# R

## Raa[[@Headword:Raa]]

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

## Raah[[@Headword:Raah]]

             SEE GLEDE.

## Raamah[[@Headword:Raamah]]

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

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

## Raamiah[[@Headword:Raamiah]]

             (Heb. Raamyah', רִעִמְיָה, thundesr of Jehovah; Sept. ῾Ρεελμά [v. r. Νααμία), one of the chief Israelites who returned from exile with Zerubbabel (Neh 7:7), B.C. 445. In the parallel list (Ezr 2:2) he is called REELAIAH, and the Greek equivalent of the name in the Sept. of Nehemiah appears to have arisen from a confusion of the two readings, unless, as Bulrrington (Geneal. ii, 68) suggests, ῾Ρεελμά is an error of the copyist for ῾Ρεελαία, the-uncial letters ai having been mistaken for m. In 1Es 5:2 the name appears as REESALAS.

## Raamses[[@Headword:Raamses]]

             (Exo 1:10). SEE RAMSES.

## Rab[[@Headword:Rab]]

             SEE RABBI; SEE RABBINISM.

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

             properly ABBA ARIKHA, a noted Jewish teacher, was born at Kaphri, a small place between Sura and Nehardea, in Babylon, about A.D. 170. In early life he went in quest of knowledge into Palestine, and became one of the most favorite scholars of Jehudah the Holy (q.v.). On his return to the East he labored, some say for thirty years (between A.D. 188 and 219!, at Nehardea as meturgeman, or amorats, under Shela and Samuel; and at the close of that relationship, he entered upon the higher sphere of school rector and judge at Sura (or Sora), where he exercised those offices till the end of his life. “In this college, which was called LeRab (ברב), being an abbreviation of Beth-Rab (ביתרב), the school of Rab, the disciples assembled two months in the year-viz. Adar and Elul — in autumn and spring, for which they were denominated Yarche Kullah ( כלה ירחי), the months of assembly; and into it all the people were admitted a whole week before each principal festival, when this distinguished luminary delivered expository lectures for the benefit of the nation at large. So eager were the people to hear him, and so great were the crowds, that many could find no house accommodation, and were obliged to take up their abode in the open air ou the banks of the Sora River (Succa, 26 a).

These festival discourses were denominated rigle (רגלי), and during the time in which they were delivered all courts of justice were closed (Baba Kamna, 113 a).” After holling the presidency for about twenty-eight years, Rab died in A.D. 247, lamented by the whole nation. The esteem in which he was held during his lifetime is best expressed in the title “Rab,” i.e. teacher, by which they called him,just as Jehudah the Holy was called “Rabbi” or “Rabbenu” in Palestine. One of Rab's main works was the systematic exposition of the Mishna (q.v.), a copy of which, as revised and somewhat amended by Rab himself, in his later years, he had brought from Palestine. This second recension of the Slishna became the authorized or canonical form of that work, and, under the Aramaic name of Matnita ce Be-Rab, “the Mishna of the School of Rab,” constituted the text of the Babylonian Talmud. But,  besides his labors as an oral expositor on the Mishna, Rab was the author of two important works which greatly contributed to the advancement of Biblical exegesis. These were, Siphra or Siohras de Be-Rab, “the Book of the School of Rab” (ספרא דבירב), a Midrash on Leviticus; and Siphre or Siphre de Be-Rab (ספרי דבירב), a similar commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy. These works have, indeed, been sometimes attributed to other authors, but the greatest weight of authority assigns them to the doctor of Sura. An analysis of these works is given in the article MIDRASH, where also some of the editions are mentioned. The best edition of the Sipihra is that of M. L. Malbim, with the commentary Hatora vehamitzva (Bucharest. 1860), and that of Weiss (Vielnna, 1862); the Siphre has been best edited by M. Friedmann (ibid. 1864). Rab also enriched the present Seder Tephiloth, or Order of Common Prayers, and some of the finest prayers and thanksgivings are the production of his pen. See Grhitz, Gesch. d. Juden, 4:214, 232, 279, 289, 293; Fiurst, Kultur- u. Literaturgeschichte der Juden in Asien, p. 33 sq.; id. Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 125 sq.; Etheridge, Introdulction to Hebrez Literature, p. 157 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, art. “Iab;” De Rossi, Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl. by Hamberger), p. 272 sq.; Joel, Etwas uber die Bucher Sifra und Sifre (Breslau, 1873); but above all, the excellent monograph by Milhlfelder, Rab: ein Lebensbild zur Geschichte des Talliuds (Leips. 1871). (B. P.)

## Rab-mag[[@Headword:Rab-mag]]

             (רִבאּמִג, Ratb-nm r, chief magician; Sept. ῾Ραβ-μάγ or ῾Ραβαμάχ ), a word found only in Jer 39:3; Jer 39:13, as a title borne bi, a certain Nergal-sharezer who is mentioned amongt the “princes” that accompanied Nebuchadnezzar to the last siege of Jerusalem. Nergal-sharezer is probably identical with the king, called by the Greeks Neriglissar, who ascended the throne of Babylon two years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar. SEE NEERGAL-SHAREZER.

This king, as well as certain other important personages, is found to bear the title in the Babylonian inscriptions. It is written, indeed, with a somewhat different vocalization, being read as Rabu-Emga by Sir H. Rawlinson. The signification is somewhat doubtful. Rabu is most certainly “great,” or “chief,” an exact equivalent of the Hebrew רִבwhence Rabbi, “a great one, a doctor;” but Mag or Emga, is an obscure term. It has been commonly identified with the word “Magus” (Gesenius, cad voc. מָג; Calmet, Comnmetaire Litteral, 6:203, etc.); but this identification is somewhat uncertain, since an entirely different word — one which is read as Magusu — is used in that sense throughout the Behistun inscription (Oppert, Expedition Scientifique en Mesoppotaimie, ii, 209). Sir H. Rawlinson inclines to translate emgat by “priest,” but does not connect it with the Magi, who in the time of Neriglissar had no footing in Babylon. He regards this rendering, however, as purely conljectural, and thinks we call only say at present that the office was one of great power and dignity at the Babylonlian court, and probably gave its possessor special facilities for obtaining the throne. SEE MAGI.

## Rab-saris[[@Headword:Rab-saris]]

             (Heb. רִבאּסָריס, Rab-Saris), a name applied to two foreigners, but probably rather the designation of an office than of an individual, the word signifying chief eunzuch; in Dan 1:3, Ashpenaz is entitled the master of the eunuchs (Rab-sarisim). Luther translates the word, in the three places where it occurs, as a name of office, the arch-chamberlain (der Erzkammerer, der oberste Kammerer). Josephus (Ant. 10:8, 2) takes them as the A. V. does, as proper names. The chief officers of the court were  present attending on the king; and the instance of the eunuch Narses would show that it was not impossible for the Rab-saris to possess some of the qualities fitting him for a military command. In 2Ki 25:19, a eunuch (סִריס, Saris, in the text of the A. V. “officer,” in the margin “eunuch”) is spoken of as set over the men of war; and in the sculptures at Nineveh “eunuchs are represented as comnmanding in war; fighting both on chariots and on horseback, and receiving the prisoners and the heads of the slain after battle “(Layardc Nineveh, ii, 325). But whether his office was really that which the title imports, or some other great court office, has been questioned. The chief of the eunuchs is an officer of high rank and dignity in the Oriental courts; and his cares are not confined to the harem, but many high public functions devolve upon him. In the Ottoman Porte the Kislar Aga, or chief of the black eunuuchs, is one of the principal personages in the empire, and in an official paper of great solemnity is styled by the sultan the most illustrious of the officers who approach his august person, and worthy of the confidence of monarchs and of sovereigns (D'Ohsson, Tab. Gen. iii, 308). It is, therefore, by no means improbable that such an office should be associated with a military commission; perhaps not for directly military duties, but to take chlarge of the treasure, and to select from the female captives such as might seem worthy of the royal harem. SEE EUNUCH.

1. (Sept. ῾Ραβσαρείς v. r. ῾Ραφίς) An officer of the king of Assyria sent up with Tartan and Rab-shakeh against Jerusalem in the time of Hezekiah (2Ki 18:17). B.C. 713.

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

## Rab-shakeh[[@Headword:Rab-shakeh]]

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

## Rab-shakeh (2)[[@Headword:Rab-shakeh (2)]]

             is the last named of three Assyrian generals sent against Jerusalem in the reign of Hezekiah. Sennacherib, having taken other cities of Judah, was now besieging Lachish; and Hezekiah, terrified at his progress, and losing, for a time, his firm faith in God, sends to Lachish with an offer of submission and tribute. This he strains himself to the utmost to pay, giving for the purpose not only all the treasures of the Temple and palace, but stripping off the gold plates with which he himself, in the beginning of his reign, had overlaid the doors and pillars of the house of the Lord (2Ki 18:16; 2Ch 29:3; see Rawlinson, Bampton Lectures, 4:141; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 145). But Sennacherib, not content with this — his cupidity being excited rather than appeased — sends a great host against Jerusalem under Tartan, Rab-saris, and Rab-  shakeh; not so much, apparently, with the object of at present engaging in the siege of the city as with the idea that, in its present disheartened state, the sight of an army, combined with the threats and specious promises of Rab-shakeh, might induce a surrender at once. In Isaiah 36, 37 Rabshakeh alone is mentioned, the reason of which would seem to be that he acted as ambassador and spokesman, and came so much more prominently before the people than the others. Keil thinks that Tartan had the supreme command, inasmuch as in 2 Kings he is mentioned first, and, according to Isa 20:1, conducted the siege of Ashdod. In 2 Chronicles 32 where, with the addition of some not unimportant circumstances, there is given an abstract of these events. it is simply said that (2Ch 32:9) “Sennacherib king of Assyria sent his servants to Jerusalem.” Rab-shakeh seems to have discharged his mission with much zeal, addressing himself, not only to the officers of Hezekiah, but to the people on the wall of the city, setting forth the hopelessness of trusting to any power, human or divine, to deliver them out of the hand of “the great king, the king of Assyria,” and dwelling on the many advantages to be gained by submission. Many have imagined, from the familiarity of Rab-shakeh with Hebrew, that he either was a Jewish deserter or an apostate captive of Israel. Whether this be so or not, it is not impossible that the assertion which he makes on the part of his master, that Sennacherib had even the sanction and command of the Lord Jehovah for his expedition against Jerusalem (“Am I now come up without the Lord to destroy it? The Lord said to me, Go up against this land to destroy it”), may have reference to the prophecies of Isaiah (8:7, 8; 10:5, 6) concerning the desolation of Judah and Israel by the Assyrians, of which, in some form, more or less correct, he had received information. Being unable to obtain any promise of submission from Hezekiah, who, in the extremity of his peril returning to trust in the help of the Lord, is encouraged by the words and predictions of Isaiah, Rabshakeh goes back to the king of Assyria, who had now departed from Lachish. SEE HEZEKIAH.

## Rabad[[@Headword:Rabad]]

             (ראבד), or ABRAHAM IBN-DAUD, for which the acrostic stands, a noted rabbi, was born at Toledo about 1110, and died as a martyr 1180. He was one of the most renowned Talmudists of his time, highly esteemed for his historical knowledge. He is the author of the סֵ הִקִּבָּלָה(The Successions of Tradition), written in the form of annals, giving the history of the world from Adam to his own time (1161), and showing the uninterrupted chain of tradition to his day, against the opinion of the Karaites, who denied all tradition. As a supplement to this chronicle, Ibn-Daud wrote a succinct history of the Roman empire, from its foundation by Romulus till the West Gothic king Reccared, entitled Memoirs of the Events of Rome (רומי גכרון דברי), and the History of the Jewish Kings during the Second Temple ( דברי מלכי ישראל בבית שני). These histories were first published, together with the Seder Olam, in Mantua (1513), then in Venice  (1545), and Basle (1580); the Sepher Ha-kabbalah by itself, with the Seder Olam Rabba and Sutta (Cracow, 1820), and with a Latin translation by Gilbert Genebrard (Paris, 1572). He also wrote a work in Arabic, Akida Rafina; in Hebrew, Emunah Ramah (ed. Well, Frankfort-on-theMain, 1857), on the elements of nature and their capability of leading to elements of religious faith; on these elements of faith, and on the medicine for the soul in its infirmities. He also wrote Astronomical Notices and Replies to Abn-Alpharag on the section of the law named the “Journeyings,” i.e. Numbers 33 etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. i, 7 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. der Juden, 6:176183, 212; Jost, Gesch. des Judenth. u. s. Sekten, ii. 425; Dessauer, Gesch. der Juden, p. 295; Braunschweiger, Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten, p. 70 sq.; Lindo, History of the Jews in Spain, p. 60; Finn, Sephardim, p. 193; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Literature, p. 251; Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, i, 420, 427; Guggenheimer, Die Religionsphilosophie des R. Abr. ben-David ha-Levi (Augsburg, 1860); Levita, Massoreth ha-Massoreth (ed. Ginsburg, Lond. 1867), p. 108. (B. P.)

## Rabanus Maurus[[@Headword:Rabanus Maurus]]

             SEE RHABANUS.

## Rabardeau, Michel[[@Headword:Rabardeau, Michel]]

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

## Rabat[[@Headword:Rabat]]

             is a linen neck-collar worn by ecclesiastics.

