, both Catholic and Protestant, were called upon to interfere and to restore the pope to his throne. The pope issued a new brief of excommunication, in which he said, “We declare to you, venerable brethren, and through you to the whole Church, that all those (in whatever notable dignity they may shine) who have been guilty of the invasion, usurpation, occupation of any of our provinces, or of this holy city, or of anything connected therewith, and likewise all who have commissioned, favored, aided, counseled, adhered to them, and all others who promote or carry out the things aforesaid, under any pretext whatever, and in any manner whatever, have incurred the greater excommunication (excommunicatio major), and the other censures and penalties which have been provided in the holy canons of the apostolical constitutions and the decrees of the ecumenical councils, in particular that of Trent.” None of all these measures produced the least effect. When the first Parliament of all Italy met, the king declared, “We entered Rome in virtue of the national right, in virtue of the compact which unites all Italians to one nation. We shall remain there, keeping the promises which we have solemnly given to ourselves; freedom of the Church, entire independence of the pope in the exercise of his religious functions, and in his relations to the Catholic Church.” None of the foreign governments interrupted its amicable relations with the Italian government. In July, 1871, the government transferred its seat to Rome, where, in spite of all the papal excommunications, it received the enthusiastic applause of a large majority of the Italian people, and where it was at once followed by the representatives of all the foreign governments.

Although nearly all the bishops and the overwhelming majority of the priests showed themselves as partisans of the papacy in its struggle against the government and the public opinion of Italy, the idea of reforming the Church by rejecting all or much of the corruptions which had crept into it  during the Middle Ages and in modern times and by reconciling it with the civilization of the 19th century, found more adherents among the priests of Italy than among those of any other country. In a political point of view, the reformers desired the Church, in ‘particular, to abandon the temporal rule of the pope, to recognize the national unity of Italy, and to aid in carrying through a separation between Church and State. In the province of religion they all wished to restrict the power of the popes, to enlarge that of the bishops, and one portion went so far as to enter into amicable relations with the High-Church party of the Church of England. They had an organ, the Examinatore of Florence; and as even one of the six hundred bishops (cardinal D'Andrea), and the Jesuit Passaglia, who had long been regarded by the ultramontane party as one of their ablest theologians, and other men of high prominence, declared their concurrence with a part or the whole of the reformatory projects, there seemed to be good reason for hoping lasting results from the movement. More recently, the reformatory movement in Germany, headed by Dr. Döllinger, has found the warmest sympathy among the Italian reformers.

After the suppression of the Reformation in the 16th century, cruel laws made it for more than two hundred years impossible for any Italian to declare himself a Protestant; only the Waldenses (q.v.), in their ‘remote valleys, maintained with difficulty, and amidst great persecutions, their organization. At the close of the 18th century the victorious French republic recognized the human rights of the Waldenses, and proclaimed religious toleration; but the restored monarchies revived some of the most intolerant laws, and even the Waldenses were placed in so unbearable a position that it required the intervention of England and Prussia to secure for them the merest toleration. At length the liberal constitution of 1848 gave them full political rights in Sardinia; they were allowed to step forward out of their seclusion in the valley, and, with the most hearty sympathy of all friends of religious toleration, opened a chapel in the capital of the kingdom, Turin. In the remainder of Italy the persecution of the Protestants continued. The government of Tuscany, though by no means the most tyrannical of the Italian governments, startled the whole civilized world by its cruel measures against the Madiai couple, against count Guicciardini and Dominico Cecchctti, and only the most energetic remonstrances of the foreign powers prevailed upon the grand-duke to change the penalty of imprisonment into exile. Finally, in 1859, the establishment of the kingdom of Italy gave to the Waldenses the liberty of  extending their evangelistic labors to all parts of the peninsula. They soon occupied a number of important places, transferred their theological seminary to Florence, and had an able representative in the Italian Parliament (the Turin banker Malan). Many Italians, however, who were eager to embrace Protestant views, did not share all the views of the Waldenses, especially those on the ministry and the Church, and, after the model of the Plymouth Brethren in England, organized free Christian organizations. Of their leaders, professor Mazarella and count Guicciardini are the best known. Moreover, a number of missionaries were sent out by the Protestant churches of the United States, Great Britain, and other countries, who laid the foundation of several other Church organizations. Nearly every town of importance has thus received the nucleus of a Protestant population. ‘In some places the fanaticism of the priests caused riots against Protestants, none of which was so bloody as that in Barletta in 1866; but the government of Italy, and the immense majority of the Italian Parliaments, have secured the complete triumph of the cause of religious toleration.

II. Statistics. — Nearly the whole population of Italy is nominally connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The total population of the kingdom was estimated in 1881 at 28,459,457; of whom 96,000 were Protestants. 36,000 Jews, and 100,000 members of the Greek Church. Practically a large portion of the population is no longer in communion with the Church of Rome, as can easily be proved by the fact that the government and Parliament have been for years in open conflict with Rome, and utterly disregard and set aside the laws of the Church: that the claims of the pope have only a few advocates in the Parliament, and that, in particular the radical party, with men like Mazzini and Garibaldi at their head, have openly and formally renounced the religious communion with Rome.

According to the Papal Almanac (Annuanrio Pontifico) for 1889, the country had, exclusive of Rome and of the six suburban sees (the sees of the cardinal bishops), Ostia, Porto, Palestrina, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina, 268 dioceses, which were distributed among the former Italian states as follows:

ArchbishopricsBishopricsNaples2589States of the Church757

Sardinia632Tuscany419Venetia29Lombardy17Modena14Parma3Total47221Of these dioceses, 11 archbishoprics and 63 bishoprics are immediately subject to the pope, and without connection with an ecclesiastical province, while 37 archbishops are heads of ecclesiastical provinces, containing, besides them, 155 suffragan bishops. The dioceses of Italy, in point of territorial extent, are smaller than in any other country; and while the (nominally) Catholic population is no more than one eighth of the Roman Catholic population of the world, it has more than one fourth of all the dioceses. Thus the Italian bishops have an undue preponderance at every council; and as they generally hold the most ultramontane views, they have considerably contributed to the success of ultra papal theories within the Catholic Church. The government of Italy has expressed a wish to reduce the number of dioceses, and a considerable number has therefore been kept vacant since the establishment of the kingdom.

The secular clergy in 1866 had about 115,000 members, or about 1 to every 245 inhabitants, showing a relatively larger number of priests than in any other country of the world. Besides the secular clergy, Italy had in 1860 more than 60,000 monks in 2050 establishments, and about 30,000 nuns in 302 establishments. The most numerous among the monastic orders are the Franciscan monks, with 1227 houses; the Dominicans, with 140; the Augustinians, with 138; the Carmelites, with 125; the Jesuits, with 57; the Brothers of Charity, with 49; the Redemptorists, with 31; the Franciscan nuns, with 89; the Sisters of Charity, with 50. The convents were formerly very rich, but a large portion of their property was confiscated during the French invasion at the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. More recently the government of Italy has suppressed a large portion of all the convents, and confiscated their property. In 1866, the total number of convents suppressed amounted to over 2000, with 38,000 inmates; of these, 1252, with 20,228 inmates,  belonged to the mendicant orders, and 1162, with 18,168 inmates, were of other orders.

Popular instruction, which until recently was chiefly in the hands of monks and nuns, is, according to official accounts, in a very low condition. In 1862, of the entire male population, only 2,620,269 were able to read; of the female, only 1,258,186; 17,000,000 persons were unable to read and write. Of every 1000 persons, there were, unable to read-in Lombardy, 599; in Piedmont, 603; in Tuscany, 773; in Modena, 799; in the Romagna, 802; in Parma, 818; in the Marca, 851; in Umbria, 858; in Naples, 880; in Sicily, 902; in Sardinia, 911. Since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy public instruction has made great progress. From 1860 to 1863 the number of male teachers increased from 12,475 to 17,604; that of female teachers from 6631 to 13,817. The number of educational institutions amounted in 1881 to 42,510, which were attended by 1,928,706 children. In the same year Italy had 104 gymnasia, with 8268 pupils; 79 lycea, with 3773 pupils; and 135 seminaries, with 10,659 pupils. There were 21 universities, 16 of which were state and 5 free. Six have been declared by the government to be first-class universities: Turin, Pavia, Bologna, Florence, Naples, and Palermo; The number of students had in 1881 decreased to 11,728, from 15,668 in 1862.

The Church of the Waldenses is the only fully organized Protestant Church in Italy. It consists of 16 communities, with a membership of 22,000. Its governing body is called the Table. The Theological School in Florence had in 1869 3 professors (Revel, Geymonat, and De Sanctis) and 14 students, 4 of whom were formerly Catholic priests. According to the report made to the Waldensi: n Synod in 1866, evangelistic work was carried on by this Church at 23 principal stations, which were thus distributed: 7 in Piedmont, 3 in Lombardy, 1 in Emilia, 3 in Liguria, 4 in Tuscany, in the district of Naples, 1 in Sicily, 1 in the Isle of Elba, and 2 in France for Italians. To work these stations it employed 19 pastors, 11 evangelists, and 29 teachers in all, 59 agents. The number of attendants upon public worship was reckoned at from 2000 to 2500; that of communicants at 1095. According to the latest official returns the Waldensian Church had in 1886-87 43 churches and 38 mission churches throughout Italy. The ordained pastors numbered 37, evangelists 6, male and female teachers 56, the total number of salaried agents being 124. The Church had 4005 members, and the day-schools were attended by 2206 scholars, the Sunday-schools by 2482. The Methodist Episcopal Church  entered this field in 1872. The work is now organized into an Annual Conference with two districts, with (1889) 17 preachers, 968 members, and property valued at $105,900. There is a theological school at Florence. The Nice Foreigners' Evangelization Committee employed in 1867 15 agents, who were stationed at Barletta, Como, Milan, Fara, Florence, Piverone, Sardinia, and Sondrio. The salaries of six of the evangelists are paid by the Evangelical Continental Society of London. The total receipts of the committee, including the money received from the Evangelical Continental Society, were £1323; the expenditures £1180. The American and Foreign Christian Union supports more than 40 agents in Italy.