## Rabaudy, Bernard De[[@Headword:Rabaudy, Bernard De]]

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

## Rabaut, Paul[[@Headword:Rabaut, Paul]]

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

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

## Rabbah[[@Headword:Rabbah]]

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

1. A very strong place on the east of Jordan, which, when its name is first introduced in the sacred records, was the chief city of the Ammonites. In five passages (Deu 3:11; 2Sa 12:26; 2Sa 17:27; Jer 49:2; Ezra 21:20) it is styled at length רִבִּת בְּנֵי עִמּוֹן, Rabbdth-bene-Ammon, A. V. “Rabbath of the Ammonites,” or “of the children of Ammon;” but elsewhere (Jos 13:25; 2Sa 11:1; 2Sa 12:27; 2Sa 12:29; 1Ch 20:1; Jer 49:3; Ezra 25:5; Amo 1:14) simply “Rabbah.” The Sept. generally has ῾Ραββάθ, but in some MSS. occasionally ῾Ραβάθ, or ἡ ῾Ραββά. In Deu 3:5 it is τῆ ἄκρα τῶν υἱῶν ῎Αμμών in both MSS. In Jos 13:25 the Vat. has῎Αραβα ἡ ἐστιν κατὰ πρόσωπον Α᾿ράδ, where the first and last words of the sentence seem to have changed places. Other various readings likewise occur.

Rabbah appears in the sacred records as the single city of the Ammonites; at least no other bears any distinctive name, a fact which contrasts strongly with the abundant details of the city life of the Moabites. Whether it was originally, as some conjecture, the Ham of which the Zuzim were dispossessed by Chedorlaomer (Gen 14:5), will probably remain forever a conjecture. The statement of Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. ‘Ajucav) that it was originally a city of the Rephaim implies that it was the Ashteroth Karnaim of Genesis 14. In agreement with this is the fact that it was in later times known as Astarte (Steph. Byz. quoted by Ritter, p. 1155). In this case, the dual ending of Karnainm may point, as some have conjectured in Jerushalaim, to the double nature of the city — a lower town and a citadel. When first named it is in the hands of the Ammonites, and is mentioned as containing the bedstead of the giant Og (Deu 3:11), possibly the trophy of some successful war against the more ancient Rephaim. With the people of Lot, their kinsmen the Israelites had no quarrel, and Rabbath- of-the-children-of-Ammon remained to all appearance unmolested during the first period of the Israelitish occupation. It was not included in the territory of the tribes east of Jordan; the border of Gad stops at “Aroer, which faces Rabbah” (Jos 13:25). The attacks of the Bene-Ammon on Israel, however, brought these peaceful relations to an end. Saul must have had occupation enough on the west of' Jordan in attacking and repelling the Philistines and in pursuing David through the woods and ravines of Judah to prevent his crossing the river, unlless on such special occasions as the relief of Jabesh. At any rate, we never hear of his having penetrated so far in that direction as Rabbah. But David's armies were often engaged against both Moab and Ammon. His first Ammonitish campaign appears to have occurred early in his reign. A part of the army, unider Abishai, was sent as far as Rabbah to keep the Ammonites in check (2Sa 10:10; 2Sa 10:14), but the main force under Joab remained at Medeba (1Ch 19:7). The following year was occupied in the great expedition by David in person against the Syrians at Helam, wherever  that may have been (2Sa 10:15-19). After their defeat the Ammonitish war was resumed, and this time Rabbah was made the main point of attack (2Sa 11:1). Joab took the command, and was follovwed by the whole of the army. The expedition included Ephraim and Benljamin, as well as the king's own tribe (2Sa 11:11), the “king's slaves” (2Sa 11:1; 2Sa 11:17; 2Sa 11:24), probably David's immediate body-guard, and the thirty-seven chief captains. Uriah was certainly there, and, if a not improbable Jewish tradition may be adopted, Ittai the Gittite was there also. SEE ITTAI.

 The ark accompanied the camp (2Sa 11:11), the only time that we hear oft' its doing so, except that memorable battle with the Philistines, when its capture caused the death of the tli'lli-priest. On a former occasion (Num 31:6) the “holy things” only are specified-an expression which hardly seems to include the ark. David alone, to his cost, remained in Jerusalem. The country was wasted, and the roving Ammonites were'driven with all their property (xii, 30) into their single stronghold, as the Betdouin Kenites were driven from their tents inside the walls of Jerusalem when Judah was overrun by the Challanans. SEE RECHABITE, The siege must have lasted nearly, if not quite, two years; since during its progress David formed his connection with Bathsheba, and the two children, that which died and Solomon, were successively born. The sallies of the Ammonites appear to have formed a main feature of the siege (2Sa 11:17, etc.). At the end of that time Joab succeeded in capturing a portion of the place — the “city of waters,” that is, the lower town, so called from its containing the perennial stream which rises in and still flows through it. The fact (which seems uindoubted) that the source of the stream was within the lower city, explains its having held out for so long. It was also called the “royal city” (עַיר הִמְּלוּכָה), perhaps from its connection with Molech or Milcom — “the king” more probably from its containing the palace of Hanun and Nahash. But the citadel, which rises abruptly on the north side of the lower town, a place of very great strength, still remained to be taken, and the honor of this capture, Joab (with that devotion to David which runs like a bright thread through the dark web of his character) insists on reserving for the king. “I have fought,” writes he to his uncle, then living at ease in the harem at Jerusalem, in all the satisfaction of the birth of Solomon — “I have fought against Rabbah, and have taken the city of waters; but the citadel still remains: now, therefore, gather the rest of the people together and come; put yourself at the head of the whole army, renew the assault against the citadel, take it. and thus finish the siege which I have carried so far,” and then he ends with a rough  banter (comp. 2Sa 19:6) — half jest, half earnest — “lest I take the city and in future it go under my name.” The waters of the lower city once in the hands of the besiegers, the fate of the citadel was certain, for that fortress possessed in itself (as we learn from the invaluable notice of Josephus, Ant. 7:7, 5) but one well of limited supply, quite inadequate to the throng which crowded its walls.

The provisions also were at last exhausted, and shortly after David's arrival the fortress was taken, and its inmates, with a very great booty, and the idol of Molech, with all its costly adornments, fell into the hands of David. We are not told whether the city was demolished or whether David was satisfied with the slaugnhter of its inmates. In the time of Amos, two centuries and a half later, it had again a “wall” and “palaces,” and was still the sanctuary of Molech” — “the king” (Amo 1:14). So it was also at the date of the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar (Jer 49:2-3), when its dependent towns (“daughters”) are mentioned, and when it is named in such terms as imply that it was of equal importance with Jerusalem (Ezra 21:20). At Rabbah, no doubt Baalis, king of the Bene-Ammon (Jer 40:14), held such court as he could muster, and within its walls was plotted the attack of Ishmael which cost Gedaliah his life and drove Jeremiah into Egypt. The denunciations of the prophets just named may have been fulfilled either at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or five years afterwards, when the Assyrian armies overran the country east of Jordan on their road to Egypt (Josephus, Ant. 10:9, 7). See Jerome, on Amos 1:41.

In the period between the Old and New Testaments, Rabbath-Ammon appears to have been a place of much importance and the scene of many contests. The natural advantages of position and water supply, which had alsays distinguished it, still made it an important citadel by turns to each side during the contentions which raged so long over the whole of the district. It lqy on the road between Heshbon and Bosra, and was the last place at which a stock of water could be obtained for the journey across the desert; while, as it stood on the confines of the richer and more civilized country, it formed an important garrison station for repelling the incursions of the wild tribes of the desert. From Ptolemy Philadelphus (B.C. 285-247) it received the name of Philadelphia (Jerome, on Ezra 25:1), and under this name it is often mentioned by Greek and Roman writers (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 16; Ptolemy. Geog. v, 15), by Josephus (War, i, 6, 3; i, 19, 5; ii, 18, 1), and upon Roman coins (Eckhel, iii, 351; Muinet, v, 335), as a city of Arabia, Coele-Syria, or Decapolis. The district either then  or subsequently was called Philadelphene (Josephus, War iii, 3, 3), or Arabia Philadelphensis (Epiphanius, in Ritter, Syriev, p. 1155). In B.C. 218 it was taken from the then Ptolemy (Philopator) b)y Antiochus the Great, after a long and obstinate resistance from the besieged in the citadel. A communication with the spring in the lower town had been made since (possibly in consequence of) David's siege, by a long secret subterranean passage, and had not this been discovered to Antiochus by a prisoner, the citadel might have been enabled to hold out (Polybius, v, 17). During the struggle between Antiochus the Pious (Sidetes) and Ptolemy. the son-in- law of Simon Maccabaeus (B.C. cir. 134), it is mentioned as being governed by a tyrant named Cotylas (Ant. 13:8, 1). Its ancient name, though under a cloud, was still used; it is mentioned by Polybius (v, 71) under the hardly altered form of Rabbatamana ( ῾Ραββατάμανα). About B.C. 65 we hear of it as in the hands of Aretas (one of the Arab chiefs of that name), who retired thither from Judaea when menaced by Scaurus, Pompey's general (Josephus, War, i, 6, 3). The Arabs probably held it till the year B.C. 30, when they were attacked there by Herod the Great. But the account of Josephus (War, i, 19. 5, 6) seems to imply that the city was not then inhabited, and that although the citadel formed the main point of the combat, yet that it was only occupied on the instant. The water communication above alluded to also appears not to have been then in existence, for the people who occupied the citadel quickly surrendered from thirst, and the whole affair was over in six days.

At the Christian aera Philadelphia formed the eastern limit of the region of Permea (Josephus, War, iii, 3, 3). It was one of the cities of the Decapolis, and as far down as the 4th century was esteemed one of the most remarkable and strongest cities of the whole of Ccele-Syria (Eusebius, Onomast.; Ammianus Marc. in Ritter, p. 1157). Its magnificent theatre (said to be the largest in Syria), temples, odeon, mausoleum, and other public buildings were probably erected during the 2d and 3d centuries, like those of Jerash, which they resemble in style, though their scale and design are grander (Lindsay). Among the ruins of an “immense term ple” on the citadel hill, Mr. Tipping saw some prostrate columns five feet in diameter. Its coins are extant, some bearing the figure of Astarte, some the word Herakleion, implying a worship of Hercules, probably the continnuation of that of Molech or Milcom. From Stephanus of Byzantium we learn that it was also called Astarte, doubtless from its containing a temple of that  goddess. Justin Martyr, a native of Shechem, writing about A.D. 140, speaks of the city as containing a multitude of Ammonites (Dict. with Trypho), though it would probably not be safe to interpret this too strictly.

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

When the Moslems conquered Syria, they found the city in ruins (Abulfeda inl Ritter, p. 1158; and in note to lord Lindsay); and in ruins remarkable for their extent and desolation even for Syria, the “land of ruins,” it still remains. The ancient name has been preserved among the natives of the country. Abulfeda calls it Amman (Tab. Syr. p. 19), and by that name it is still known. The prophet Ezekiel foretold that Rabbah should become “a stable for camels,” and the country “a couching-place for flocks” (Eze 25:5). This has been literally fulfilled, and Burckhardt actually found that a party of Arabs had stabled their camels among the ruins of Rabbah. Too much stress has, however, been laid upon this minute point by Dr. Keith and others (Evidence from Prophecy, p. 150).

What the prophet meant to say was that Ammon and its chief city should be desolate; and he expressed it by reference to facts which would certainly occur in any forsaken site in the borders of Arabia; and which are now constantly occurring not in Rabbah only, but in many other places. Rabbah lies about twenty-two miles from the Jordan at the eastern apex of a triangle, of which Heshbon and es-Salt form respectively the southern and northern points. It is about fourteen miles from the former and twelve from the latter. Jerash is due north, more than twenty miles distant in a straight line, and thirty-five by the usual road (Lindsay, p. 278). It lies in a valley which is a branch, or perhaps the main course, of the Wady Zerka, usually identified with the Jabbok. The Moiet-Ammann, or water of Amman, a mere streamlet, rises within the basin which contains the ruins of the town.  The main valley is a winter torrent, but appears to be perennial, and contains a quantity of fish, by one observer said to be trout (see Burckhardt, p. 358; G. Robinson, 2, 174; “a perfect fish-pond,” Tipping). The stream runs from west to east, and north of it is the citadel on its isolated hill. The public buildings are said to be Roman, in general character like those at Jerash, except the citadel, lwhich is described as of large square stones put together without cement, and which is probably more ancient than the rest. Among the ruins are chiefly noticeable a spacious church, built with large stones, and having a steeple; a temple, with part of the side walls and a niche in the back wall remaining; a curved wall along the water-side, with many niches, and in front of it a row of large columns, four of which remain, though without capitals; a high- arched bridge over the river, still perfect, apparently the only one that had existed. The citadel on the hill, a structure of immense strength, and the theatre have been referred to above. ‘The remains of private houses scattered on both sides of the stream are very extensive. They have been visited, and described in more or less detail, by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 357- 360), Seetzen (Reisen, i, 396; 4:212214), Irby (June 14), Buckingham (E. Syria, p. 68-82), lord Lindsay (5th ed. p. 278-284), G. Robinson (ii, 172178), lord Claud Hanmilton (in Keith, Evid. of Proph. ch. vi), De Saulcy (Dead Sea, i, 387 sq.), Tristram (Land of Israel, p. 544 sq.), Porter (Handb. foi Palest. p. 302), B:itdeker (Palastina, p. 319), and the Rev. A. E. Northern, in the Quart. Statement of the “Pal. Explor. Fund,” April, 1872, p. 57 sq., where a plan is given.

2. (הָרִבָּה, with the definite article; Sept. Σωθηβᾶ v. r. Α᾿ρεββα; Vulg. Aebba) a city of Judah, named, with Kirjath-jearim, in Jos 15:60 only. It lay among the group of towns situated to the west of Jerusalem, on the northern border of the tribe of Judah (Keil, Comment. ad loc.). It is probably only an epithet for Jerusalem itself, which otherwise would not appear in the list. SEE JUDAH (Tribe of).

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

4. Although there is no trace of the fact in the Bible there can be little doubt that the name of Rabbah was also attached in Biblical times to the chief city of Moab. Its Biblical name is “Ar,” but we have the testimony of Eusebius (Onomast. s.v. Moab) that in the 4th century it possessed the  special title of Rabbath-Moab, or, as it appears in the corrupted orthography of Stephanus of Byzantium, the coins, and the Ecclesiastical Lists, Rabathmoba. Rabbathmoma. and Ratba or Robba Moabitis (Reland, Palest. p. 226, 957; Seetzen, Reisen, 4:227; — titter, p. 1220). This name was for a time displaced by Areopolis, in the same manner that Rabbath- Ammon had been by Philadelphia: these, however, were but the names imposed by the temporary masters of the country, and employed by them in their official documents; and when they passed away, the original names, which had never lost their place in the mouths of the common people, reappeared, and Rabba, like Ammam, still remains to testify to the ancient appellation. Rabba lies on the highlands at the southeast quarter of the Dead Sea, between Kerak and Jibel Shihan. Its ruins, which are unimportant, are described by Burckhardtm (July 15), Seetzen (Reisel, i, 411), De Saulcy (Jan. 18), and Porter (Handb.for Palestine, p. 297 sq.). SEE AN.

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

             (Jos 15:60) is conjectured by Lieut. Conder (Tent Work, 2:339) to be the present Khurbet Rubba, laid down on the Ordnance Map at five miles northeast of Beit-Jibrin, and described in the. accompanying Memoirs (3:360) as consisting of "caves, cisterns, and heaps of stones, zuined walls, bases of pillars and shafts much worn, two lintel stones with crosses, each measuring about seven feet by two and a half feet."

## Rabbanism[[@Headword:Rabbanism]]

             is the name of a school of Jewish doctors in Spain, which flourished for nine generations, covering the period from the beginning of the 11th century to the end of the 15th, after which they succeeded to the Gaons (q.v.). The founder of this school was rabbi Samuel Hallevi, surnamed Haragid, or the prince, who lived in 1027. The last of the line was rabbi Isaac Aboab, of Castile, who left that. kingdom after the edict of banishment in 1492, and spent the remainder of his life in Portugal. SEE SCHOOLS, HEBREW.

## Rabbath Of The Children Of Ammon[[@Headword:Rabbath Of The Children Of Ammon]]

             and OF THE AMMONITES. (The former is the more accurate, the Hebrew being in both cases; רִבִּת בְּנֵי עִמּוֹן; Sept. ἡ ἄκρα τῶν υἱῶν Α᾿μμών, ῾Ραββὰθ υἱῶν Α᾿μμών; Vulg. Rabbath filiorum Ammon.) This is the full appellation of the place commonly given as RABBAH SEE RABBAH (q.v.). It occurs only in Deu 3:11 and Eze 21:20. The th is merely the Hebrew “construct state,” or mode of connecting a word ending in ah with one followving it. SEE GIBEATH; SEE KIRJATH; SEE RAMATH, etc.

## Rabbath-Ammon[[@Headword:Rabbath-Ammon]]

             Some additional particulars respecting Amman are given by Merrill, East of the Jordan, page 386 sq.

## Rabbenu Gershom[[@Headword:Rabbenu Gershom]]

             or, more properly, Rabbi GERSHOM BEN-JEHUDA, the reputed founder of the Franco-German Rabbinical school, in which the studies of that of Babylonia were earnestly revived, was born about 960, and died in 1028. He was called “The Ancient,” “The Light of the Exile,” and was the founder of monogamy and other “institutions” among the Jews, which were for a long time disputed and rejected, and himself wvas placed under ban for attempting to abrogate the Mosaic precept respecting the marriage of a man with the childless wife of his deceased brother. Gershom also wrote a commentary on the Talmud, and some hymns and penitential prayers, which are extant in the Machzor. For reasons unknnown he went to Mayence, where he founded a college, which soon attracted the youth of  Germany and Italy. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. i, 328: De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 114; Griitz, Gesch. der Juden (Leips. 1871), v, 364 sq.; Braunschweiger, Gesch. der Juden in den romanischen Staaten, p. 32 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth, at. s. Sekten, ii, 388; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten, p. 310; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 283 sq.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p. 69; Zunz, Literaturgesch. d. synagogalen Poesie, p. 238; id. Synagogale Poesie, p. 171-174; Delitzsch, Zur Gesch. derjiid. Poesie, p. 51, 156; Adams, Hist. of the Jews, i, 226; Frankel. Monactsschrift, 1854, p. 230 sq. (B. P.)

## Rabbenu Tam[[@Headword:Rabbenu Tam]]

             SEE TAM.

## Rabbi[[@Headword:Rabbi]]

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

I. Different Forms, and the Signification of the Title. — The term רִבַּי, Rabbi, is a form of the noun רִב, Rab (from רָבִב, to multiply, to become great, distinguished), which in the Biblical Hebrew denotes a great man; one distinquished either for age, position, office, or skill (Job 32:9; Dan 1:3; Pro 26:10); but in the canonical books it does not occur with this suffix. It is in post-Biblical Hebrew that this term is used as a title, indicating sundry degrees by its several terminations for those who are distinguished for learning, who are the authoritative teachers of the law, and who are the appointed spiritual heads of the Jewish community. Thus, for instance, the simple term רִב, Rsab without any termination, and with or without the name of the person following it, corresponds to our expression teacher, master, διδάσκαλος ‘, and is the lowest degree; with the pronominal suffix first person singular-viz. רִבַּי, Rabbi, ῾Ραββί, 1my Rabbi (Mat 23:7-8; Mat 26:25; Mat 26:49; Mar 9:5; Mar 11:21; Mar 14:45; Joh 1:38; Joh 1:49; Joh 3:2; Joh 3:26; Joh 4:31; Joh 6:25; Joh 9:2; Joh 11:8) — it is a higher degree; and with the pronominal suffix first person plural — viz. רִבַּן, Rabban,  ῾Ραββον, our teacher, our master, in the Chaldee form — it is the highest degree, and was given to the patriarchs (נשיאים) or the presidents of the Sanhedrim. Gamaliel I, who was patriarch in Palestine A.D. 30-50, was the first that obtained this extraordinary title, and not Simon ben-Hillel, as is erroneously affirmed by Lightfoot (Harmony of the Four Evangelists, Joh 1:38). This is evident from the following statement in the Aruch of R. Nathan (s.v. אביי): “We do not find that the title Rabbon began before the patriarchs rabbon Gamaliel I, rabbon Simon his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were presidents.” Lightfoot's mistake is all the more strange since he himself quotes this passage elsewhere (comp. Hebrew and Talmudical Exercitations, Mat 23:7). רִבָּן, however, which, as we have said, is the noun רִבwith the Chaldee pronominal suffix first person plural, is also used in Aramaic as a noun absolute, the plural of which is רִבָּנַיןand רִבָּנַים(comp. Chaldee paraphrase on Psa 80:11; Rth 1:2); pronominal suffix second person singular רִבָּנִיךְ(Son 6:4); pronominal suffix third person plural רִבָּנֵיהוֹן(Psa 83:12). Accordingly ῾Ραββονί in Mar 10:51, which in Joh 20:16 is spelled ῾Ραββουνί, is the equivalent of רִבָּנַי, Rabbani, my master, giving the Syriac pronunciation to the Kamets under the Beth. As such it is interpreted by the evangelists (διδάσκαλος, Joh 1:39; Joh 20:16; Mat 23:8).

II. Origin and Date of these Titles. — Nathan ben-Jechiel (q.v.) tells us, in his celebrated lexicon denominated Aruch (s.v. אביי), which was finished A.D. 1101, that Mar Rab Jacob asked Sherira Gaon, and his son Hai, the co-Gaon (A.D. 999), for an explanation of the origin and import of these different titles, and that these spiritual heads of the Jewish community in Babylon replied as follows: “The title Rab (רב) is Babylonian, and the title Rabbi (רבי) is Palestinian.” This is evident from the fact that some of the Tanaim and Amoraim are simply called by their names without any title — e.g. Simon the Just, Antigonus of Soho, Jose ben Jochanan, Rab, Samnuel,Abaje, and Rabba; some of them bear the title Rabbi (רבי) — e.g. rabbi Akiba, rabbi Jose, rabbi Simon, etc.; some of them have the title Mar (מר) — e.g. mar Ukba, mar Januka, etc.; some the title of Rab (רב) — e.g. rab Hana, rab Jehudah, etc.; while some of them have the title Rabbon (רבן) — e.g. rabbon Gamaliel, rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, etc.  The title Rabbi (רבי) is that of the Palestinian sages, who received there of the Sanhedrim the laying-on of the hands, in accordance with the laying-on of the hands as transmitted in unbroken succession by the elders ( זקנים), iand were denominated Rabbi, and received authority to judge penal cases; while Rab (רב) is the title of the Babylonian sages, who received the layingon of hands in their colleges. The more ancient generations, however, who were far superior, had no such titles as Rabbon (רבן), Rabbi (רבי), or Rab (רב), either for the Babylonian or Palestinian sages, as is evident from the fact that Hillel I, who came from Babylon, had not the title Rabbon (רבן) attached to his name; and that of the prophets, who were very eminent, it is simply said ‘Haggai the prophet,' etc.; ‘Ezra did not come lup from Babylon,' etc., without the title Rabbon being affixed to their names. Indeed, we do not find that this title is of an earlier date than the patriarchate. It began with rabbon Gamaliel the elder (A.D. 30), rabbon Simon, his son (who perished in the destruction of the second Temple), and rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai, all of whom were patriarchs or presidents of the Sanhedrim (נשיאים). The title Rabbi (רבי), too, comes into vogue among those who received the laying-on of hands at this period — as, for instance, rabbi Zaddok, rabbi Eliezer ben-Jacob, etc., and dates from the disciples of rabbon Jochanan ben-Zakkai downwards. Now the order of these titles is as follows: Rabbi is greater than Rab; Rabbon, again, is greater than Rabbi; while the simple name is greater than Rabbon. No one is called Rabbon except the presidents.” From this declaration of Sherira Gaon and Hai, that the title Rabbi obtained among the disciples of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, the erudite Gratz concludes that “we must regard the title Rabbi, which in the Gospels, with the exception of that by Luke, is given to John the Baptist and to Jesus, as an anachronism. We must also regard as an anachronism the disapprobation put into the mouth of Jesus against the ambition of the Jewish doctors, who love to be called by this title, and the admonition to his disciples not to suffer themselves to be styled Rabbiκαὶ φιλοῦσι (οἱ γραμματεῖς)...καλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ῥαββὶ ῥαββί. ῾Υμεῖς δἑ μὴ κληθῆτε ῥαββί, Mat 23:7-8).

This, moreover, shows that when the Gospels were written down the title Rabbi stood in so high a repute that the fathers could not but transfer it to Christ” (Geschichte der Juden [Berl. 1853], 4:500). But even supposing that the title Rabbi came into vogue in the days of Jochanan ben-Zakkai, this would by no means warrant Gritz's conclusion, inasmuch as Jochanan lived upwards of a hundred years, and survived four presidents  — viz. Hillel I (B.C. 30-10), Simon I (A.D. 10-30), Gamaliel I (A.D. 30- 50), and Simon II (A.D. 50-70), and it might therefore obtain in the early days of this luminary, which would be shortly after the birth of Christ. The Tosaphoth at the end of Eduyoth, however, quoted in the Aruch in the same article, gives a different account of the origin of this title, which is as follows: “He who has disciples, and whose disciples again have disciples, is called Rabbi; when his disciples are forgotten (i.e. if he is so old that his immediate disciples already belong to the past age), he is called Rabbon; and when the disciples of his disciples are also forgotten, he is simply called by his own name.” This makes the titles coeval with the origin of the different schools, and at the same time accounts for the absence of them among the earliest doctors of the law.

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

## Rabbim[[@Headword:Rabbim]]

             SEE BATH-RABBIM.

## Rabbinic Bibles[[@Headword:Rabbinic Bibles]]

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

1. רב העיון על ידי ארבעה ועשרים חומש עם תרגום אונקלוס דניאל בומבירגי מאנוירשא בויניזיאה ועם פירושרשי נדפסעם, fol. This is the first Rabbinic Bible published by Bomberg, and carried through the press by Felix Pratensis (q.v.) (Venice, 1516-17) ( ראח= 278). It consists of four parts, with a separate title-page to each, and with the following contents:

a. The Pentateuch, with the Chaldee paraphrase of Onkelos (q.v.) and the commentaries of Rashi (q.v.).

b. The Prophets, with the Chaldee of Jonathan ben-Uziel (q.v.) and the commentaries of Kimchi (q.v.).