A Theological Training School has been established by the society at Milan where in 1866 the Rev. Mr.. Clark, assisted by 4 Italian professors, instructed 19 theological students, superintended churches in 8 different places, and sustained from 10 to 20 colporteurs in North Italy. In 1870 the training school was transferred to the care of a Committee of Evangelization- appointed by the Free Christian Church of Italy. This body was formally organized at Milan in June 1870, and consists of a considerable number of evangelical churches, two thirds of which (more than 20) represent the results of the previous expenditure and labor of this society. These churches and their pastors are still sustained by the board. Another missionary of the society superintended at Sarzana evangelistic operations in some 10 different places. The Wesleyan Missionary Society had in 1867 several agents in Italy under the superintendence of the Rev. H. J. Piggott at Padua. A Ragged School, supported by the society in this city, was regularly attended by 40 lads. Florence also had prosperous schools; there were increasing congregations at Cremona, Parma, Mezzano Inferiore (15 miles from Parma), and at Naples; and efforts, with some success, had been made in other places. The missionaries and other agents were sustained at a cost of about. 20,000. The Scotch Free Church had several ministers settled in various parts of Italy, who were engaged, in addition to their regular labors among their countrymen, in superintending the work of Bible distribution. In addition to these Protestant agencies, free evangelical Italian churches were to be found in several parts, as in Genoa, Florence, etc., all of them being more or less allied with the Plymouth Brethren.

School-work is carried on in connection with most of the churches and stations. In Naples there were in 1868 4 schools, with 14 teachers and 373 children, under the direction of a special committee. There were 3  Waldensian schools in Florence and 2 in. Leghorn. The Waldensian schools in the valleys numbered 80, with 3750 children in regular attendance. The “Italian Evangelical Publication Society” selects and translates religious books and tracts suitable for Italy, and prints them at the lowest possible rate. It prints the Eco della Verita (weekly) and the Amico di Casa (annual). It has published 232 new works, or new editions of works, amounting to 520,000 copies, and has sold since 1862 as many as 390,000 copies. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. 8, 99; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon, 5, 582 sq, Wiggers, Kirchl. Statistik, 2, 3 sq.; Neher, Kirch. Geogr. u. Statistik, 1, 4 sq.; Nippold, Handbuch der z-Ueecten Kirchengesch. (2nd ed. Elberf. 1868); Christian Yearbook- (London, 1867 and 1868); Ughelli, Italia Sacra (Rome, 1644, 6 vols.);. M'Crie, Hist. of the Progress and Suppression of the Reformation in Italy (Edinb. 1827); Erdma-lnn Die Reformation u. ihre Martzrer in Italien (Berl. 1855); Leopold, Ueber die Ursachen der Reformation und deren Verfall in Italien (in Zeitschrifi für hist Theol. 1843); Matthes, Kirchl. Chronik. (A. J. S.)

## Itch[[@Headword:Itch]]

             (חֶרֶס, che'res, from חָרִס, to scratch and to burn), an inflammatory irritation of the skin, threatened to the Israelites as an infliction in case of idolatry (Deu 28:27); probably some coetaneous or eruptive disorder common in Egypt, but of what peculiar character is uncertain, if, indeed, any peculiar malady is intended. SEE DISEASE.

## Ith[[@Headword:Ith]]

             a German theologian and philosopher of some note, was born at Berne, Switzerland, in 1747. In 1781 he was appointed to the chair of philosophy at the university of his native place, where he had also pursued his studies, but in 1796 he entered the ministry, and settled at Siselen, where he lived until 1799, when he was elected dean and president of the committee of education and religion in the canton of Berne. He died in 1813. Besides a number of philosophical, philological, psuedogogical, and even homiletical works, he wrote Versuch einer Anthropologie oder Philosophie der Menschen (Berne, 1794-5, 2 vols.; new edit. 1803 sq.), which is a very valuable work: — Verhatnisse d. Staats z. Religion u. Kirche (ibid. 1798, 8vo): — Sittenlehre der Braninen (ibid. 1794, 8vo), really a reproduction  of his translation of Ezour- Vidam, an old Hindu work on morals and religion. See Krug, Philos. Worterbuch, 2, 558. (J.H.W.)

## Ithacius[[@Headword:Ithacius]]

             SEE IDACIUS.

## Ithai [[@Headword:Ithai ]]

             (1Ch 11:31). SEE ITTAI.

## Ithamar[[@Headword:Ithamar]]

             (Heb. Ithamar', אַיתָמָר, palm-isle; but according to Furst, not high, i.e. little; Sept. Ι᾿θάμαρ; Josephus Ι᾿θάμαρος, Ant. 8, 1, 3), the fourth and youngest son of Aaron (1Ch 6:3). B.C. 1658. He was consecrated to the priesthood along with his brothers (Exo 6:23; Num 3:2-3); and after the death of Nadab and Abihu (Lev 10:1 sq.), as they left no children, he and Eleazar alone remained to discharge the priestly functions (Lev 10:6; Lev 10:12; Num 3:4; Num 26:60 sq.; 1Ch 24:2). Nothing is individually recorded of him, except that the property of the tabernacle was placed under his charge (Exo 38:21), and that he superintended all matters connected with its removal by the Levitical sections of Gershon and Merari (Num 4:28). The sacred utensils and their removal were entrusted to his elder brother Eleazar, whose family was larger than that of Ithamar (1Ch 24:4). Ithamar, with his descendants, occupied the position of common priests till the high-priesthood passed into his family in the person of Eli, under circumstances of which we are ignorant. SEE ELI.

Abiathar, whom Solomon deposed, was the last high-priest of that line, and the pontificate then reverted to the elder line of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1Ki 2:27). SEE HIGH-PRIEST.

The traditionary tomb of Ithamar is still shown near that of his brother Eleazar in the hill of Phinehas (Schwarz, Palest. p. 151). A priest by the name of Daniel, of his posterity, returned from Babylon. (Ezr 8:2; 1Es 8:29).

## Ithiel[[@Headword:Ithiel]]

             (Heb. lthiel', אַיתַיאֵל, for אַתַּי אֵל, God with me, or, according to Furst, the property of God; Sept. Αἰθιήλ,Vurlg. Etheel; but in Pro 31:1,  both translate οἱ πιστεύοντες θεῷ, cum quo est Deus and Deo secum morante), the name of two men.

1. A person mentioned along with Ucal in Pro 30:1, apparently as one to whom the “words of Agur's prophecy” had been addressed. B.C. perhaps cir. 990. SEE AGUR. Gesenius (Thesaur. Heb. p. 88) thinks that Ithiel and Ucal were the children or disciples of Agur, to whom he inscribed his aphorisms; others regard both words as appellatives, and render the whole clause as follows: “Thus spake the man: I have toiled for God, I have toiled for God, and have ceased” (see Stuart's Comment. ad loc.).

2. The son of Jesaiah and father of Maaseiah, a Benjamite, one of whose posterity returned with a party from Babylon (Neh 11:7). B.C. long ante 536.

## Ithmah[[@Headword:Ithmah]]

             (Heb. Yithmah', יַתְמָה, orphanage; Sep Ι᾿εθεμά), a Moabite, and one of David's supplementary body-guard (1Ch 11:46). B.C. 1046. SEE DAVID.

## Ithnan[[@Headword:Ithnan]]

             (Heb. Yithnan', יַתְנָן, bestowed, otherwise distance; Sept. Ι᾿θνάν [but the Vat. MS. joins it to the preceding word, Α᾿σοριωνάν, and the Alex. to the following, Ι᾿θναζίφ],Vulg. Jethram), one of the cities in the south of Judah, mentioned between Hazor and Ziph (Jos 15:23); perhaps lying along the southern edge of the highland district. It cannot well have been the Jedna of the Onomasticon (Ι᾿εδνά, the modern Idhna), for this is in the mountains west of Hebron (see Keil Comment. ad loc.). The enumeration in Jos 15:32 requires us to join this with the following (there being no copula between), Ithnan-Ziph, i.e. Zephath (q.v.). SEE JUDAH.

## Ithra[[@Headword:Ithra]]

             (Heb. Yithra', יַתְרָא, excellence; Sept. Ι᾿εθερ Vulg. Jetra), an Israelite (probably an error of transcription [see Thenius, Comment. ad loc.]; a Jezreelite, according to the Sept. and Vulg.; but [more correctly] an Ishmaelite, according to 1Ch 2:17), and father of Amasa  (David's general) by Abigail, David's sister (1 Kings 2, 5); elsewhere called JETHER (2Sa 17:25). B.C. ante 1023.

## Ithran[[@Headword:Ithran]]

             (Heb. Yithran', יַתְרָן, excellent), the name of one or two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿δράν, Ι᾿εθράν; Vulg. Jethram, Jethran.) One of the sons of Dishon, and grandson of Seir the Horite (Gen 36:26; 1Ch 1:41). B.C. cir. 1964.

2. (Sept. Ι᾿εθέρ, Vulg. Jethran.) Apparently one of the sons of Zophah, the great-grandson of Asher (1Ch 7:37); probably the same as JETHER in 5. 58. B.C. long post 1856.

## Ithreim[[@Headword:Ithreim]]

             (Heb. Yithream', יַתְרְעָם, superabundance of the people; Sept. Ι᾿εθεραάμ, Ι᾿εθράμ; Josephus Γεθραάμης [Ant. 7:i, 4]), David's sixth son, born of Eglah in Hebron (2Sa 3:5; 1Ch 3:3). B.C. 1045. In the ancient Jewish traditions (Jerome, Qucest. Heb. in 2Sa 3:5; 2Sa 5:23) Eglah is said to have been Michal, and to have died in ‘giving birth to Ithream: but this is at variance with the Bible.