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

This edition, however, did not prove acceptable to the Jews, since it did not come up to all the requirements of Masoretic rules, as can be seen from the remark Levita makes in his Masoreth ha-Masoreth: “Let me therefore warn and caution every one who reads the folio or quarto editions of the four-and-twenty books published here in Venice in the year 1517 to pay no attention to the false remarks printed in the margin in the form of Keri and Kethib, plene and defective, Milel and Milra, and variations in the vowels and accents, or to any of those things which ought not to have been done, as I have stated above. The author of them did not know how to distinguish between his right hand and his left. Not being a Jew, he knew nothing about the nature of the Masorah, and what he did put down simply arose from the fact that he sometimes found variations in the copies which he had before him, and, as he did not know which reading was the correct one, he put down one in the margin and another in the text. Sometimes it so happened that he put the correct readling into the text and the incorrect one — into the margin, and sometimes the reverse is the case; thus he was groping in darkness like a blind man. Hence they are not to be heeded, for they are confusion worse confounded.” When Levita states that the editor  was no Jew. he is wrong: he was born a Jew, in 1513 embrace Christianity at Rome, and died in 1539. The defectiveness of this first edition induced Bomberg to undertake another edition, for which he employed as editor the celebrated Jacob ben-Chajim (q.v.), and which he published under the title

2... . שער יהוה הקדש. , i.e. Porta Dei Sancta (Venice, 1524-25, 4 vols. fol.). This edition is an improvement upon the former, and its contents are as follows:

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

b. The second volume, comprising the earlier prophets (ראשונים נביאים), i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and the Kings, has the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphraseof Jonathan ben-Uziel, nnd the commentaries of Rashii, Kimchi, and Levi ben-Gershon, and the Masorah in the margin.

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

d. The fourth volume, comprising the Hagiographa (כתובים), gives the Hebrew text, the Chaldee paraphrase of Joseph the Blind, the commentaries of Rashi on the Psalms, Ezra, Neheminh, the Five Megilloth. and Chronicles of Aben-Ezra on the Psalms, Proverbs, Job, Daniel, the Five Megilloth, Ezra, and Nehemiah; of Levi ben-Gershon on Proverbs and Daniel; of Saadias on Daniel and the second Targum of Esther.  But the most valuable part of his labors are the appendices to this volume, which are, “1, the Masorah which could not be got into the margin of the text in alphabetical order, with Jacob ben-Chajiim's directions; 2, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali, and the Eastern and Western codd.; and, 3, a treatise upon the points and accents, conutaining the work דרכי הנקוד והנגינות, or כללי הנוקיד, by Moses Nakdan. Jacob ben-Chajiim bestowed the utmost labor in amassing the Masorali and in purifying and arranging those materials which Felix Pratensis published very incorrectly in the first edition of Bomberg's Rabbinic Bible. He was, moreover, the first who, in his elaborate introduction, furnished the Biblical student with a treatise on the Masorah; and his edition of the Bible is of great importance to the criticism of the text, inasmuch as from it most of the Hebrew Bibles are printed. Keniicott published a Latin translation of Jacob ben-Chajim's valuable introduction from an anonymous MS. in the Bodleian Library in an abridged form (comp. Dissertation the Second [Oxford, 1759], p. 229244), and Ginsburg has published an English translation of the whole with explanatory notes in the Journal of Sacred Literature, 1863. In after-life Jacob ben-Chajim embraced Christianity, a circumstance which will account for Elias Levita's vituperations against him (צרורה בצרור נקוב תהי נשמתו, i.e. (Let his soul be bound up in a bag with holes').”

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

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

5. גדול שמו בישראל ונודע חמשה חומשי תורה מן העשרים וארבע, published at Venice in 1617-19 (4 vols. fol.) by Pietro and Lorenzo Bragadin, and edited by the celebrated Leon di Modena (q.v.) and Abraham Chaber-Tob ben-Solomon Chajim Sopher. It contains the whole matter of the foregoing edition, and is preceded by a preface written by Leon di Modena. This edition, however, is of less value to the critical student, being castrated by the Inquisition, under whose censorship it was published, as may be seen from the remark of the censor at the end: “Visto per me, Fr. Renato da Mod. a. 1626.”

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

1, Rashi on the whole Old Test.;

2, Aben-Ezra on the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, Psalms, Job, the Five Megilloth, and Daniel;

3. Moses Kimchi on the Proverbs, Ezra, and Nehemiah;

4, D. Kimchi on Chronicles;

5, Ralbag on the earlier prophets and Proverbs;

6, Saadias on Daniel;

7, Jacob ben-Asher on the Pentateuch;

8, Jachja on Samuel;

9, the Masorah Finalis and Buxtorf's Tiberias, etc.;

10, the various readings of Ben-Asher and Ben-Naphtali;

11, the variations between the Eastern and Western codices;

12, a treatise on the accents.

The whole is formed after Jacob ben-Chajim's second edition (1546-48), with some corrections and alterations by Buxtorf. Buxtorf, in editing this Bible, has erected to himself a lasting monument. Of course, like every human work, it is imperfect; but, in spite of its deficiencies, the student must still thank the editor for this work, and Richard Sinon, in his Histoire Critique du V. T. p. 513, certainly does great injustice when he says: “Bien  qu'il pretende que son edition est plus exacte que les autres, les Juifs cependant ne lestiment pas beaucoup, h cause des fautes qui s'y rencontrent, surtout dans les commentaires des rabbins, ofu ii a laisse les erreurs des copistes, qui etoient dans les editions precedentes, et ii y en a ajoute de nouvelles. 11 seroit necessaire d'avoir de bons exemplaires manuscrits de ces commentaires des rabbins, pour les corriger en une infinite d'endroits; et c'est it quoi Buxtorfe devoit plutot s'appliquer, qu'n reformer la punctuation du texte Caldaique.”

7. ספר קהילת משה, or the Amsterdam Rabbinic Bible, edited by Moses Frankfurter (Amsterdam, 172427, 4 vols. royal fol.). This is unquestionably the most valuable of all the Rabbinic Bibles. It is founded upon the Bomberg editions, and gives not only their contents, but also those of Buxtorf's, with much additional matter. This is the last Rabbinic Bible which is described in bibliographical works, and for this reason we give here the literature pertaining to the above Bibles: Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebr. ii, 365 sq.; Le Long-Mash, Bibliotheca Sacra, i, 95 sq.; Rosenmuller, Handbuch der bibl. Literatur, i, 249 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 6 sq.; Ginsburg, in Kitto, s.v. “Rabbinic Bibles;” Carpzov, Citica Sacra (Lipsiae, 1748), p. 409 sq.; R. Simon, Histoire Critique du Vieux Test. p. 512 sq. SEE FRANKFURTER.

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

1, an index of the things explained by R. Abdias Seforno, according to the Parashanyoth;

2, a treatise by the sante author on the Law:

3, approbationis of the synagogues of Amsterdam, Frankfort, and others;

4, an explication by Moses (the author) of the signs used to designate the unithors referred to;

5, ancient prefaces at the head of former editions;

6, an index of the chapters of the books of the Old Test.;

7, the prefaces of R. Chiskuni;

8, the preface of Levi ben-Gershon (Ralbag), writh a revision of the Talmud;

9, the preface of R. Abdias Seforno;

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

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

c. The third volume contains the later prophets (the text, etc., arranged as before), with the commentaries of Rashi, Radak (R. David Kimchi), Aben- Ezra on Isaiah and Jeremiah, R. Samuel Laniado, 1. Jacob ben-Rab, R. Abdias Seforno, Samuel Almesnires, and R. Isaac Gershon, and the Minchah Gedolah (a series of extracts similar to the above) by the editor.

d. The fourth volumne, containing the Kethubim (in like style), has the piefaces of Aben-Ezra, Aben-Esaias, and Simeon ben-Zemach in the Ohel Mesh'nat and the Mishpat Zedek. There are also various commentaries on the Iagiographa, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Isaac Jabez, Aben-Jechaja; Abdias Seforno on the Psalms, and extracts from the Miozma Lattora of Samnel Arepol; on the Proverbs, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Menahem Hammeiri, with the commentary Kab Venaki of Solonlon benAbraham; on Job, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Ramban, Abo, Perizol, Abdias Seforno, and Simeon ben-Zemach; on the  Canticles, by Rashi, AbenEzra, Ralbag, Aben-Jechaja, Isaac Jabez, Meri Arama, and Abdias Seforno; on Ruth, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, Aben- Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Ecclesiastes, by the same commuentators, with the addition of Abdias Seforno; on Esther, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Ralbag, AbenJechaja; on Daniel, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Saadias, AbenJechaja, Isac Jabez, and Rallag;t on Ezra and Nehemiah, by Rashi, Aben-Ezra, Aben- Jechaja, and Isaac Jabez; on Chronicles, by Rashi, Radak, and Aben- Jechaja. The editor has also added his own commentary throughout this volume of the work, under the title Minchah Ereb. At the end of the work ale placed the Greater Masorah, the variations of the Eastern and Western Recensions (so called), and the treatise on the accents. Each of the assistants in the work is celebrated in Hebrew verse.

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

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

## Rabbinical Dialect[[@Headword:Rabbinical Dialect]]

             By this term we understand that form of the Hebrew language in which the principal Scripture commentators among the rabbins wrote, as Kimchi, Aben-Ezra, Abrabanel, Rashi, together with the Mishna, the Jewish Prayer- books, etc. Books in this dialect are generally printed in a round character, more resembling writing than the ordinary square Hebrew letters; but the power, value, and pronunciation of the letters are precisely the same as in Biblical Hebrew. The Rabbinical characters are given below. Although substantially Hebrew, yet this dialect has so many peculiarities as to require a separate study. The scholar who is well versed in the pure or classic Hebrew of the Holy Scriptures would be unable to read the first two lines in the Talmud without an especial indoctrination in its grammatical forms, aside from the difficulty of explaining words derived from the Greek, Latin, French, Arabic, and the like. The orthography, too, of this dialect has, to the reader of pure Hebrew, often an uncouth, and at first sight unintelligible, appearance. This is caused by the habit of inserting the letters י ו א, instead of using the corresponding vowelpoints, and thus אstands for or-, as שאני for מאי שָני for מִי; וstands for or T as כולם: for לפותרו כֻלם for לפָתרו;for .. or .., as פירוש for פֵּרוּשׂ, איפשר for אֶפְשִׁר; also for or dagesh, as לימינות for לְמינוֹת, כיסהfor כַסָּה. Sometimes a radical in verbs is dropped either at the beginning, middle, or end of a word. It drops the first, as חד for נש אחד for נא אנש: for נן אנא for כל מר אנן for אכל. It drops the second, as אי for קס אוי: for קדם, שה for תלים שעה for תות תהליםfor תחות; or it drops the third, as איטוֹר בי איןטוֹר נין, בי for כי בית for שב כין for שכ שבת for תו שכע for תובParts of words are often prolonged, as by doubling letters, or inserting double Yod; and to this and many other peculiarities must be added the use of numerous abbreviations, requiring a study in itself-thus e.g. אא‘ may be אחד אמר אהד אמר אליהו אדני אבי אומר אני אאעה אומרים אין אי אמרת אשת איש אמן אמן אי אפשר אופן stands for השלום אברהם אבינו עליו  We give a list of such works as will help the student in this branch of literature.

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

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

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

## Rabbinism[[@Headword:Rabbinism]]

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

The first stage of development appears in the work of the so-called Sopherim, the last of whom was Simon the Just (q.v.); and their work will be more fully described in the art. SCRIBES. The Sopherim were followed  by another class of men, known as the Tanaim, or teachers of the law (the νομοδιδάσκαλοι in the N.T.), comprising a period from B.C. 200 to A.D. 220. While we reserve a description of their work for the art. SCRIBES, we will only mention that from this school proceeded the oldest Midrashim, as Aechilta, Siphra, and Siphri SEE MIDRASH, AND THE MISHNA (q.v.). The most distinguished rabbins of the Tanaim (who are in part given already, or will be given, in this Cyclopopdia) were:

1. Antigonus of Soho (B.C. 200-170), whose famous maxim “Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of receiving wages, but be like servants who serve their master without expecting to receive wages; and let the fear of the Lord be upon you” (Aboth, i, 3) a maxim pronounced by Pressense (in his Jesus Christ: his Times, etc.) as “[a noble and almost evangelical one],\* truly a most beautiful maxim, and one denoting a legitimate reaction from the legal formalism which was in process of development” — is said to have given rise to Sadduceeism;

2. Jose ben-Joeser, of Zereda, and his companion, Jose ben-Jochanan, of Jerusalem;

3. Jochanan, the high-priest (commonly called John Hyrcanus, q.v.);

4. Jehoshua ben-Perachja, the reputed teacher of Christ, and his colleague, Nithai of Arbela (q.v.);

5. Simon ben-Shetach (q.v.) and Jehudah benTabai;

6. Shemaja (q.v.) and Abtalion; 7. Hillel I (q.v.);

8. Simon ben-Hillel I (q.v.);

9. Gamaliel I (q.v.);

10. Simon II ben-Gamaliel (q.v.), who fell at the defence of Jerusalem;

11. Jochanan ben-Zachai (q.v.);

12. Gamaliel II, of Jabne (q.v.);

13. Simon II ben-Gamaliel II (q.v.) and R. Nathan ha-Babli (q.v.);

14. Jehudah I the Holy (q.v.); and,

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

On the dissolution of the Babylonian schools, Spain, Portugal, and Southern France became the centre of Rabbinism. As early as about A.D. 1000 the Talmud is said to have been translated into Arabic. In Spain, the most flourishing school was that of Cordova, founded by Moses ben- Chanoch (q.v.). Besides Cordova, Rabbinism flourished in Granada, then in Lucena, the most famous representative of which was Isaac benJacob Alfasi (q.v.). To the 11th and 12th centuries belong especially Jehudah ha- Levi ben-Samuel (q.v.), Aben-Ezra (q.v.), the Kimchis (q.v.), and Solomon Parchon (q.v.). In France flourished Gershom ben-Jehudah, or Rabbenu Gershom (q.v.), and Rashi (q.v.). But the most distinguished of all was Moses Maimonides (q.v.), of Cordova, whose philosophical treatment of tradition divided Judaism, after his death, into two hostile parties; and the Spanish and French schools were divided for some time. When, in 1305, Asher ben-Jechiel, of Germany, came into Spailn, he succeeded in bringing the French school, which was hostile to philosophy, to supremacy, and thus philosophy was proscribed. But there was another kind of philosophy — if it deserve that name at all — which was especially cultivated in these times — the so-called Cabala, as it especially appears in the Sohar (q.v.). As the foremost representatives of this branch of literature, we may mention Meir ibn-Gabbai (q.v.), Joseph Karo (q.v.), Salomo al Kabez, Moses Cordovero (q.v.), Isaac Loria (q.v.), Moses Galante (q.v.), Samuel Laniado (q.v.), Jacob Zemach, and Hajim Vidal. The invention of the art of printing produced a new activity in the Church as well as in the Synagogue, and the first printed edition of the Talmud, in 1520, at Venice; the edition of the second Bomberg Rabbinic Bible, by Jacob ben-Chajim, in 1526; and the writings of Elias Levita (q.v.), are the first Jewish fruits of the art. Rabbinism was again revived and represented in the schools of Brody,  Lemberg, Lublin, Cracow, Prague, Firth, Frankfort, Venice, and Amsterdam. The party spirit which, in former ages, was represented in the Spanish and French schools was revived in the Portugueso-Italian and Germano-Polish schools. Moses Mendelssohn (q.v.), and his friends — as Hartwig Wessely, David Friedlanider, and others-opened a new epoch, and endeavored to enlighten their coreligionists; but the chasm was not healed. On the contrary, a final division was produced; and Reformed and Orthodox Judaism are the two antipodes of the present day. As a religious system, “Rabbinism,” says the late Dr. M'Caul, “has fared like all other religious systems: it has had prejudiced assailants to attack, and over- zealous admirers to defend it. The former have produced whatever they could find objectionable; the latter have carefully kept out of view whatever seemed to its disadvantage. The truth is, that it is a mixed system of good and bad. Founded on the inspired writings of Moses and the prophets, it necessarily contains much truth and wisdom; but, expounded and enlarged by prejudiced men, it presents a strange incongruity of materials.” See the art. “Rabbinism,” in Herzog's Real-Encyld.; the same art. in Theol. Universal-Lexicon; Wese n des Rabbimismus, in Jost, Gesch. cl. Judenth. u. s. Secten, i, 227 sq.; M'Caul, Sketches of Judaisnm and the Jews (London, 1838), ch. iv — “Rabbinism Considered as a Religious System,” p. 69 sq. (B. P.)

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

## Rabbith[[@Headword:Rabbith]]

             (Heb. רִבַּיתRabbith' [always with the art.], multitude; Sept. ῾Ραββάθ v. r. Δαβιρίον), a city in the tribe of Issachar (Jos 19:20). Schwarz (Palest. p. 166) found a village, Arubuni, three English miles west of Beth- shean, which he is disposed to identify with the Rebbo of Jerome, and the Rabbith of Joshua. But this is beyond the bounds of Issachar. Probably the locality in question is in the north-east part of the tribe, possibly at the ruins Sumurieh (? Samaria).

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

             Tristram (Bible Places, page 237) thinks this may be the modern Arrabeh, which, however, does not lie "in the plain" of Esdraelon, but about two miles southwest of Dothan; while Lieut. Conder suggests (Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey, 2:228) Rdba, a Small stone village lying about nine miles southwest of Beisan, and therefore entirely beyond the boundaries of Issachar.

## Rabbling[[@Headword:Rabbling]]

             a term employed to denote the summary ejectment, on Christmas-day, 1688, of Episcopal clergymen and their families by the Scottish populace, after the Revolution. The incumbents were turned out of their houses, and often into the snow; the church doors were locked, and the key was taken  awav. These measures were certainly harsh and uncalled for; but the people had been exasperated, especially in the west country, by twenty-five years of bloodshed and persecution. Though they were “rude, even to brutality,” yet, as lord Macaulay says, “they do not appear to have been guilty of any intentional injury to life or limb.” The better part of the people put a stop to the riotous proceedings on the part principally of the Cameronians; but a form of notice, or a threatening letter, was sent to every curate in the Western Lowlands.

## Rabbling Act[[@Headword:Rabbling Act]]

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

## Rabboni[[@Headword:Rabboni]]

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

## Rabe[[@Headword:Rabe]]

             SEE ROSENBACH.

## Rabe, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Rabe, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 16, 1710, at Lindfluhr, near Wurzburg. He studied at Altdorf, was in 1741 deacon at  Anspach, in 1764 archdeacon, in 1778 pastor and member of consistory, in 1790 general superintendent. Rabe died February 12, 1798. He is best known by his German translation of the Mishna (Anspach, 1760-63, 6 parts), and by his translation of the treatises Berachoth and Peah, according to the Jerusalem Talmud (1777, 1781). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:127; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:212, 523, 524, 525; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.).

## Rabh[[@Headword:Rabh]]

             SEE RAB.

## Rabsaces[[@Headword:Rabsaces]]

             ( ῾Ραψάκης), a Graecized form (Sir 48:18) of the name RAB- SHAKEH SEE RAB-SHAKEH (q.v.).

## Rabulas, Of Edessa[[@Headword:Rabulas, Of Edessa]]

             all Eastern prelate who flourished near the opening of the 5th century, was a student of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, and, in 431, was prominently identified with the Antiochites at the council in Ephesus. In the following year, however, Cyril of Alexandria succeeded in gaining Rabulas to his side; and after this we hear of him as a devout orthodox. He energetically opposed Nestorius, and greatly weakened the Nestorians. He condemned  the bishop of Edessa, the writings of Diodorus of Tarsus and of Theodorus of Mopsuestia, banished and drove off the teachers from the school at Edessa who were reputed favorable to their doctrines, and thus became an unwilling instrument in the founding of the school at Nisibis by Barsulmas and in the spread of Nestorianism in the East. He died in 436. His successor at Edessa was Ibas (q.v.). Under the name of Rabulas there is extant an old canonical collection of the Syrian Church, pieces of which are contained in the edition of the Nomoncanon of Bar-Hebraeus by Mai (Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. vol. x).

## Rabusson[[@Headword:Rabusson]]

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

## Rac(c)ovian Catechism[[@Headword:Rac(c)ovian Catechism]]

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

## Raca[[@Headword:Raca]]

             ( ῾Ρακά), a term of reproach used by the Jews of our Saviour's age (Mat 5:22). Critics are agreed that it is but the Greek form of the Chaldee term רֵיקָא, ireyka' (the terminal אbeing the definite article, used in a vocative sense), with the sense of “worthless;” but they differ as to whether this term should be connected with the root רוּקconveying the notion of emptiness (Gesen. Thesaur. . 1279), or with one of the cognate roots רָקִק(Tholuck) or רָקִע(Ewald), conveying the notion of thinness (Olshausen, De Wette, On Matthew v, 22). The first of these views is probably correct. We may compare the use of רֵיק, vain,” inJudges 9:4; 11:3, al., and of κενέ in Jam 2:20. Jesus, contrasting the law of Moses, which could only take notice of overt acts, with his own, which renders man amenable for his motives and feelings, says in effect: “Whosoever is rashly angry with his brother is liable to the judgment of God; whosoever calls his brother raca is liable to the judgment of the Sanhedrim; but whosoever calls him fool (μωρέ) becomes liable to the judgment of Gehenna.” To apprehend the higher criminality here attached to the term fool, which may not at first seem very obvious, it is necessary to observe that while “raca” denotes a certain looseness of life and  manners, “fool” denotes a wicked and reprobate person: foolishness being in Scripture opposed to spiritual wisdom (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. ad loc.). SEE FOOL.

## Racchei[[@Headword:Racchei]]

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

## Racci, Matteo[[@Headword:Racci, Matteo]]

             a noted Jesuit missionary of the 16th century, is closely identified with the Romanizing work of that aera in the Chinese empire. The very year which marks the death of Xavier (1552), marks the occurrence of an event which opened China to the Europeans. A party of Jesuit missionaries, at whose head was Racci, in that year landed stealthily at Macao. These missionaries of Rome had determined to win over the Chinese to Christianity by stratagem. They had studied mathematics and natural science, with a view to astonish the natives by their exhibitions. Some objects, common enough in Europe, but unheard of in China, were prepared as presents for the mandarins and others. A clock that showed the rising and setting of the sun and moon; a prism that by the emission of its rainbow-rays was mistaken for a fragment of the celestial hemisphere, and maps which exhibited the world of barbarians, with China filling the east and Europe in the remote west, produced sensations of wonder such as had never before stirred the placid spirit of the viceroy of Canton. Instead of driving them away from the country, as they feared, he actually detained the Jesuits to exhibit and explain their wonders; for only they had the secret of keeping that curious machine in action, and only they could manage the spectrum, and expound the new system of geography. Literary men crowded the palace to see the Jesuits and to hear their wisdom, and the missionaries thus gained an influence which they knew well how to utilize. The popularity thus acquired by Racci, Ruggiero, and others was truly astonishing; and by virtue of an imperial edict, Racci took up his residence near the royal palace. and enjoyed the highest reputation for learning. He courted the literati; withheld from their knowledge such parts of the sacred history and doctrine as were likely to offend their prejudices or wound their pride; by his influence at court secured the protection of his brethren in the provinces; and by extreme sagacity surrounded himself with a considerable number of persons who might be variously described as pupils, partisans, converts, or novices. In a secret chapel he disclosed to the more favored  symbols of his worship, yet so shaped as not to be repugnant to their heathen notions, and intermingled with other symbols from the religion of Confucius. Racci died in 1610, and was honored with a solemn funeral. The remains of a foreigner never before had such a distinction. It is said that both mandarins and the people saluted with a mournful admiration the corpse of the Jesuit as it was taken to the grave by a company of Christians, with a splendid cross going before it; and that it was interred, by the order of the emperor, in a temple dedicated to the true God.

## Race[[@Headword:Race]]

             (prop. מֵרוֹוֹ, Ecc 9:11; δρόμος, “course;” but in the A.V. the rendering, likewise, of אֹרִח, a path, and in the New Test. only of ἀγών and στάδιος). Races were evidently known to the Hebrews (Ecc 9:11). In the New Test. there are allusions to the various gymnastic sports and games celebrated by the Greeks. So the term “race” is often used in comparisons drawn from the public races and applied to Christians, as expressing strenuous effort in the Christian life and cause;  and we are exhorted to strive after the rewards of the Gospel as strenuously as the athletes did in the public games (1Co 9:24-27; Gal 2:2; Gal 5:7; Php 2:16; Php 3:14; 2Ti 2:5; 2Ti 4:6-8; Heb 12:1). Among the principal public games noticed by the historians are the Olympic, which were celebrated every fifth year, the Pythian, Nemean, and the Isthmian. These exercises principally consisted in trials of strength and skill — in running on foot, wrestling, leaping, throwing the dart and discus, also in the horse-race and chariot-race. SEE GAME.

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

The most strict and laborious preparation was made for these agonistic contests. alnd the whole course of preparation, as well as the contest, was governed by strict and established rules. The athletes who contended for the prize were divested of clothing; every impediment was removed; the prize was placed on a tripod in the middle of the stadium, in the full view of the competitors; and the crown was placed upon the conqueror's head the moment the issue was proclaimed by the judges. Those persons who designed to contend in these games were obliged to repair to the public gymnasium at Elis ten months before the solemnity, where they prepared themselves by continual exercises. No man who had omitted to present himself in this manner was allowed to contend for any of the prizes; nor were the accustomed rewards of victory given to such persons, if by any means they introduced themselves and overcame their antagonists. No person who was himself a notorious criminal, or nearly related to any such, was permitted to contend; and, further, if any person were convicted of bribing his adversary, a severe fine was laid upon him. Nor were these precautions alone thought a sufficient guard against evil and dishonorable contracts and unjust practices, but the contenders were obliged to swear  that they had spent ten whole months in preparatory exercises; and both they and their fathers, or brethren, took a solemn oath that they would not, by any sinister or unlawful means, endeavor to stop the fair and just proceedings of the games (Potter, Greek Antiq.).

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

“No greater honor e'er has been attain'd

Than what strong hand or nimble feet have gain'd.”

Indeed, all those exercises that conduced to fit men for war were more especially valued. Swiftness was looked upon as an excellent qualification in a warrior, both because it serves for a sudden assault and onset, and likewise for a nimble retreat; and therefore it is not to be wondered at that the constant character which Homer gives of Achilles is, that he was swift of foot; and in the Holy Scripture, David, in his poetical lamentation over those two great captains Saul and Jonathan, takes particular notice of this warlike quality of theirs: “They were swifter than eagles, stronger than lions” (2Sa 1:23). SEE AHIMAAZ.

Such as obtained victories in any of these games, especially the Olympic, were universally honored — nay, almost adored. At their return home they rode in a triumphal chariot into the city, the walls being broken down to give them entrance; which was done (as Plutarch is of opinion) to signify that walls are of small use to a city that is inhabited by men of courage and ability to defend it. At Sparta they had an honorable post in the army, being stationed near the king's person. At some towns they had presents made to them by their native city, were honored with the first place at shows and  games, and ever after maintained at the public charge. Cicero reports that a victory in the Olympic games was not much less honorable than a triumph at Rome. Happy was that man esteemed who could but obtain a single victory; if any person merited repeated rewards, he was thought to have attained the utmost felicity of which human nature is capable; but if he came off conqueror in all the exercises, he was elevated above the condition of men, and his actions styled wonderful victories. Nor did their honors terminate in themselves, but were extended to all about them; the city that gave them birth and education was esteemed more honorable and august; happy were their relations, and thrice happy their parents. It is a remarkable story which Plutarch relates of a Spartan who, meeting Diagoras, that had himself been crowned in the Olympic games, and seen his sons and grandchildren victors, embraced him and said, “Now die, Diagoras; for thou canst not be a god!” By the laws of Solon, a hundred drachms were allowed from the public treasury to every Athenian who obtained a prize in the Isthmian games, and five hundred drachms to such as were victors in the Olvmpiali. Afterwards, the latter of these had their maintenance in the Prytaneum, or public hall of Athens. The rewards given in these games have been thus rendered into English by Addison, from the Greek:

“Greece, in four games thy martial youth were train’d,

For heroes two, and two for gods ordain’d:

Jove bade the olive round his victor wave;

Phoebus to his an apple-garland gave;

The pine Palaemomn; nor with less renown,

Archemorus couferr’d the parsley crown.”