## Ithrite[[@Headword:Ithrite]]

             or, rather, JETHERITE (Heb. Yithri', יַתְרַי, Sept. Ι᾿εθρῖος and Ι᾿εθερί, but Αἰθαλείμ in 1Ch 2:53; Vulg. Jethrites and Jethrceus or Jethreus), the posterity of some JETHER mentioned as resident in Kirjath- jearim (A.V. “the Ithrites” [1Ch 2:53]); probably the descendants of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (who settled in this region, Jdg 1:16), and so called as being thus the posterity of JETHRO, the father-in-law of Moses. SEE KENITE.

Two of David's famous warriors, Ira and Gareb, belonged to this clan (2Sa 23:38; 1Ch 11:40). SEE DAVID. Ira has been supposed to be identical with; Ira the Jairite,”' David's priest (2Sa 20:26). According to another supposition, Jether may be only another form for ITHRA (2Sa 17:25), the brother-in-law of David, and it is possible that the “Ithrites,” as a family, sprang from him. According to still another supposition, the two Ithrite heroes of David's guard may have come from JATTIR, in the mountains of Judah, one of the places which were the  “haunt” of David and his men in their freebooting wanderings, and where he had “friends” (1Sa 30:27; comp. 31).

## Itinerancy[[@Headword:Itinerancy]]

             a word which Methodism has adopted in its ecclesiastical terminology as expressing one of the most characteristic features of that religious denomination. Wesley's plans for the revival of Christian life throughout the United Kingdom rendered it necessary that he should travel from town to town. He did so quite systematically through his long life. Very early, a few talented laymen were commissioned by him to preach in the societies which he had organized during his own absence, for he usually staid but a day or two in any one place. These lay preachers, or “helpers,” as he called them, soon multiplied to scores, at last to hundreds; but the societies demanding their labors in the intervals of the great preacher's visits multiplied still faster. As early as his third Conference (May, 1746), he saw the necessity of extending and methodizing the labors of his “helpers” on some plan of “itinerancy.” He appointed them, therefore, to definitive “circuits” this year. The word “circuit” has ever since been an important technical term in Methodism. The “Minutes,” or journal of this Conference, show that the whole country was mapped into seven of these “itinerant” districts. Wales and Cornwall each constituted one: Newcastle and its neighboring towns another. That of Yorkshire comprised seven counties. London, Bristol, and Evesham were the headquarters of others. By 1749 there were twenty of these “rounds” in England, two in Wales, two in Scotland, and seven in Ireland; and at Wesley's death there were seventy-two in England, three in Wales, seven in Scotland, and twenty- eight in Ireland. The circuits were long, comprising at least thirty “appointments” for each month, or about one a day. The preachers were changed at first from one circuit to another, usually every year, and invariably every two years; sometimes from England to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and back again.

The “circuit system” has been retained in England down to our day; even the churches of the large cities are combined under a “circuit” pastorate. In “America,” the societies in cities, and also the large societies in the country, are generally “stations,” each being supplied by its own pastor. The “circuit system,” however, is maintained among the feebler churches, and quite generally in the Far West, and nearly everywhere along the frontier settlements of the country.  Two other characteristic features of Wesley's system rendered the “itinerancy” not only possibly, but notably effective. The “local” ministry, consisting of gifted laymen in secular business-supplied the pulpits in the absence of the “regular” or itinerant preachers as the latter could appear in any given place on their long circuits but once a fortnight, in most cases but once a month, and in others but once in six weeks. Thus public ministrations were kept up every Sunday. The class meeting, comprising twelve “members,” under an experienced “leader,” met weekly, and thus a sort of pastoral supervision of the whole membership was maintained in the absence of the authorized pastor or itinerant. SEE LAY MINISTRY.

In these facts, so co-ordinate and co-operative, we have the chief explanation of the remarkable success of Wesley's ministerial system. Some of the circuits, in our own country especially, were five or six hundred miles in extent, including scores or hundreds of societies or “appointments,” each of which was regularly visited, at intervals of four or six weeks, by the “circuit preacher,” and meanwhile the “local preachers” and “class-leaders” kept each fully supplied with Sabbath, and, indeed, almost daily religious services. In nothing, perhaps, does the legislative genius of Wesley, so highly estimated by Southey, Macaulay, and Buckle, more strikingly appear than in this combination of pastoral provisions.

If its adaptation to England was eminent, it was preeminent in America, where the customary local pastorate of other denominations seemed to afford no adequate provision for the prodigiously advancing population and settlement of the country. “Methodism, with its ‘lay ministry' and its ‘itinerancy,' could alone afford the ministrations of religion to this overflowing population; it was to lay the moral foundations of many of the great states of the West. The older churches of the colonies could never have supplied them with ‘regular' or educated pastors in any proportion to their rapid settlement. Methodism met this necessity in a manner that should command the national gratitude. It was to become at last the dominant popular faith of the country, with its standard planted in every city, town, and almost every village of the land. Moving in the van of emigration. it was to supply with the means of religion the frontiers, from the Canada's to the Gulf of Mexico, from Puget's Sound to the Gulf of California. It was to do this indispensable work by means peculiar to itself; by districting the land into circuits which, from one hundred to five hundred miles in extent, could each be statedly supplied with religious instruction by one or two traveling evangelist, who, preaching daily, could  thus have charge of parishes comprising hundreds of miles and tens of thousands of souls. It was to raise up, without delay for preparatory training, and thrust out upon these circuits, thousands of such itinerants, tens of thousands of ‘local' or lay preachers and ‘exhorters,' as auxiliary and unpaid laborers, with many thousands of class-leaders, who could maintain pastoral supervision over the infant societies in the absence of the itinerant preachers, the latter not having time to delay in any locality for much more than the public services of the pulpit.

Over all these circuits it was to maintain the watchful jurisdiction of traveling presiding elders, and over the whole system the superintendence of traveling bishops, to whom the entire nation was to be a common diocese” (Stevens,. Story of Methodisms). “Without any disparagement of other churches, we may easily see that they were not in a state to meet the pressing wants of the country. The Episcopal Church was much shattered and enfeebled, was destitute of the episcopal order, had to wait long, and urge her plea ardently upon the attention of the bishops of England before they could procure consecration for any of her ministers (and, as is well known, the non-existence of a bishop involves amongst the Episcopalians the non- existence of the Church), so that this community was not in a position to undertake to any great extent an aggressive service. The principles of the Independents, which subordinate the call of a minister to the voice of the Church. placed a bar in the way of their seeking the outlying population, inasmuch as there were no Churches to address this call; and, though the Presbyterian system is not necessarily so stringent in these matters as Independent churches acting on their theories, yet, as they cannot move without the action of their synodical bodies, there was little prospect of their doing much missionary work. Thus this work fell very much into the hands of the Methodist itinerancy. The men were admirably fitted for their task. Rich in religious enjoyment, full of faith and love, zealous and energetic, trained to labor and exertion, actuated by one single motive — that of glorifying God, they thought not of privation, but unhesitatingly followed the emigrants and ‘squatters' in their peregrinations wherever they went. American society was thus imbued with Christian truth and principle, as well as accustomed to religious ordinances, in its normal state” (London Quarterly Ret Review, October, 1854, p. 125).

Wesley started with no “theory” of ministerial itinerancy. The expediency of the plan alone led to its adoption; but he died believing in it as a theory, as, indeed, the apostolic plan of evangelization. In his estimation, it not  only had a salutary effect on the evangelists, by keeping them energetic and chivalrous, but it had the capital advantage of enabling one preacher to minister the truth to many places, and it made small abilities available on a large scale. He says that he believes he should himself preach even his congregation “asleep” were he to stay in one place an entire year. Nor could he “believe that it was ever the Lord's will that any congregation should have one teacher only.” “We have found,” he writes, “by long and constant experience, that a frequent exchange of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a whole congregation.” (A. S.)

There can be no question that an itinerant ministry has the sanction of the highest scriptural examples. Christ was an itinerant. His ministry in the flesh was not a settled pastorate; he went about doing good. The twelve disciples were itinerants, both before and after the crucifixion and resurrection. They went from city to city preaching the Gospel of the kingdom. And the prophets before them were itinerants. Samuel had his circle of appointments; Elijah, and, after him, Elisha, had no settled abode even, but moved about from place to place. These were all itinerants. If in the early Christian Church, even while the apostles were yet at work, there are evidences that a stationary ministry was occasionally introduced, it does not appear to have entered into the original plan of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. “Is there one word,” says Beauchamp (Letters on the Call and Qualifications of Ministers of the Gospel [Charleston, S. C., 1849, 18mo], page 97), perhaps too strongly, “in the New Testament from which anything can be inferred in favor of a settled ministry? The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit.” Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a settled ministry, and numerous the efforts to bring it about, most of the Christian preachers were “itinerants.” In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order-a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigni, Histoire de la Reformation, 5, 102). Thus Berenger, in France. employed itinerant ministers to spread his objections to the doctrine of transubstantiation; Wycliffe, in England, introduced the system of itinerant preaching, and the Swiss historian goes so far even as to assert that the reformatory movements among the Christians of England have all been marled by an  effort to introduce the system of itinerant preaching. “This kind of preaching always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church” (ibid. p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing “itinerancy” as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination.

The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is hedged about by one of the restrictive rules in the Meth. Epis. Church (see their Discipline, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the traveling preachers may remain on the same “charge” (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. “Presiding elders” can remain only four years on the same “district.”

As to the advantages and disadvantages of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuation of “itinerancy” than Dr. Crane (Method. Quart. Rev., Jan. 1866, p. 73 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. “The people are restricted in the choice of their pastors.” If this be true, no other system so soon remedies the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time with the pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

2. “At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place.” In return, it affords each church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.

3. “Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own good demands.” This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the only one that it is hard to deny. It is with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.

4. “The change sometimes comes inopportunely.” If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister a  pastorate, so long as he is able to work effectively in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is “unemployed ministers.” Thus a writer in the Intelligencer, speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: “No man who can work, and wants to work, need be idle, with fields appointed and the Church's benedictions upon those who strive to till them, and no man is laid upon the shelf till age, infirmity, or misconduct places him there; while, when age and infirmity come, that Church still supports and cherishes those who have worn life out in her and the Master's work. That a Church thus served with the whole life-long energies other ministry should thrive and grow under the divine blessing, need surprise no one who properly weighs the bearings of cause and effect. The ruling out by our churches of half the aggregate effective force of the ministry, which a growing fastidiousness in the matter of choosing and settling preachers causes to be practically lost to the Church, has a gloomy look for her future prosperity. The prospect of such a life-voyage is not apt to be specially attractive to youth pondering whether or not to embark; for, once embarked, unless it be a Methodist vessel that bears them, they may find themselves stranded high and dry, and that from no fault of theirs, ere the voyage is half run.”

5. “The brief pastorates are liable to create an unwise love of novelty and excitement.” This, if somewhat true, is not a very formidable objection; while, on the other hand, the evil of indifference and dissatisfaction, so liable to be produced by a long pastoral term, is far greater. The brief pastorates afford the minister time and mental force for the preparation of a comparatively small number of sermons, and are therefore favorable to thorough preparation for the pulpit. Says Dr. Isaac Taylor (Wesley and Methodism, Lond. 1851), “Any one who, endowed with some natural faculty arid fluency of utterance, has made the experiment, will have found it far from difficult to acquire the power of continuous and pertinent speaking upon familiar topics, especially upon religious topics, and so to hold out for thirty or forty minutes or more; and if this habit of speaking be well husbanded, and kept always within the safe enclosures of conventional phrases, and of authenticated modes of thinking, this preacher may be always ready to ascend the pulpit, in season and out of season. His sermon, or his set of discourses, is, in fact, the glib run of the mental associations upon worn tracks, this way or that, as the mind may chance to take its start from a given text. This sort of mindless facility of speaking proves a sore  temptation to many a located minister, and its consequence is to leave many a congregation sitting from year to year deep in a quagmire. Better than this, undoubtedly, would be itinerancy-far better is a frequent shifting of monotonies than a fixedness of the same.”

But also to the “itinerant” himself the system affords many advantages, though, it is true, it also subjects him to some disadvantages. The pros and cons of this part of the question are these:

1. “It restricts him in the choice of his field of labor.” But if this be a disadvantage, it is fully atoned for by the fact that, however restricted, the field is certain. — '

2. “It tends in some cases to lessen the amount paid for the support of the pastor.” If this be true, it can be so only measurably, for of late, at least, the Methodist pastor is remunerated as well as his brethren in the sister churches, while the itinerancy affords him a greater degree of independence, enabling him to “speak boldly, as he ought to speak.”

3. “It deprives the minister and his family of a permanent place of residence.” This the more prolonged stay has measurably remedied, but it is a question whether a still longer term would not deprive the itinerant of one of the greatest blessings, health. It is held by competent judges, and the point is also made by Dr. Crane, that the itinerancy is conducive to health and long life, as the vital forces of a pastor settled over a congregation for many years in succession are necessarily subjected to a fearful strain, and thus what appears at first a family deprivation turns out really to be a great blessing to the entire household. See, besides the articles and books already referred to, Hodgson, Eccles. Polity of Methodism defended, especially p. 95-118; Porter, Compendium of Methodism.

## Itogay[[@Headword:Itogay]]

             a household god among the Mongol Tartars. He is the guardian of their families, and presides over all the products of the earth. The Tartar does not presume to dine until this god and his family have been first served, by covering the mouths of the idols with grease. When the people have dined they throw out the fragments, expecting them to be devoured by some unknown spirits.

## Ittai[[@Headword:Ittai]]

             (Heb. Ittay', אַתִּי, perh. szea. or timely, otherwise possessor), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ε᾿σθαϊv.) Son of Ribai, a Benjamite of Gibeah, one of David's thirty heroes (2Sa 23:29), called in the parallel passage (1Ch 11:31) ITHAI (Heb. Ithaly, אַיתִי, a fuller form; Sept. ᾿Ηθού). B.C. 1046.

2. (Sept. Ε᾿θί [and so Josephus] v.r. Ε᾿θθεί). “ITTAI THE GITTITE,' i.e. the native of Gath, a Philistine in the army of king David. He appears only during the rebellion of Absalom, B.C. cir. 1023. ‘We first discern him on the morning of David's flight, while the king was standing under the olive-tree, below the city, watching the army and the people defile past him. SEE DAVID. Last in the procession came the 600 heroes who had formed David's band during his wanderings in Judah, and who had been with him at Gath (2Sa 15:18; comp. 1Sa 23:13; 1Sa 27:2; 1Sa 30:9-10; and Josephus, Ant. 7:9. 2). Among these, apparently commanding them, was Ittai the Gittite (2Sa 5:19). He caught the eye of the king, who at once addressed him and besought him as “a stranger and an exile,” and, as one who had but very recently joined his service, not to attach himself to a doubtful cause, but to return “with his brethren” and abide with the king (5. 19,20). But Ittai is firm; he is the king's slave (עֶבֶד, A.V. “servant”), and wherever his master goes he will go. Accordingly, he is allowed by David to proceed, and he passes over the Kedron with the king (xv, 22, Sept.), with all his men, and “all the little ones that were with him.” These”' little ones” (כָּלאּהִטִּ, “all the children”) must have been the families of the band-their “households” (1Sa 27:3). They accompanied them during their wanderings in Judah, often at great risk (1Sa 30:6), and they were not likely to leave them behind in this fresh commencement of their wandering life.

When the army was numbered and organized by David at Mahanaim, Ittai again appears, now in command of a third part of the force, and (for the time at least) enjoying equal rank with Joab and Abishai (2Sa 18:2; 2Sa 18:5; 2Sa 18:12). But here, on the eve of the great battle, we take leave of this valiant and faithful stranger; his conduct in the fight and his subsequent fate are alike unknown to us. Nor is he mentioned in the lists of David's captains and of the heroes of his body-guard (see 2 Samuel 23; 2 Samuel 1  Chronicles 11), lists which are possibly of a date previous to Ittai's arrival in Jerusalem.

An interesting tradition is related by Jerome (Quaest. Hebr. on 1Ch 20:2). “David took the crown off the head of the image of Milcom (A.V. ‘their king'). But, by the law, it was forbidden to any Israelite to touch either gold or silver of an idol. Wherefore they say that Ittai the Gittite, who had come to David from the Philistines, was the man who snatched the crown from the head of Milcom; for it was lawful for a Hebrew to take it from the hand of a man, though not from the head of the idol.” The main difficulty to the reception of this legend lies in the fact that if Ittai was engaged in the Ammonitish war, which happened several years before Absalom's revolt, the expression of David (2Sa 15:20), “thou camest but yesterday,” loses its force. However, these words may be merely a strong metaphor.

From the expression “thy brethren” (15:20) we may infer that there were other Philistines besides Ittai in the six hundred; but this is uncertain. Ittai was not exclusively a Philistine name, nor does “Gittite” — as in the case of Obed-edom, who was a Levite — necessarily imply Philistine parentage. Still David's words, “stranger and exile,” seem to show that he was not an Israelite. — Smith. Others, however, have hazarded the supposition that this Ittai is the same as the preceding, having been called a Gittite as a native of Gittaim, in Benjamin (2Sa 4:3). and a “stranger and an exile” as a Gibeonite, who, having fled from Beeroth, a Gibeonitish town (Jos 9:17), had, with his brethren, taken up his residence in Gittaim. All this. is very improbable. SEE GITTITE.

## Ittali-kazin[[@Headword:Ittali-kazin]]

             (Heb. Eth-katsin', עֵת קָצַין, time [according to Furst, people] of the judge, only with ה local, עַתָּח קָצַין; Sept. ἐπί πόλιν κασίμ v.r. κατασέμ; Vulg. Thacasin), a city near the eastern boundary of Zebulun (but within Issachar), between Gath-hepher and Remmon-methoar (Jos 19:13), therefore a very short distance (east) from Sepphoris (Seffurieh). It is, perhaps, identical with the Kefr Kenna usually regarded as the site of Cana (q.v.) of the N.T.