(Anc. Med. Dial. 2.)

Compare with these fading vegetable crowns that immortal life which the Gospel offers as a prize to the victor, in order to understand the apostle's comparison (1Co 9:25; 1Pe 5:4). SEE CROWN.

## Rachab[[@Headword:Rachab]]

             (Mat 1:5). SEE RAHAB.

## Rachal[[@Headword:Rachal]]

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

## Racham, Rachamah[[@Headword:Racham, Rachamah]]

             SEE GIER-EAGLE.

## Rachel[[@Headword:Rachel]]

             SEE SHEEP.

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

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

“The story of Jacob and Rachel has always had a peculiar interest: there is that in it which appeals to some of the deepest feelings of the human heart. The beauty of Rachel, the deep love with which she was loved by Jacob from their first meeting by the well of Haran, when he showed to her the simple courtesies of the desert life, and kissed her and told her he was Rebekah's son; the long servitude with which he patiently served for her, in which the seven years ‘seemed to him but a few days, for the love he had to her;' their marriage at last, after the cruel disappointment through the  fraud which substituted the elder sister in the place of the younger; and the death of Rachel at the very time when, in giving birth to another son, her own long-delayed hopes were accomplished, and she had become still more endeared to her husband; his deep grief and ever-living regrets for her loss (Gen 48:7) — these things make up a touching tale of personal anid domestic history which has kept alive the memory of Rachel — the beautiful, the beloved, the untimely-taken-away — and has preserved to this day a reverence for her tomb; the very infidel invaders of the Holy Land having respected the traditions of the site, and erected over the spot a small, rude shrine, which conceals whatever remains may have once been foulnd of the pillar first set up by her mourning husband over her grave. Yet, from what is related to us concerning Rachel's character, there does not seem much to claim any high degree of admiration and esteem. The discontent and fretful impatience shown in her grief at being for a time childless, moved even her fond husband to anger (Gen 30:1-2).

She appears, moreover, to have shared all the duplicity and falsehood of her family, of which we have such painfll instances in Rebekah, in Laban, and, not least, in her sister Leal, who consented to bear her part in the deception practiced upon Jacob. See, for instance, Rachel's stealing her father's images, and the ready dexterity and presence of mind with which she concealed her theft (ch. 31): we seem to detect here an apt scholar in her father's school of untruth. From this incident we may also infer (though this is rather the misfortune of her position and circumstances) that she was not altogether free from the superstitions aind idolatry which prevailed in the land whence Abraham had been called (Jos 24:2; Jos 24:14), and which still to some degree infected even those families among whom the true God was known. The events which preceded the death of Rachel are of much interest and worthy of a brief consideration. The presence in his household of these idolatrous images, which Rachel, and probably others also, had brought from the East, seems to have been either unknown to or connived at by Jacob for some years after his return from Haran; till, on being reminded by the Lord of the vow which he had made at Bethel when he fled from the face of Esau, and being bidden by him to erect an altar to the God who appeared to him there, Jacob felt the glaring impiety of thus solemnly appearing before God with the taint of impiety cleaving to him or his, and ‘said to his household and all that were with him, Put away the strange gods from among you' (Gen 35:2). After thus casting out the polluting thing from his house.

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

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

## Rachels Tomb[[@Headword:Rachels Tomb]]

             (קְבְרִתאּרָהֵל, Kibrath Rachel; Sept. in gen. for the former half of the title μνημεῖον, but in Jer 48:7, and 2Ki 5:19, Χαβραθά. This seems to have been accepted as the name of the spot [Demetrius in Eus. Pr. Ev. 9:21], and to have been actually encountered there by a traveller in the 12th century [Burchard de Strasburg, by Saint-Genois, p. 35], who gives the Arabic name of Rachel's tomb as Cabrata, or Cabata. The  present name is Kubbet Rahil, i.e. “Rachel's grave”). “Rachel died and was buried in the way Ephrath, which is Bethelehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day” (Gen 35:19-20). As Rachel is the first related instance of death in child-bearing, so this pillar over her grave is the first recorded example of the setting-up of a sepulchral monument; caves having been up to this time spoken of as the usual places of burial. The spot was well known in the time of Samuel and Saul (1Sa 10:2); and the prophet Jeremiah, by a poetic figure of great force and beauty, represents the buried Rachel weeping for the loss and captivity of her children, as the bands of the exiles, led away on their road to Babylon, passed near her tomb (Jer 31:15-17). Mat 2:17-18 applies this to the slaughter by Herod of the infants at Bethlehem. SEE RACHEL

The position of the Ramah here spoken of is one of the disputed questions in the topography of Palestine, SEE RAMAH; but the site of Rachel's tomb, “on the way to Bethlehem,” “a little way to come to Ephrath,” “in the border of Benjamin,” has never been questioned. It is about five miles south of Jerusalem, and half a mile north of Bethlehem. “It is one of the shrines which Moslems, Jews, and Christians agree in honoring, and concerning which their traditions are identical.” It was visited by Maundrell in 1697. The description given by Dr. Robinson (1:218) may serve as the representative of the many accounts, all agreeing with each other, which may be read in almost every book of Eastern travel. It is “merely an ordinary Moslem wely, or tomb of a holy person — a small square building of stone with a dome, and within it a tomb in the ordinary Mohammedan form, the whole plastered over with mortar. Of course the building is not ancient: in the 7th century there was here only a pyramid of stones. It is now neglected and falling to decay, though pilgrimages are still made to it by the Jews.

The naked walls are covered with names in several languages, many of them in Hebrew. The general correctness of the tradition which has fixed upon this spot for the tomb Rachel cannot well be drawn in question, since it is fully supported by the circumstances of the Scriptural narrative. It is also mentioned by the Itin. Hieros., A. D. 333, and by Jerome(Ep. 86, ad Eustoch. Epitaph. Pauloe) in the same century.” Since Robinson's visit, it has been enlarges by the addition of a square court on the east side, with high walls and arches (Later Researches, p. 273). Schwarz (Palest, p. 109 sq.) strongly supports the identity of the true grave of Rachel with the monument which now bears that name (see also  Bibliotheca Sacra, 1830, p. 602; Journ. of Sac. Lit. April, 1864). This monument is particularly described by Hackett (Illust. of Script. P. 101 sq.). SEE BETHLEHEM.

## Racine, Bonaventure[[@Headword:Racine, Bonaventure]]

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

## Racovian Catechism[[@Headword:Racovian Catechism]]

             a Socinian catechism which was published in Poland in the 17th century. It was prepared by Schmalz, a learned German Socinian who had settled in Poland, and by Moskovzewski, a learned and wealthy nobleman. It derived its name from being published at Racow, a little town in southern Poland, the seat of a famous Socinian school. The catechism was published in Polish and Latin, and afterwards translated into German and English. In 1652 the English parliament declared it to contain matters that are blasphemous, erroneous, and scandalous, and ordered "the sheriffs of London and Middlesex to seize all copies wherever they might be found, and cause them to be burned at the Old Exchange, London, and at the New Palace, Westminster." A new English translation was published in 1817 by Abraham Rees, with a historical introduction. There was also a smaller catechism, drawn up by Schmalz in German, and first published in 1605. SEE CATECHISM; SEE SOCINIANISM.

## Radbertus[[@Headword:Radbertus]]

             SEE PASCHASIUS.

## Radbod[[@Headword:Radbod]]

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

## Raddai[[@Headword:Raddai]]

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

## Radegunda[[@Headword:Radegunda]]

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

## Rader, Matthaeus[[@Headword:Rader, Matthaeus]]

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

## Radewin, Florentinus[[@Headword:Radewin, Florentinus]]

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

## Radha[[@Headword:Radha]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the first wife of the god Krishna. She was afterwards adored as the goddess of love.

## Radha Vallabhis[[@Headword:Radha Vallabhis]]

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

## Radulfus[[@Headword:Radulfus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the see of Brechin in 1202. He died in 1218. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 157.

## Radvulf[[@Headword:Radvulf]]

             a Scotch prelate, was ordained bishop of the see of Galloway in 790. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 272.

## Rae, William[[@Headword:Rae, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of Glasgow in 1335, and died in 1367. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 244.

## Raey, John De[[@Headword:Raey, John De]]

             a Dutch theologian and philosopher, flourished in the second half of the 17th century, at Leyden. He was a devoted Cartesianist, and distinguished himself greatly as such in 1665 at public disputation. He was in favor of  complete alienation of philosophy from religion, and had a dangerous tendency to scepticism of the very worst character. See Spanheim, Apistola, in Opp. i, 959.

## Raffaelle[[@Headword:Raffaelle]]

             SEE RAPHAEL.

## Rafflenghen, Franz[[@Headword:Rafflenghen, Franz]]

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

## Raffles, Thomas[[@Headword:Raffles, Thomas]]

             D.D., LL.D., an English Independent divine of great celebrity as a pulpit orator and theologian, was born in London, May 17, 1788, of good parentage, and was connected nith Sir Thomas S. Raffles. He pursued his theological studies at Hoinertol College, and in 1809 was settled as a Congregationlal minister at Hammersmith. In 1812 he accepted a call from the Great George Street Chapel in Liverpool, and remained sole pastor until 1858, when he was furnished a colleague as an assistant. In 1860 he resigsned his charge, and withdrew from the responsibilities of' the stated ministry altogether, his health having become inadequate to any considerable labor, yet he preached frequently after that at the opening of chapels and on other similar public occasions. He died Aug. 18, 1863.

Probably no minister in the Congregational body in England has been more widely or more feavorably known during the last half century than Dr. Raffles. Besides being one of the most popular preachers in Great Britain, and being called abroad on occasions of public interest oftener, perhaps, than any other one, he has done good service to the cause both of literature and religion by his pen. In 1817 he published a highly interesting volume of Letters during a Tour through Some Parts of France, Savoy, Switzerland. Germany, and the Netherlands. Shortly after the commencement of his ministry he preached a sermon before the London Missionary Society, which attracted great attention and was very widely circulated; and several  other of his discourses have been given to the public and received with great favor. He was accustomed to celebrate the return of the new year by amn appropriate piece of poetry, which was printed and sent forth among his friends as a most welcome remembrancer. He has, in addition to these pieces, written many beautiful hymns, some of which have found their way into some of the collections of sacred song. He is also the author of a Memoir of the life and ministry of his predecessor, the Rev. Thomas Spencer, a work which passed through many editions, and in America it has been several times reprinted. His Lectures on Christian Faith and Practice, though widely circulated, deserve to be better known than thev are, being a clear and conclusive exposition and vindication of the Gospel and the rule and motives of morality. He published several separate sermons preached on various public occasions, and contributed frequently to periodicals. See The Patriot (Liverpool), Aug. 20, 1863; N. Y. Observer, Sept. 19, 1863; Princeton Rev. April, 1870, art. 3.

## Raffles, Thomas Stamford[[@Headword:Raffles, Thomas Stamford]]

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

## Rafin, Gaspard[[@Headword:Rafin, Gaspard]]

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

## Ragau[[@Headword:Ragau]]

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

1. A place named only in the Apocrypha (Jdt 1:5; Jdt 1:15). In the latter verse the “mountains of Ragau” are mentioned. It is probably identical with RAGES SEE RAGES (q.v.).

2. One of the ancestors of our Lord, son of Phalec (Luk 3:35). He is the same person with REU SEE REU (q.v.), son of Peleg; and the  difference in the name arises from our translators having followed the Greek form, in which the Hebrew עwas frequently expressed by γ, as is the case in Raguel (which once occurs for Reuel), Gomorrha, Gotholiah (for Atholiah), Phogor (for Peor), etc.

## Rages[[@Headword:Rages]]

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

Rages is a place mentioned by a great number of profane writers. The name is said to have been derived from the chasms (ῥαγάς) made in the vicinity by earthquakes (Strabo, i, 13). It appears as Ragha in the Zendavesta, in Isidore, and in Stephen; as Raga in the inscriptions of Darius; Rhalce in Duris of Samos (Fr. 25), Strabo (xi, 9, § 1), and Arrian (Exp. Alex. iii, 20); and Rhagcoea in Ptolemy (vi, 5). Properly speaking, Rages is a town, but the town gave name to a province, which is sometimes called Rages or Rhagae, sometimes Rhagiana. It appears from the Zendavesta that here was one of the earliest settlements of the Arians, who were minglgd, in Rhagiana, with two other races, and were thus brought into contact with heretics (Bunsen, Philosophy of Universal History, iii, 485). Isidore calls Rages “the greatest city in Media” (p. 6), which may have been true in his day; but other writers commonly regard it as much inferior to Ecbatana. It was the place to which Frawartish (Phraortes), the Median rebel, fled when defeated by Darius Hystaspis, and at which he was made prisoner by one of Darius's generals (Beh. Inscs. col. ii, par. 13). SEE MEDIA.