## Ittig, Thomas[[@Headword:Ittig, Thomas]]

             a German Lutheran divine, was born at Leipzig Oct. 31, 1643. He studied at the universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Strasburg. After filling the pastorate, he became, in 1698, professor of philosophy in the university of his native city. In 1691 he was transferred to the chair of theology. He died April 7,1710. Ittig was a very able man, but he lacked all tolerance towards those who chose to differ from him, and in some of his writings he is quite severe against other religious bodies than Lutherans. He is especially celebrated as a collector of the writings of the apostolical fathers (see below). His principal works are, Animadversiones in censuram facultatis theologicae Parisiensis, etc. (Leipzig, 1685, 4to): — De Heresiarchis cevi apostolici et apostolico proximi (Leipz. 1690 and 1703, 4to): —  Prolegomena ad Flavii Josephi opera Graeco-Latina (Cologne, 1691, fol.) — Bibliotheca Patrum apostolicorum Graeco-Latina, etc. Leipz. 1699, 8vo) (above alluded to): — Operum Clementis Alexandrini Supplementum, etc. (Leipzig, 1700. 8vo): — Exercitationum Theologicarumz varii aogumenti, etc. Accedunt duce orationes inaugurales, etc. (Leipzig, 1702): — Exercitatio theologica de novisnsfinaticorugm quo Irundam nostrae cetatis puratoriis (Lpz. 1703, 4to): — De Syiodi Carentonensis a reformatis in Gallia ecclesiis anno 1631 cclebratae indulgentia erga Luther-anos, etc., Dissertatio theologica. Accedunt quatuor Progammata ‘(Lpz. 1705, 4to): — Historia Synodorunm nationalium a reformatis in Gallia habiftarune, etc. (Lpz. 1705): — De Bibliothecis et Catenis Patrum, etc. (Lpz. 1707, 8vo): — Historia ecclesiastice primi a. Christo nato sceculi selecta Capita de scriptoribus et scriptis ecclesiasticis, etc. (Lpz. 1709, 4to): — Schediasma de autoribus qui de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis egerunt (Lpz. 1711, 8vo): — Historia Concilii Nicceni (Leipz. 1712, 4to): — Opuscula varnia, edita cura Christiani Ludovici (Leipz. 1714, 8vo). See Kern, )e Vita, Obitu; Scriptisque Th. Ittigii epistolica Dissertatio (Lpz. 1710); Acta eruditorum Lipsensiea, p. 221; Niceron, memoirs, 29, 241-252; Sax, Onomast. Literar. v, 392; Appendix, 6, 585; Ersch. u. Gruber, Allg. Encyk.; J. Fabricius, Hist. Bibliotheca, 5, 140, 141, 302, 303, 310; 6:456; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Géneralé, 26:106; Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengeschichte, 2, 515.

## Ittur Sopherim[[@Headword:Ittur Sopherim]]

             (עַטּוּר סוֹפְרַים, ablatio scribarum) denotes the removal of a superfluous which had crept into the text. The Masorites have noticed five instances of such a superfluous 1, which has erroneously been prefixed to אחרin Gen 18:5; Gen 24:55; Num 31:2; Psa 68:26, and to the word משפטי in Psa 36:7. See Nedarim, fol. 37, Colossians 2; Ochlah ve Ochlah, sect. 217, page 128; Lenz, Dissertatio de Notis Masorethicis, Piska, Tikkun Sopherim et Ittur Sopherim (Wittenberg, 1702); Werchau, De Ablatione Scribarum (Leipsic, 1715; reprinted in Hasoeus and Ikenius's Thesaurus, 1:19-26); Tragard, De Ablationibus et Ordinationibus Scribarum in Masora Notatio (Greifswalde, 1763); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), pages 251-254; Strack, Prolegomena Critica (Leipsic, 1873), page 86. (B.P.)

## Itureea[[@Headword:Itureea]]

             (Ι᾿τουραία), a small district in the N.E. of Palestine, forming the tetrarchy of Philip, in connection with the adjacent territory of Trachonitis (Luk 3:1). The name is supposed to have originated withיְטוּר; Itur, or JETUR, one of Ishmael's sons (1Ch 1:31). In 1Ch 5:19, this name is given as that of a tribe or nation with which Reuben (beyond the Jordan) warred; and, from its being joined with the names of other of Ishmael's sons, it is evident that a tribe descended from his son Jetur is intimated. In the latter text the Sept. takes this view, and for “with the Hagarites, with Jetur, and Nephish, and Nodab,” reads “with the Hagarites, and Iturseans, and Nephisaeans, and Nadabseans.”

The old name seems to be still preserved in that of Jedur, which the same region, or a part of it, now bears. (This,' however, has lately been disputed by Wetzstein [Reisebericht, p. 88 sq.] on the precarious ground of the present dependent  situation of the district.) We may thus take the district to have been occupied by Ishmael's son, whose descendants were dispossessed or subdued by the Amorites, under whom it is supposed to have formed part of the kingdom of Bashan, and subsequently to have belonged to that half tribe of Manasseh which had its possessions east of the Jordan. From 1Ch 5:19, it appears that the sons of Jetur, whether under tribute to the Amorites (as some suppose), and forming part of the kingdom of Bashan or not, were in actual occupation of the country, and were dispossessed by the tribes beyond the Jordan, who now conquered and colonized the little province of Jetur, which lay between Bashan and Mount Hermon (“in Libano monte” according to Muratori, Thes. Inscript. 2, 670).

During the Exile this and other border countries were taken possession of by various tribes, whom, although they are called after the original names, as occupants of the countries which had received those names, we are not bound to regard as purely descendants of the original possessors. These new Ituraeans were eventually subdued by king Aristobulus (B.C. 108), who reconquered the province, then called by its Greek name Itursea, and gave the inhabitants their choice of Judaism or banishment (Joseph. Ant. 13, 11, 3). While some submitted, many retired to their own rocky fastnesses, and to the defiles of Hermon adjoining. Nevertheless, the Itureans were still recognizable as a distinct people in the time of Pliny (Hist. Nat. 5, 23). They extended their incursions as far as Phoenicia, but submitted to the Romans under Pompey (Appian, Mithril. 106), and appear to have been allowed to retain their native princes as vassals. Ituroea was first formally annexed to the province of Syria by Claudius (Tacitus, An. 12, 23, 1; Dio Cassius, 59, 12), having been previously included in Pernea as part of the dominions of Herod. (See F. Minter, De rebus Iturceorum [Hav. 1824]). As already intimated, Herod the Great, in dividing his dominions among his sons, bequeathed Ituraea to Philip as part of a tetrarchy composed, according to Luke, of Trachonitis and Ituraea; and as Josephus (Ant. 15, 10, 1; comp. 17:8, 1) mentions his territory as composed of Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanaea, some have thought (Reland, p. 106; Lightfoot, Ior. Heb.) that the evangelist regarded Auranitis and Paneas as comprehended under Iturea, a name loosely applied by ancient writers (see Pliny, 5, 19; Epiphan. laeres. 19; comp. Paulus, Comment. 1, 311; Wetstein, 1, 671). But it properly denoted a well-defined region distinct from Auranitis.

Pliny rightly places it north of Bashan and near Damascus (5. 23), and J. de Vitry describes it as adjoining Tracholitis and lying along the base of Libanus, between Tiberias and  Damascus (Gesta Dei, p. 1074; comp. p. 771, 1003). The districts mentioned by Luke and Josephus were distinct, but neither of these historians give a full list of all the little provinces in the tetrarchy of Philip. Each probably gave the names of such as were of most importance in connection with the events he was about to relate. Both Batanea and Auranitis appear to have been included in the region of Trachonitis” (Τραχωνίτιδος χώρα); and as Josephus mentions a part of the “house of Zenodorus” which was given to Philip, it unquestionably embraced Ituraea (Ant. 15:10, 3). According to Strabo (16, 755 sq.), the country known to classical writers was hilly (comp. Jac. de Vitriaco, p. 1074), with many ravines and hollows; the inhabitants were regarded as the worst of barbarians (Cicero, Philip. 2, 14), who, being deprived of the resources of agriculture (Apul. Florid. 1, 6), lived by robbery (Strabo, 16. 756), being skilful archers (Virgil, Georg. 2, 448; Lucan. 7:230, 514). The present Jedu probably comprehends the whole or greater part of the proper Ituraea. This is described by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 286) as “lying south of Jebelkessoue, east of Jebel esSheik (Mount Hermon), and west of the Haj road.” It is bounded on the east by Trachonitis, on' the south by Gaulanitis, on the west by Hermon, and on the north by the plain of Damascus. It is table- land, with an undulating surface, and has little conical and cup-shaped hills at intervals. The southern section of it has a rich soil, well watered by numerous springs, and streams from Hermon. The greater part of the northern section is entirely different. The surface of the ground is covered with jagged rocks, in some places heaped up in huge piles, in others sunk into deep pits; at one place smooth and naked, at another seamed with yawning chasms, in whose rugged edges rank grass and weeds spring up. The rock is all basalt, and the formation similar to that of the Lejah. See ARGOB. The molten lava seems to have issued from the earth through innumerable pores, to have spread over the plain, and then to have been rent and shattered while cooling (Porter, Handbook, p. 465). Jedur contains thirty-eight towns and villages, ten of which are now entirely desolate, and all the rest contain only a few families of poor peasants, living in wretched hovels amid heaps of ruins (Porter, Damasscus, 2, 272 sq.). See Robinson, Bib. Res. Appendix, p. 149; Jour. Sac. Lit. July, 1854, p.311.

## Itzchaki[[@Headword:Itzchaki]]

             also called Ben-Jasus, and by the long Arabic name of Abu brahim Isaac Ibn-Kastar (or Saktar) bene-Jasus, a Jewish philosopher of great celebrity,  and commentator, was born A.D. 982 at Toledo. Like many other Jewish savans, he followed the medical profession, and so distinguished himself that he was appointed physician to the princes of Denia and Mug'ahid, and to Ali Ikbal Addaula. He died in 1057. Itzchaki wrote (1) a Hebrew grammar, called ספר הצרופים, The Book of Syntax; and (2) on Biblical criticism, called ספר יצחקי, The Work of ltzchaki. Neither of these works is now known to us, but from Aben-Ezra, who quotes them, we learn that Itzchaki was one of the earliest assailants of the Mosaic authorship of some portions of the Pentateuch. Thus he is said to have maintained that the portion in the Pentateuch which describes the kings of Idumaea (Gen 36:30, etc.) was written many centuries after Moses (comp. Aben-Ezra, Commentaries on Gen 36:30-31; Num 24:17; flos. 1, 1). See Gratz, Geschichte der nuden, 6:53; Zeitschrift der deutsch. morenl. Gesellsch. 1854, p. 551; 1855, p. 838.

## Itzchaki, Solomon[[@Headword:Itzchaki, Solomon]]

             SEE RASHI.

## Ivah[[@Headword:Ivah]]

             (Heb. Ivvah', עַוָּה, for עִיָּה, avvah', an overturning or ruin, as in Eze 21:32; Sept. Α᾿ουά, but in Isa 37:13, unites with the preced word into Α᾿ναεγγουγανά), a city of the Assyrians Whence they brought colonists to re-people Samaria (2Ki 18:34; 2Ki 19:13; Isa 37:13, where it is mentioned in connection with Hena and Sepharvaim; also in the cognate form “Ava,” 2Ki 17:24, where it stands in connection with Babylon and Cuthah). Sir H. Rawlinson thinks that the site must be sought in Babylonia, and that it is probably identical with the modern Hit, which is the Hit of Herodotus (1, 179), a place famous for bituminous springs (see Rich, First Memoir on Babylon, p. 64, and Chesney, Euphrates Expedition, 1, 55). This town lay on the Euphrates, between Sippara (Sepharvaim) and Anah (Hena), with which it seems to have been politically united shortly before the time of Sennacherib (2Ki 19:13). He also regards it as probably the Ahava (אְִִהוָא) of Ezra (8:15). He believes the name to have been originally derived from that of a Babylonian god, Ιυα, who represents the sky or Ether, and to whom the town is supposed to have been dedicated (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 606, note). In the Talmud the name appears as Ihih (יהיא), whence might  possibly be formed the Greek Ιχ, and the modern Hit (where the t is merely the feminine ending), if we might suppose any connection between the Greek and the Talmud. Isidore of Charax seems to intend the same place by his Α᾿εί-πολις (Mans. Parth. p. 5). Some have thought that it occurs as Ist in the Egyptian inscriptions of the time of Thothmes III, about B.C. 1450 (Birch, in Otia Eggyptiaca, p. 80). But these conjectures are destitute of any great probability, as the form of the Heb. name does not well correspond. See AVA.

## Ives, Dwight, D.D[[@Headword:Ives, Dwight, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in West Springfield, Massachusetts, September 20, 1805. He graduated at Brown University in 1835, and was ordained pastor of the First Baptist Church in Springfield, Mass., soon after. He removed to Alton, Illinois, in 1836, to take charge of the Baptist church in that place, where he had a very successful ministry. The climate proving unfavorable to his health, he returned to New England, and became pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Suffield, Connecticut, in 1839, and continued in office until 1874. His pastorate here was one of great ability, and singularly blessed. He took a deep interest in the establishment of the Connecticut Literary Institution, a seminary of a high order, under the patronage of the Baptists of Connecticut. He resigned his pastorate in April 1874, and removed to Conway, Massachusetts, where he performed ministerial duties as his health would permit, until his death, December 22, 1875. (J.C.S.)

## Ives, Levi Sillman, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Ives, Levi Sillman, D.D., LL.D]]

             a theologian of some note, more especially on account of his defection from the Protestant Episcopal Church to Romanism, was born in Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797. His parents removed to New York State while he was quite young, and he was prepared for college at Lewisville Academy. At the outbreak of the war in 1812, he served his country for one year, and in 1816 finally entered upon his collegiate course at Hamilton College, pursuing, at the same time, studies preparatory for the work of the ministry. He had been reared in the Presbyterian Church, but in 1819, when impaired health obliged him to quit the college, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and continued his theological education at N. Y. City under bishop Hobart, at whose hands he received deacon's orders in 1822, and whose son-in-law he became in 1825. His first parish was Batavia, N. Y.; but he remained there only a few months, as he received a call in 1823 from Trinity Church, Philadelphia, which he at once accepted, bishop White ordaining him to the priesthood.

In 1827 he was called to Christ Church, Lancaster, Pa., and the year following became assistant rector of Christ Church, N.Y. City. This connection he severed six months later, to assume the rectorship of St. Luke's Church, N. Y. In 1831 he was honored with the bishopric of North Carolina, where he became very popular, and for a time wielded great influence; but in 1848 he began to advocate doctrines inadmissible by any Protestant believer of the Christian doctrines, and distrust and alienation on the part of his diocese led him to renounce publicly his mistaken course. But so inclined had he become to the Roman Catholic view of the apostolical succession, and the need of an “infallible” interpreter of the Scriptures, that he soon avowed his former opinions, and in 1852, while in Europe, publicly submitted to the authority of Rome. Of course, this caused his deposition from the bishopric of N. Carolina. In defense of his course, he published The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism (Boston, 1854, 8vo), in which he sets forth the Roman  Catholic view of the divine right of episcopacy.

Finding that the Protestant Epis. Church does not possess a regular apostolical succession (p. 146- 157), he felt obliged to accept the Church of Rome as the true Church. This course was very naturally pursued by bishop Ives, who, while yet in the Episcopal Church, had always inclined to High-Churchism. “Sitting upon the pinnacle of High-Churchism, the head easily turns, or becomes so dizzy as to fall down into the abyss of Popery.” Ives fell, like Doane, and Wheaton, and Iarkoe, by carrying out the High-Church principles to their legitimate results. After his change he was employed as professor of rhetoric in St. Joseph's Theological Seminary, and as lecturer on rhetoric and English literature in the convents of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Charity. Ex-bishop Ives evidently was a man of good parts and noble intentions, for during the last years of his life we find him incessantly at work in the establishment of an institution at Manhattanville for the protection of destitute children: here nearly 2000 children are now provided for. He died Oct. 13,1867. Ives published also a volume of sermons On the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship, and another On Obedience of Faith (1849, 18mo). See New Englander, Aug. 1855, art. 4; Princeton Review, 17, 491 (on his sermons); Appleton, American Cyclop. annual of 1867, 411 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 945. (J. H.W.)

## Ivimey, Joseph[[@Headword:Ivimey, Joseph]]

             the historian of the English Baptists, was born in 1773, pursued his studies at the Bristol Academy, and for twenty-nine years was pastor of a Baptist church in London. His principal publications are,

(1) an edition of The Pilgrim's Progress, with Notes: —

(2) The Life of John-Bunyan: —

(3) Treatise on Baptism and Communion: —

(4) The Life, Times, and Opinions of John Milton: —

(5) History of the English Baptists (4 vols. 8vo).

The last, his most important work, is highly commended by Robert Hall for the value of its historical substance and for the quality of the author's style. His Life of Bunyan continued to be the chief authority on the subject, until the growing public appreciation of the “ingenious dreamer” enlisted in the illustration of his life the classic pen of Southey and the minute diligence of Mr. Offor. Mr. Ivimey's death occurred in 1834. See G. Pritchard, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Joseph Ivimey (London, 1835, 8vo).

## Ivo, bishop of Chartres[[@Headword:Ivo, bishop of Chartres]]

             (Carnotensis). Little is known of the life of this prelate beyond what we can learn from his works. The exact date of his birth is not ascertained (it is supposed to have been about 1040), neither is his descent: some say that he was of low extraction (“ex genere minime nobili,” Gallia Christiana, 8, 1126), while others give him a noble parentage (“in agro Bellovacensi natus nobili a sanguine nobilem animtmu traxit,” Vita D. Ivonis, Paris ed. 1647). He studied philosophy and rhetoric at Paris, then theology under Lanfranc in the convent of Bec; and in 1078 became superior of the convent of St. Quentin, in which office he acquired great reputation as a theologian and canonist. In 1090, upon the deposition of the bishop of Chartres for simony, Ivo was appointed in his place, yet his predecessor had still such strong local, interest that Ivo had to be nominated directly by the pope (Urban II), and was only installed in 1092, at Capua.. He is one of the prelates who contributed most to the extension of papal authority, yet he did not hesitate to speak plainly against the abuse of the system of curacy; in the Paris edition of his life he is even praised as one of the defenders of the Gallican liberties.

In the difficulty about the question of investiture (q.v.), raised by Hildebrand and his followers, the course of Ivo. was marked by great moderation, arising, not from weakness, but from a desire of conciliating and meting justice to all parties. He also endeavored to check the persecuting spirit of the hierarchy when it began to accuse pope Paschal II of heresy for having yielded to emperor Henry V. His private character, as well as his learning, gave him great influence. When Philip I repudiated his legitimate wife to marry another, he alone had the courage to oppose him, and neither promises nor threats could induce him to sanction the misdeed; and by his noble and straightforward course he excited the admiration of the people and nobility, who ail took his part. He died in 1115 (according to Richter and Mejer, in 1125), and was canonized in 1570 for May 20. As a writer, he is known as the author of a Pannormia and a decretum SEE CANONS AND DECRETALS, COLLECTIONS OF; also of 287 Letters (Paris, 1584-85,1610), which shed much light on the history of his time, and show in how high an estimation his opinions were held; 24 ecclesiastical discourses on synods, festivals, etc.; and, finally, a short chronicle of the French kings. The most complete collection of his. works has been published at Paris in 1647, fol., but it does not contain the Pannormia. In Migne's edition of the fathers Ivo's works were reprinted in 1855 (Paris). See Hist. Litt. de France, 10, 102; 5, 150; Herzog, Real-  Encyklopadie, 7,.189 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. 2, 180 sq. Ceillier, Hist. des Aut. Sac.21, 423 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. 17, 13 sq.; 26,.12 sq.