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

## Ragged Schools[[@Headword:Ragged Schools]]

             is the popular name for a voluntary agency providing education for destitute children, and so preventing them from falling into vagrancy and crime. Vagrant children, and those guilty of slight offences, are provided for in the English Certified Industrial School; but the two institutions are in Great Britain frequently combined. SEE INDUSTRIAL SCHOOLS.

The movement which established ragged schools was almost simultaneous with that which instituted reformatories. John Borgia, an unlettered laboring mason, established a “ragged school” towards the close of the last century, composed of thievish and vagrant children gathered from the streets and by-ways of Rome. A few years later, John Pounds, an uneducated cobbler, for twenty years, till his death in 1839, gathered into his shop the most  destitute and degraded children of Portsmouth, and thus instituted the first ragged school in England. Both wrought miracles among the juvenile gamzins of the street. The mental, industrial, moral, and religious training which they imparted to the juvenile generation of their time was a work most appropriately honored as “the beginning of the greatest of all social problems.” It saved thousands of children from beggary and vice, and raised multitudes from the verge of infamy to the rank of a useful and honored life. The first school in which education was accompanied by offer of food was opened by Sheriff Watson in Aberdeen in 1841, and from thence ragged feeding-schools spread over all the country. London had a ragged Sunday-school in 1838, ivhich eventually became a free day-school. Field Lane followed in 1843. The Ragged School Union of London in 1864 numbered 201 day-schools, with 17,983 scholars (of these, 2849 were industrial); 180 Sunday-schools, with 23,360 scholars; and 205 night- schools, with 8325 scholars. The number of schools throughout the country cannot be ascertained, as they are not officially known. A Privy- council minute of 1856 allowed a capitation grant of £2 10s. to every child fed in the schools. This was withdrawn in 1859, as was also the grant of one third the cost of material used in industrial training. Many of the existing schools certified lunder the Act of 1857, as in Scotland under Mr. Dunlllop's Act of 1854; but these acts operated very slightly in changing the character of the schools, though introducing the principle of compulsory detention, more fully worked out under recent acts. In the present code of government education, ragged schools are left out. They canl obtain grants on the same conditions as other schools-conditions to them often difficult and unnecessary. For industrial teaching, they receive nothing. The ragged school joined to the certified industrial is precluded from aid from any quarter. There are still, it is estimated, 25,000 ragged children in the streets of London. Schools for the instruction of poor colored children were established by the Friends of Philadelphia as early as 1770, and their benevolent care has not relaxed in this respect for an entire centurv. SEE ALSO SUNDAY-SCHOOLS

.

## Ragnarokr[[@Headword:Ragnarokr]]

             (Divine twilight), in Norse mythology, is the final destruction of the world, which threatens the Scandinavian deities, the Asas, their treasures, their creations, and also the earth and its inhabitants. The Edda gives the following description of it:

"There will come a winter, called Fimbulweter, in which snow will fall from all sides, with a severe frost and rough winds, whereby the warmth of the sun will be destroyed. Three such winters will succeed each other without a summer intervening. But previous to these there will be three years of bloody war over the whole earth. Brothers will slay each other, and even parents will not spare their children. Then the wolf Skoll will devour the sun, another wolf, Hati, the moon. The stars will disappear from the heavens, the earth will reel, the trees will be torn out by their roots, the mountains fall, and all chains and bands burst asunder. The Fenriswolf will tear himself loose, the sea boil, because the Midgard-snake will seek the shore. Then also, the ship Naglfar will become loose. It is made out of the nails of human beings. The giant Hryvner is pilots The wolf Feunris precedes it with open mouth. The Midgardsnake vomits poison, which contaminates the air and the water. In this tumult the heavens will burst, and Mnspel's sons come riding, led by Surtur, who is surrounded by fire, and whose sword shines brighter than the sun. When they ride over Bifrfst (rainbow bridge) it will collapse. Muspel's sons will come to Fenris aid the Midgard-snake. Loke, Itrymer, and all Hrymtuuses will join them. Muspel's sons will have their own order of battle. Then Heimidal will blow into the Giallar horn and wake up all the gods. Odin will ride to Mimer's well to get advice for him and his. The ash-tree Ygdrasil will fall, and everything be full of fear in heaven and earth. The Asas will prepare themselves with the Einheriars anid proceed to the plain. Before them will ride Odin with a golden helmet, a good armor, and the never-failing spear Gungna. He will battle against Fenris. Thor will fight at his side against the Midgard-snake. Freir will  combat against Suirtur, and will fall. The cause is the lack of a good sword, which hie gave to Skirner. The dog Gramr will tear himself loose, causing much misery. He will combat Tyr, and the two kill each other. Thor will slay the snake, but fall, poisoned by the snake's venom. The wolf will devour Odin, but Vidar will renud open his law and pull Odin out. After all this, Surtur will throw fire and burn the whole earth. But then there shall arise out of the sea a beautiful green earth, in which corn will grow. Vidar and Vali will live on the Ida-plain where fomerly Asgamrd lay. There Thor's sons also, Magni and Modi, will appear with the hammer, Miolner. Hodur, Baldui, and Hel will also be there. There will likewise be two human beings, Lif and Lifthirasir, who will become the progenitors of the new race of men."

## Ragstatt, Frederic[[@Headword:Ragstatt, Frederic]]

             of Weile, a minister of the Reformed Church, was born, of Jewish parents, at Metz in 1648. In the year 1671 he was baptized at Cleves in the faith of the Reformed Church; and his conversion and public confession of the divine truths of Christianity were not less remarkable. Shortly after his baptism, when scarcely twenty-three years of age, he published a Latin  apology: Theatrum Lucidumn, exhibens Verum Messiam, Dominus nostrum Jesum Christum, ejusque Honorem Defendens contra Accusationes Judorum seu Rabbinorum in Genere, speciatir R. Lipmanni Nizzachon (Amst. 1671), in which the name of the Messiah, our Lord Jesus Christ, was gloriously maintained against the abominable Nizzachon of the famous Rabbi Lipmann (q.v.). Having studied at Groningen and Leyden, in 1680 he was called to the pastorate at Spyk, near Gorcum, in South Holland, where he labored with great blessing, bringing many of his former coreligionists to the foot of the cross. Besides his Theatrum, he published some other writings. See First, Bibl. Judaica, iii, 128 sq.; Jicher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. “Von Weile;” Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. I, iii, 4 (Nuremb. 1850); Bayle, Dictionnaire, s.v.; Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 63 sq.; Delitzsch, Wissenschaft, Kunst u. Judenthum, p. 138; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 561 sq. (B. P.)

## Raguel[[@Headword:Raguel]]

             (Heb. רְעוּאֵל; Sept. ῾Ραγουήλ), a less correct Anglicism of the name REUEL SEE REUEL (q.v.).

1. A prince-priest of Midian, the father of Zipporah, according to Exodus ii, 21, and of Hobab according to Num 10:29. As the father-in-law of Moses is named Jethro in Exo 3:1, and Hobab in Jdg 4:11, and perhaps in Num 10:29 (though the latter passage admits of another sense), the prima-facie view would be that Raguel, Jethro, and Hobab were different names for the same individual. Such is probably the case with regard to the two first, at all events, if not with the third. SEE HOBAB.

One of the names may represent an official title, but whether Jethro or Raguel is uncertain, both being appropriately significant (Jethro “pre-eminent,” from יתר, “to excel,” and Raguel= “friend of God,” from רְעוּ אֵל). Josephus was in favor of the former (τουτο, i.e. Ι᾿εθεγλαῖος, ην ἐπίκλημα τῷ ῾Ραγουήλῳ, Ant. ii, 12, 1), and this is not unlikely, as the name Reuel was not an uncommon one. The identity of Jethro and Reuel is supported by the indiscriminate use of the names in the Sept. (Exo 2:16; Exo 2:18); and the application of more than one name to the same individual was a usage familiar to the Hebrews, as instanced in Jacob and Israel, Solomon anti Jedidiah, and other similar cases. Another solution of the difficulty has been sought in the loose use of terms of relationship among the Hebrews; as that chothen (חֹתֵן) in Exo 3:1; Exo 18:1;  Num 10:29, may signify any relation by marriage, and consequently that Jethro and Hobab were brothers-in-law of Moses; or that the terms arb (אָב) and bath (בִּת) in Exo 2:16; Exo 2:21, mean grandfatther and grandtdauughter. Neither of these assumptions is satisfactory, the former in the absence of any corroborative evidence, the latter because the omission of Jethro, the father's name, in so circumstantial a narrative as in Exodus ii, is inexplicable; nor can we conceive the indiscriminate use of the terms father and grandfather without good cause. Nevertheless, this view has a strong mweight of authority in its favor, being supported by the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Michaelis, Winer, and others. SEE JETHRO

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

## Ragueneau, Frederic De[[@Headword:Ragueneau, Frederic De]]

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

## Rahab[[@Headword:Rahab]]

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

I. (Heb. Raechab', רָחָב, wide; Sept. ῾Ραχάβ [and so in Mat 1:5, “Rachab”], ῾Ραάβ; Josephus, ῾Ραχάβης, Ant. v, 1, 2.) A woman of Jericho  at the time of the Eisode, whose name has become famous in that connection (Joshua 2) and in Jewish lineage (B.C. 1618). In the following accounlt of her we chiefly follow the Biblical and other ancient authorities, with additions from modern sources. SEE EXODE.

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

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

As regards Rahab herself, we learn from Mat 1:5 that she became the wife of Salmon, the son of Nahshon, and the ancestress of Boaz, Jesse's grandfather. The suspicion naturally arises that Salmon may have been one of the spies whose life she saved, and that gratitude for so great a benefit led, in his case, to a more tender passion, and obliterated the memory of any past Disgrace attaching to her name. We are expressly told that the spies were “young men” (Jos 6:23) — Sept. νεανίσκους, 2, 1; and the example qf the former spies who were sent from Kadesh- Barnea, who were all “heads of Israel” (Num 13:3), as well as the importance of the service to be performed, would lead one to expect that they would be persons of high station. But, however this may be, it is certain, on the authority of Matthew, that Rahab became the mother of the line from which sprang David, and, eventually, Christ; and there can be little doubt that it was so stated in the public archives from which the evangelist extracted our Lord's genealogy, in which only four women are named — viz. Thamar, Rachab, Ruth, and Bathsheba — who were all, apparently, foreigners, and named for that reason; for that the Rachab mentioned by Matthew is Rahab the harlot is as certain as that David in the genealogy is the same person as David in the books of Samuel. The attempts that have been made to prove Rachab different from Rahab (chiefly by Outhov, a Dutch professor, in the Biblioth. Bremens. iii, 438: the earliest expression of any doubt is by Theophylact, in the 11th century) in order to get out of the chronological difficulty, are singularly absurd, and all the more so because, even if successful, they would not diminish the difficulty as long as Salmon remains as the son of Nahshon and the ancestor of Boaz. However, as there are still found those who follow Outhov in his opinion, or at least speak doubtfully (Valpy, Greek Test. with English notes, on Matthew i, 5; Burrington, On the Genealogies, i, 192- 194, etc.; Kuinil, on Matt. i, 5; Olshausen, ibid.), it may be as well to call attention, with Dr. Mill (p. 131), to the exact coincidence in the age of Salmon, as the son of Nahshon, who was prince of the children of Judah in the wilderness, and that of Rahab the harlot. and to observe that the only conceivable reason for the mention of Rachab in Matthew's genealogy is that she was a remarkable and well-known person, as Tainar, Ruth, and Bathsheba were. The mention of an utterly unknown Rahab in the line  would be absurd. The allusions to “Rahab the harlot” in Heb 11:31; Jam 2:25, by classing her among those illustrious for their faith, make it still more impossible to suppose that Matthew was speaking of any one else. The four generations, Nahshon, Salmon, Boaz, Obed, are, nevertheless, not necessarily all consecutive. SEE DAVID.

There does not seem, however, to be any force in Bengel's remark, adopted by Olshausen, that the article (ἐκ τῆς ῾Ραχάβ) proves that Rahab of Jericho is meant, seeing that all the proper names in the genealogy which are in the oblique case have the article, though many of them occur nowhere else, and that it is omitted before Μαρίας in Jam 2:16. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

The Jewish writers abound in praises of Rahab, on account of the great service she rendered their ancestors. Even those who do not deny that she was a harlot admit that she eventually became the wife of a prince of Israel, and that many great persons of their nation sprang from this union. The general statement is, that she was ten years of age at the time the Hebrews quitted Egypt; that she played the harlot during all the forty years they were in the wilderness: that she became a proselyte when the spies were received by her; and that, after the fall of Jericho, no less a personage than Joshua himself made her his wife. She is also counted as an ancestress of Jeremiah, Maaseiah, Hanameel, Shallum, Baruch, Ezekiel, Neriah, Serial, and Huldah the prophetess. See Talm. Babyl. Megillah, fol. 14. Colossians 2 : Yuchasin, 10:1; Shalshalet Hakabala, 7:2; Abarbanel, Kimchi, etc., on Jos 6:25; Mitzvoth Toreh, p. 112; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. ad Matthew i1:4; Meuschen, N.T. Talmud, p. 40. SEE JOSHUA

2. Rahab's Character. — This has been a subject of deep interest and no little controversy. In the narrative of these transactions, Rahab is called זוֹנָה, zotih, which our own, after the ancient versions, renders “Harlot.” The Jewish writers, however, being unwilliig to entertain the idea of their ancestors being involved in a disreputable association at the commencement of their great undertaking, chose to interpret the word “hostess,” one who keeps a public-house, as if from זוּן, “to nourish” (Josephus, Ant. v, 1; ii and vii; comp. the Targum, and Kimchi and Jarchi on the text). Christian translators, also, are inclined to adopt this interpretation for the sake of the character of a woman of whom the apostle speaks well, and who would appear, from Mat 1:4, to have become, by a subsequent marriage with Salmon, prince of Judah, an  ancestress of Jesus. But we must be content to take facts as they stand, and not strain them to meet difficulties; and it is now universally admitted by every sound Hebrew scholar that זוֹנָהmeans “harlot,” and not “hostess.” It signifies “harlot” in every other text where it occurs, the idea of “hostess” not being represented by this or any other word in Hebrew, as the function represented by it did not exist. (See Frisch, De Miuliere Peregrina tp. Heb. [Lips. 1744].) There were no inns; and when certain substitutes for inns eventually came into use, they were never, in any Eastern country, kept by women. On the other hand, strangers from beyond the river might have repaired to the house of a harlot without suspicion or remark: the Bedawin from the desert constantly do so at this day in their visits to Cairo and Bagdad. The house of such a woman was also the only one to which they, as perfect strangers, could have had access, and certainly the only one in which they could calculate on obtaining the information they required without danger from male inmates. Thnis concurrence of analogies in the word, in the thing, and in the probability of circumstances ought to settle the question. If we are concerned for the morality of Rahab, the best proof of her reformation is found in the fact of her subsequent marriage to Salmon: this implies her previous conversion to Judaism, for which, indeed, her discourse with the spies evinces that she vas prepared. Dismissing, therefore, as inconsistent with truth and with the meaning of זוֹנָהand πόρνη, the attempt to clear her character of stain by saying that she was only an innkeeper, and not a harlot πανδοκευτρία, Chrysostom and Chald. Vers.), we may yet notice that it is very possible that to a woman of her country and religion such a calling may have implied a far less deviation from the standard of morality than it does with us (“vitae genus vile magis quam flagitiosum:” Grotius), and, moreover, that with a purer faith she seems to have entered upon a pure life. SEE HARLOT.