## Ivory[[@Headword:Ivory]]

             (שֶׁנְהִבַּים, shenhabbim', elephant's tooth; see A. Benary, in the Besrliner Lit. Jahrb Ucher, 1831, No. 96; 1Ki 10:22; 2Ch 9:21; and so explained by the Targum, שֵׁן דְּפַיל, and Sept. ὀδόντες ἐλεφάντινοις) also simply שֵׁן, a tooth, Psa 45:8; Eze 27:15; Amo 6:4; N.T. ἐλεφάντινος, of ivory, Rev 18:12). It is remarkable that no word in Biblical Hebrew denotes an elephant, unless the latter portion of the compound shem-habbim be supposed to have this meaning. Gesenius derives it from the Sanscrit ibhas, “an elephant;” Keil (on 1Ki 10:22) from the Coptic eboy; while Sir Henry Rawlinson mentions a word habba, which he met with in the Assyrian inscriptions, and which he understands to mean “the large animal,” the term being applied both to the elephant and the camel (Journ. (of As. Soc. 12:463). It is suggested in Gesenius's Thesaurus (s.v.) that the original reading may have been שֵׁן הָבְנַים, “ivory, ebony” (compare Eze 27:15). By some of the ancient nations these tusks were imagined to be horns (Eze 27:15; Pliny, 8:4; 18:1), though Diodorus Siculus (1, 55) correctly calls them teeth. As they were first acquainted with elephants through their ivory which was an important article of commerce, the shape of the tusks, in all probability, led them into this error. They are genuine teeth, combining in themselves, and occupying, in the upper jaw, the whole mass of secretions which hi other animals form the upper incisor and laniary teeth. They are useful for defense and offence, and for holding down green branches, or rooting up water-plants; but still they are not absolutely necessary, since there is a variety of elephant in the Indian forests entirely destitute of tusks, and the females in most of the races are either without them, or have them very small; not turned downwards, as Bochart states, but rather straight, as correctly described by Pliny. Only two species of elephants are recognized — the African and the Indian easily distinguished from each other by the size of the ear, which in the former is much larger than in the latter. The tusks of the African elephant attain sometimes a length of 8 or even 10 feet, and a weight of 100 to 120 pounds; but those of the Indian elephant are much shorter and lighter, while in the females they often scarcely project beyond the lips. “Elephant's tooth,” or simply “elephant,” is a common name for ivory, not only in the  Oriental languages and in Greek, but also in the Western tongues, although in all of them teeth of other species may be included. There can be no doubt, for example, that the harder and more accessible ivory obtained from the hippopotamus wars known in Egypt at least as early as that obtained from the elephant. This kind of ivory does not split, and therefore was anciently most useful for military instruments. SEE ELEPHANT.

The Egyptians at a very early period made use of this material in decoration. The cover of a small ivory box in the Egyptian collection at the Louvre is “inscribed with the praenomen Nefer-ka-re, or Neper-cheres, adopted by a dynasty found in the upper line of the tablet of Abydos, and attributed by M. Bunsen to the fifth…. In the time of Thothmes III ivory was imported in considerable quantities into Egypt, either ‘in boats laden with ivory and ebony' from Ethiopia, or else in tusks and cups from the Ruten-nu…. The celebrated car at Florence has its linchpins tipped with ivory” (Birch, in Trans. of Roy. Soc. of Lit. 3, 2nd series). The specimens of Egyptian ivory work, which are found in the principal museums of Europe, are, most of them, in the opinion of Mr. Birch, of a date anterior to the Persian invasion, and some even as old as the 18th dynasty. The practice of inlaying or covering the walls with ivory and other valuable substances was in very extensive use among the Egyptians, who used it likewise for ornamenting articles of furniture, as may be seen in the British Museum. Amongst the articles of household furniture there is a seat with four turned legs inlaid with ivory, brought from Thebes; also a high-backed chair on lion-footed legs; the back solid, inlaid with panels of darker wood, with lotus towers of ivory. The ivory used by the Egyptians was principally brought from Ethiopia (Herod. 3:114), though their elephants were originally from Asia. The Ethiopians, according to Diodorus Siculus (i, 55), brought to Sesostris “ebony and gold, and the teeth of elephants.” Among the tribute paid by them to the Persian kings were “twenty large tusks of ivory” (Herod. 3:97).

The processions of human figures bearing presents, etc., still extant on the walls of palaces and tombs, attest, by the black, crisp-haired bearers of huge teeth, that some of these came from Ethiopia or Central Africa; and by white men similarly laden, who also bring an Asiatic elephant and a white bear, that others came from the East. In the Periplus of the Red Sea (c. 4), attributed to Arrian, Coloe (Calai) is said to be “the chief mart for ivory.” It was thence carried down to Adouli (Zulla, or Thulla), a port on the Red Sea, about three days' journey from  Coloe, together with the hides of hippopotami, tortoise-shell, apes, and slaves (Pliny, 6:34). The elephants and rhinoceroses from which it was obtained were killed further up the country, and few were taken near the sea, or in the neighborhood of Adouli. At Ptolemais Theron was found a little ivory like that of Adouli (Periplus, c. 3). Ptolemy Philadelphus made this port the depot of the elephant trade (Pliny, 6:34). According to Pliny (8, 10), ivory was so plentiful on the borders of Ethiopia that the natives made doorposts of it, and even fences and stalls for their cattle. The author of the Periplus (c. 16) mentions Rhapta as another station of the ivory trade, but the ivory brought down to this port is said to have been of an inferior quality, and “for the most part found in the woods, damaged by rain, or collected from animals drowned by the overflow of the rivers at the equinoxes” (Smith, Dict. of Class. Geography, s.v. Rhapta). The Egyptian merchants traded for ivory and onyx stones to Barygraza the port to which was carried down the commerce of Western India from Ozene (Periplzas, c. 49).

The Assyrians appear to have carried on a great traffic in ivory. Their early conquests in India had made them familiar with it, and (according to one rendering of the passage) their artists supplied the luxurious Tyrians with carvings in ivory from the isles of Chittim (Eze 27:6). On the obelisk in the British Museum the captives or tribute-bearers are represented as carrying tusks. Among the merchandise of Babylon enumerated in Rev 18:12 are included “all manner vessels of ivory.” Mr. Layard discovered several ornaments made from ivory in the Assyrian mounds (Nineveh, 2, 15), but they are of uncertain date, and exhibit marks of Egyptian workmanship (ib. p. 163, 168). Many specimens of Assyrian carving in ivory have been found in the excavations at Nimrod, and among the rest some tablets “richly inlaid with blue and opaque glass, lapislazuli, etc.” (Bonomi, Nineveh and its Palaces, p. 334; comp. Son 5:14). Part of an ivory staff, apparently a scepter, and several entire elephants' tusks, were discovered by Mr. Layard in the last stage of decay, and it was with extreme difficulty that these interesting relics could be restored (Nini. and Bab. p. 195).

In the early ages of Greece ivory was frequently employed for purposes of ornament. The trappings of horses were studded with it (Homer, II. 5, 584): it was used for the handles of keys (Odyssey, 21, 7) and for the  bosses of shields (Hes. Sc. Herc. 141, 142). The “ivory house” of Ahab (1Ki 22:39) was probably a palace; the walls of which were paneled with ivory, like the palace of Menelaus described by Homer (Odys. 4, 73; compare Eurip. Aph. Aul. 583, ἐλεφαντοδέτοι δόμοι. Comp. also Amo 3:15, and Psa 45:8, unless the “ivory palaces” in the latter passage were perfume-boxes made of that material, as been conjectured). It is difficult to determine whether the “tower of ivory” of Son 7:4 is merely a figure of speech, or whether it had its original among the things that were. Beds inlaid or veneered with ivory were in use among the Hebrews (Amos 6, 4; compare Homer, Od. 23, 200), as also among the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. 3, 169). The practice of inlaying and veneering wood with ivory and tortoise-shell is described by Pliny (16, 84).

By the luxurious Phoenicians ivory was employed to ornament the boxwood rowing-benches (or “‘hatches” according to some) of their galleys (Eze 27:6). The skilled workmen of Hiram, king of Tyre, fashioned the great ivory throne of Solomon, and overlaid it with pure gold (1Ki 10:18; 2Ch 9:17). The ivory thus employed was supplied by the caravans of Dedan (Isa 21:13; Eze 27:15), or was brought from the East Indies, with apes and peacocks, by the navy of Tarshish (1Ki 10:22). As an instance of the superabundant possession and barbarian use of elephants' teeth may be mentioned the octagonal ivory hunting tower built by Akbar, about twenty-four miles west of Agra: it is still standing, and bristles with 128 enormous tusks disposed in ascending lines, sixteen on each face. Mr. Roberts, remarking on the words of Amos (6, 4), they “that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon couches,” refers the last word, in conformity with the Tamuld version, to swinging cots, often mentioned in the early tales of India, and still plentifully used by the wealthy. But it does not appear that they were known in Western Asia, or that figures of them occur on Egyptian bas-reliefs. It is more likely that palkies (those luxurious traveling litters) are meant, which were borne on men's shoulders, while the person within was stretched at ease. They were in common use even among the Romans, for Cicero fell into his assassin's hands while he was attempting to escape in one of them towards Naples. Among the Romnans, inlaying with ivory seems to have become, at length, rather a common method of ornamenting the interiors (of the mansions of the wealthy; for Horace mentions it as an evidence of his humble way of life that “no walls inlaid with ivory adorned his house.”

## Ivy[[@Headword:Ivy]]

             (κισσός) is mentioned but once in the Scriptures, and that in the Apocrypha, namely, in 2Ma 6:7, where it is said that the Jews were compelled, when the feast of Bacchus was kept, to go in procession carrying ivy to this deity, to whom it is well known this plant was sacred. Ivy, however, though not mentioned by name, has a peculiar interest to the Christian, as forming the “corruptible crowin” (1Co 9:25) for which the competitors at the great Isthmian games contended, and which St. Paul so beautifully contrasts with the “incorruptible crown” that shall hereafter encircle the brows of those who run worthily the race of this mortal life. In the Isthmian contests the victor's garland was either icy or pine. SEE CROWN.

The term κισσός or κιττός seems to have been applied by the Greeks in a general sense, and to have included many plants, and among them some climbers, as the convolvulus, besides the common ivy (Hedera helix), which was especially dedicated to Bacchus, and which was distinguished by the name of “Hedera poetica, Dionysia ant Bacchica, quod ex ea poettaruim coronae consuerentur.” It is well known that in the Dionysia, or festivals in honor of Dionysus, and in the processions called θίασοι, with which they were celebrated, women also took part, in the disguise of Bacchee, Naiades, Nymphoe, etc., adorned with garlands of ivy, etc. (Ovid, Fasti, 3, 766). Bacchus is generally thought to have been educated in India, and the Indian Bcyghls has been supposed to be the original of the name. The fact of Baghes being a compound of two words signifying tiger and master or lord, would appear to confirm the identity, since ‘Bacchus is usually represented as drawn in his chariot by a tiger and a lion, and tigers, etc., are described as following him in his Indian journey. As the ivy, however, is not a plant of India, it might be objected to its being characteristic of an Indian god. But in the mountains which bound India to the north both the ivy and the vine may be found, and the Greeks were acquainted with the fact that Mount Mero is the only part of India where ivy was produced. Indeed, Alexander and his companions are said to have crowned themselves with ivy in honor of Bacchus. The ivy, Hedera helix, being a native of most parts of Europe, is too well known to require special notice. SEE BACCHUS.

## Ixcuina[[@Headword:Ixcuina]]

             was the goddess of love and all joys, the Venus of the Mexicans.

## Ixion[[@Headword:Ixion]]

             in Greek mythology, was the son of Antion and Perimela, king in Thessaly. He married Dia. the daughter of Deioneus, but refused to pay the promised wedding presents to her father, wherefore the latter took possession of a number of horses of Ixion as a substitute. Ixion promised to give Deioneus what he wanted, and caused him to fall into a cave of red-hot coals, under the pretence it was a cave of gold. It was so great a crime that no man would purify him. Jupiter did this himself, and was so pleased with Ixion that he fed him at the table of the gods. A new crime sprang up in the heart of the murderer. He longed for the love of Juno. Juno forgave him, and formed Nephele (a cloud), by whom Ixion became father of the Centaurs. Finally, Jupiter's patience becoming exhausted, he threw him into Tartarus, where he remains, tortured by the Furies, along with Sisyphus and Tantalus. His penalty is to turn a wheel which perpetually recoils.

## Ixora[[@Headword:Ixora]]

             a divinity of the East Indians, or the worshippers of Brahm. They hold him to be of infinite endurance, and illustrate this belief by saying that Brahm himself, desirous of seeing Ixora's head, ascended to heaven on wings, but failed to gain admittance, the power of Ixora preventing it. A very similar desire Vishnu cherished, but all his attempts also to this end Ixora frustrated. He is said to have two wives, one of whom constantly resides with him, and conceals herself in his hair; the other, strangely enough, they say, dies annually, and is by Ixora restored to life again. The Brahmins represent this idol standing on a pedestal, with no less than sixteen arms, each of them grasping something of value, or representing the natural elements, or weapons indicating his power. His head is adorned with long and beautiful hair; his face is white and shining; he has three eyes, and a crescent or half moon upon his forehead. — Broughton, Bibliotheca Hist. Sac. i, 561. SEE BRAHMINISM.

## Ixtitlon[[@Headword:Ixtitlon]]

             is the AEsculapius of the Mexicans, the protecting god of the medical art.

## Iyar[[@Headword:Iyar]]

             (אַייָר; Ι᾿άρ, Josephus, Ant. 8, 3, 1; the Macedonian Α᾿ρτεμίσιος) is the late name of that month which was the second of the sacred, and the seventh of the civil year of the Jews, and which began with the new moon of May. The few memorable days in it are the 10th, as a fast for the death of Eli; the 14th, as the second or lesser Passover for those whom uncleanness or absence prevented from celebrating the feast in Nisan (Num 9:11); the 23rd, as a feast instituted by Simon the Maccabee in memory of his taking the citadel Acra, in Jerusalem (1Ma 13:51-52); the 28th, as a fast fox the death of Samuel. SEE CALENDAR.

Gesenius derives Iyar from the Hebrew root אור, to shine; but Benfey and Stern, following out their theory of the source from which the Jews obtained such names, deduce it from the assumed Zend representative of the Persian bahar,; spring” (Monatsnamen, p. 134). The name Iyar does not occur in the O.T., this month being always described as the second month, except in two places in which it is called Zif (1Ki 6:1; 1Ki 6:37). SEE ZIF.

## Iyim[[@Headword:Iyim]]

             SEE ISLAND; SEE WILD BEAST.

## Izdubar[[@Headword:Izdubar]]

             (or Gizdubar, Mass of Fire) is, according to the newly discovered Izdubar Tablets, are early mythical Assyrian hero, who was probably a form of the solar deity. He was a great chieftain, and delivered the city of Erech when it was assailed by the giants. He had for, his wife the goddess Ishtar, who proved unfaithful to him, and sent some monstrous bulls to destroy him. These animals he was enabled to slay by the assistance of his faithful friend and adviser, the deified sage Heabani, who was ultimately killed by an unknown insect or reptile, called a Tambukki. Izdubar afterwards, becoming afflicted with a cutaneous disorder, went by the advice of his boatman, Urhamsi, to seek the sage Adrahasis, who, having survived the Deluge, was supposed to be able to cure him of his malady. Adrahasis complied with his request, and related to him in considerable detail the legend of the flood. Upon returning to Erech, Izdubar set up a monument in memory alike of his cure and of the story related by his benefactor, and  then, by the aid of enchantment, had the soul of Heabani raised up to commune with him. Izdubar seems after these events to have become a king, but his history is so mixed up with a mythological series of legends that his real character is uncertain, as also are, of course, his parentage and birth.

## Ized[[@Headword:Ized]]

             in Persian mythology, is a name of the twenty-eight good genii of the second rank, who recognize Ormuzd and his seven assistants, the Amshaspands, as their ruler. The Izeds are male and female beings of greatest purity and mildness, created by Ormuzd, the representative of the highest, invisible god, and superintend the year, the month, the day, the hours guide men on life's journey, command the animal and vegetable world, and rule the natural laws and elements, and are in continuous combat with Ahriman and his evil spirits.

## Izehar[[@Headword:Izehar]]

             (Num 3:19). SEE IZHAR.

## Izeharite[[@Headword:Izeharite]]

             (Num 3:27). SEE IZHAR.

## Izhar[[@Headword:Izhar]]

             (Heb. Yitshar', יַצְהָר, oil, as often; Sept. Ι᾿σσαάρ, Ι᾿σαάρ), the second son of Kohath (son of Levi), and father of three sons (Exo 6:18; Exo 6:21; Num 16:1; 1Ch 6:2; 1Ch 6:18; 1Ch 6:38; 1Ch 23:12; 1Ch 23:18). In Num 3:19, his name is Anglicized “Izehar.” His descendants are called IZHARITES (Heb. Yitshari', יַצְהָרַי; Sept. Ι᾿σσααρί, Ι᾿σσαρί, Ι᾿σσαάρ [Num 3:27; 1Ch 24:22; 1Ch 26:23; 1Ch 26:29, in the first of which passages it is Anglicized “Izeharites”]). B.C. post 1856. SEE ZOHAR.

“In 1Ch 6:22, Alminiadab is substituted for Izhar, as the son of Kohath and father of Korah, in the line of Samuel. This, however, must be an accidental. error of the scribe, as in 1Ch 6:38, where the same genealogy is repeated, Izhar appears again in his right place. The Codex Alex. in 1Ch 6:22 reads Izhar in place of Amminadab, and the Aldine and Complut. read Amminadab between Izhar and Kore, making another generation. But these are probably only corrections of the text. (See Burrington, Geneal. Of the O.T.)” (Smith).

## Izquierdo, Sebastiano[[@Headword:Izquierdo, Sebastiano]]

             a Jesuit, was born at Alcaraz, Spain, in 1601. He was rector of the colleges at Murcia and Alcala, and died about 1680. He wrote, Opus Theologicum et Philosophicum: — Praxis Exercitionum Spiritualiunt. See Alegambe, Bibliotheca Scriptorum Societatis Jesu; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexicon, s.v.; Antonii Bibliotheca Hispanica. (B.P.)

## Izrahiah[[@Headword:Izrahiah]]

             (Heb. Yizrachyah', יַזְרִחְיָה, sprout of Jehovah sc. into the world), the name of one or two men.

1. (Sept. Ι᾿εζριά; Vulg. Israhia.) The “son” of Uzzi, and grandson of Tola, the son of Issachar (1Ch 7:3). B.C. cir. 1014. SEE OBADIAH.

2. (Sept. omits, but some copies have Ι᾿εζρίας, others Ι᾿εσρίας; Vulg. Jezraja; A.V. “Jezrahiah.”) The superintendent of the singers (doubtless a Levite) who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh 12:42). B.C. 446.

## Izrahite[[@Headword:Izrahite]]

             (Heb. Yizrach', יַזְרָח, l only with the art. הִיַּזְרָח, the indigenous, prob. by error of transcription for יַזְרָחַי, a Yizrachite [but Furst makes it a man's name =Izrahiah], and this again for אֶזְרָחַי, Ezrachite; Sept. has Ι᾿εζραέλ v.r. Ι᾿εσραέ; Vulg. Jezerites), a patronymic epithet of Shamhuth, one of David's generals (1Ch 27:8), prob. so called as being descended from Zerah, Judah's son. SEE EZRAHITE.

## Izri[[@Headword:Izri]]

             (Heb. Yitsri', יַצְרַי, the Jezerite, otherwise a former; Sept. Ι᾿εσδρί; Vulg. Isari), the leader of the fourth division of Levitical singers under David (1Ch 25:11); prob. the same with ZERI, of the sons of Jeduthmu, mentioned in 1Ch 25:3. B.C. 1014.