As a case of casuistry, her conduct in deceiving the king of Jericho's messengers with a false tale, and, above all, in taking part against her own countrymen, has been much discussed. With regard to the first, strict truth, either in Jew or heathen, was a virtue so utterly unknown before the promulgation of the Gospel that, so far as Rahab is concerned, the discussion is quite superfluous. The question, as regards ourselves, whether in any case a falsehood is allowable — say to save our own life or that of another — is different, but need not be argued here. The question, in reference both to Rahab and to Christians, is well discussed by  Augustiue, Contr. Mendacium (Opp. 6:33, 34; comp. Bullinger, 3d Dec. Serm. iv). With regard to ler taking part against her own countrymen, it can only be justified — but is fully justified — by the circumstance that fidelity to her country would, in her case, have been infidelity to God, and that the higher duty to her Maker eclipsed the lower duty to her native land. Her anxious provision for the safety of her father's house shows how alive she was to natural affections, and seems to prove that she was not influenced by a selfish insensibility, but by an enlightened preference faor the service of the true God over the abominable pollutions of Canaanitish idolatry. If her own life of shame was in any way connected with that idolatry, one can readily understand what a further stimulus this would give, now that her heart was purified by faith, to her desire for the overthrow of the nation to which she belonged by birth, and the establishment of that to which she wished to belong by a community of faith and hope. Anyhow, allowing for the difference of circumstances, her feelings and conduct were analogous to those of a Christian Jew in Paul's time, who should have preferred the triumph of the Gospel to the triumph of the old Judaism, or to those of a converted Hindu in our own days, who should side with Christian Englishmen against the attempts of his own countrymen to establish the supremacy either of Brahma or Mohammed.

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

The fathers generally (“miro consensu:” Jacobson) consider the deliverance of Rahab as typical of salvation, and the scarlet line hung out at her window as typical of the blood of Jesus, in the same way as the ark of Noah and the blood of the paschal lamb were — a view which is borne out by the analogy of the deliverances, and by the language of Heb 11:31 (τοῖς ἀπειθήσασιν, “the disobedient”), compared with 1Pe 3:20 (ἀπειθησασίν ποτε). Clement (ad Corinth. 12) is the first to do so. He says that by the symbol of the scarlet line it was “made manifest that there shall be redemption through the blood of the Lord to all who believe  and trust in God,” and adds that Rahab in this was a prophetess as well as a believer — a sentiment in which he is followed by Origen (in lib. Jes., Hon. iii). Justin Martyr, in like manner, calls the scarlet line “the symbol of the blood of Christ, by which those of all nations who once were harlots and unrighteous are saved;” andl in a like spirit Irenaeus draws from the story of Rahab the conversion of the Gentiles, and the admission of publicans and harlots into the kingdom of heaven through the symbol of the scarlet line, which he compares with the Passover and the Exodus. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine (who, like Jerome and Cyril, takes Psa 87:4 to refer to Rahab the harlot), and Theodoret, all follow in the same track; but Origen, as usual, carries the allegory still further. Irenaeus makes the singular mistake of calling the spies three, andl makes them symbolical of the Trinity! The comparison of the scarlet line with the scarlet thread wmhich was bound round the hand of Zarah is a favorite one with them. See Ireneus, Contr. Her. 4:xx; Just. Mart. Contr. Tryph. p. 11; Jerome, Adv. Jovin. lib. i; Epist. 34 ad Nepot.; Breviar. in Psalms 86; Origen, Comm. in Matthew 27; Chrysost. Hon. 3 in Matt., also 3 ins Ep. ad Roml.; Eph. Syr. Rhythm 1 and 7 on Nativ.; Rhythm 7 on the Faith; Cyril of Jerusalem, Catechet. Lect. ii, 9; 10:11. Bullinger (5th Dec. Sermn. vi) views the line as a sign and seal of the covenant between the Israelites and Rahab.

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

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

II. (Heb. Ra'hab, רִהִב, strength; Sept. ῾Ραάβ, Psa 87:4; τὸ κῆτος, Job 16:12; ὑπερήφανος, Psa 89:10; omits Isa 51:9). A  poetical name signifying “sea monster,” which is applied as an appellation to Egypt in Psa 74:13-14; Psa 87:4; Psa 89:10; Isa 51:9 (and sometimes to its king, Eze 29:3; Eze 33:3; comp. Psa 68:31) — which metaphorical designation probably involves an allusion to the crocodiles, hippopotami, and other aquatic creatures of the Nile (q.v.). As the word, if Hebrew, radically denotes “fierceness, insolence, pride,” when applied to Egypt, it would indicate the national character of the inhabitants. Gesenius thinks it was probably of Egyptian origin. but accommodated to Hebrew, although no likely equivalent has been found in Coptic, or, we may add, in ancient Egyptian (Thesaur. s.v.). That the Hebrew meaning is alluded to in connection with the proper name does not seem to prove that the latter is Hebrew, but this is rendered very probable by its apposite character and its sole use in poetical books. SEE BEHEMIOTH.

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

## Raham[[@Headword:Raham]]

             (Heb. Rach'am, רִחִם, belly; Sept. ‘Paest), the son of Shema and father of Jorkoam, in the genealogy of the descendants of Caleb the son of Hezron,  of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 2:44). B.C. post 1600. Rashi and the author of the Quaest. in Paral., attributed to Jerome, regard Jorkoam as a place, of which Raham was founder and prince.

## Rahauser, Frederick A[[@Headword:Rahauser, Frederick A]]

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

## Rahel[[@Headword:Rahel]]

             a form originally adopted everywhere in the A. V. (in the edition of 1611) for the present familiar name RACHEL SEE RACHEL (q.v.), but retained  in our present Bible only in Jer 31:15, apparently by a mere oversight of the later editors.

## Rahu[[@Headword:Rahu]]

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

## Rai Dasis[[@Headword:Rai Dasis]]

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

## Raiford, Matthew[[@Headword:Raiford, Matthew]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Jefferson Co., Ga., July 12, 1789. He enjoyed the comfortable assurance of grace at or before the tenth year of his age, and joined the Church in his eleventh year. He was licensed to exhort March 28, 1818, and was licensed to preach Dec. 6. He entered the Georgia Conference at the ensuing session, and filled various appointments until 1842, when he ceased to be an effective preacher. He was sorely afflicted for several years before his death, but often spoke of it with calmness and Christian confidence. He  died in Monroe Co., Ga., April 16,1849. — Minutes of Annual Conf. of the M. E. Ch., South, 1850, p. 25.

## Raikes, Henry[[@Headword:Raikes, Henry]]

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

## Raikes, Robert[[@Headword:Raikes, Robert]]

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

In 1781 his attention was directed to the children of the poor. He had, bv frequlent intercourse with the common people, learned of their low intellectual state and the absolute neglect suffered by the rising generations. He was struck,  as he himself tells us in one of his letters written in 1784, with the number of wretched children whom he found in the suburbs of Gloucester, chiefly in the neighborhood of a pin manufactory, where their parents were employed, wholly abandoned to themselves, half clothed, half fed, and growing up in the most degrading vices. The state of the streets was worse on Sunday, when the older chlildren, who were employed in the factory on week-days, were joined to their younger associates; and all manner of excesses became the theme of complaint on the part of the shopmen and the property-owners generally. Even the farmers near there complained of the depredations frequently committed by juvenile offenders. Raikes determined to provide a remedy for this growing evil. He saw very clearly the surest result in education, and therefore sought the help of four excellent teachers and devoted Christian womcn, whom he paid a small allowance for their services, and, gathering the children on the Sabbath- day, attempted the kind of work which has given shape to the modern Sabbath-school. He procured the help of the clergy, and the enterprise begun in such an unpretending manner grew into proportions of which Raikes himself had not had the faintest idea. The instruction was at first confined to reading and writing. Instead of secular text-books, the Bible was the principal reading-book used, and so the children were made familiar with the Gospel's great benefits to man. How he got the children we will let him tell in his own language: “I went around,” he says, “to remonstrate with numbers of the poor on the melancholy consequences that must ensue from a fatal neglect of their children's morals. I prevailed with some, and others soon followed; and the school began to prosper in numbers.

The children were to come soon after ten in the morning and stay till twelve; they were then to go home and return at one, and, after reading a lesson, they were to be conducted to church. After church they were to be employed in repeating the catechism till half-past five, and then to be dismissed with an injnunction to go home without making a noise, and by no means to play in the street. With regard to the rules adopted, I only required that they come to the school on Sunday as clean as possible. Many were at first deterred because they wanted decent clothing, but I could not undertake to supply this defect. Although without shoes and in a ragged coat, I rejected none on that account; all that I required were clean hands, a clean face, and the hair combed. If they had no clean shirt, they were to come in that which they had on. The want of decent apparel at first kept great numbers at a distance, but they gradually became wiser, and all pressed to learn. I had the good luck to procure places for some that were  deserving, which was of great use. The children attending the school varied from six years old to twelve or fourteen. Little rewards were distributed among the most diligent this excited an emulation.” The mode of procedure is thus described by himself: “Upon the Sunday afternoon the mistresses take their scholars to church, a place which neither they nor their ancestors ever entered with a view to the glory of God. They assemble at the house of one of the mistresses, and walk before her to church, two and two, in as much order as a company of soldiers. I am generally at church, and after service they all come round me to make their bow, and, if any animosities have arisen, to make their complaint.

The great principle I inculcate is to be kmbd and good-natured to each other; not to provoke one another; to be dutifill to their parents; not to offend God by cursing and swearing, and such plain precepts as all mayv comprehend.” Although other schemes may have been formed on a larger scale and excited a more romantic interest. none were ever so productive of more extensively beneficial results. The necessity, and the advantages to be derived from the establishment, of such schools seem to have occurred about the same time to several individuals in various parts of the country; and although Mr. Stoxe, in particular, the rector of St. John's, Gloucester, cordially co-operated in the erection and superintendence of the Sunday- schools in that city, yet, for the energetic development of the principle, for the carrying-out into practical details and bringing it in the most advantageous form before the country so as to render it a prolific source of public benefit, to Robert Raikes, beyond all dispute, belongs the honorable title of the Founder of Sunday-schools. Three years after the inauguration of the Gloucester institution, the inhabitants of an obscure district where he had fixed a school remarked that “the place had become quite a heaven upon Sundays compared to what it used to be.” Schools of the same kind were, ere long, opened in most of the large towns in England. A Sunday- school Society was opened in London under the auspices of such men as Henry Thornton, bishops Barrington, Porteus, and other well-known Christians of the period; and, at a general meeting of that association, held on July 11, 1787, it was resolved unanimously that, in consideration of the zeal and merits of Robert Raikes, he be admitted an honorary member of the society. Within the sphere of his own immediate experience, Raikes had the satisfaction of seeing the happiest fruits spring from the institutions in Gloucester; for, out of all the thousands of poor children who were educated at those Sunday-schools, it was found, after a long series of years, that not one had ever been either in the city or county prisons.  Raikes died April 5, 1811. See Gentleman's Magazine (Lolll.), 1784-1831. pt. ii, 132, 294; Sketch of the Life of Robt. Raikes, (and the History of Sunday Schools (N. Y. 18mo); Cornell, Life of Robert Raikes (N. Y. 1864); Jamieson, Christian Biography, s.v.

## Raikes, Timothy[[@Headword:Raikes, Timothy]]

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

## Railes, Richard[[@Headword:Railes, Richard]]

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

## Raillon, Jacques[[@Headword:Raillon, Jacques]]

             a French prelate, born at Bourgoin, July 17, 1762, was educated for the priesthood at the seminary in Lucon, in which he had been placed by bishop Mercy of that place. After graduation he was made a curate of Montaigu, but was obliged in the Revolutionary period to quit his parish, alnd lived for some time at Paris, where he took the defence of the priests in his Appel au Peuple Catholiqe (1792, 8vo). But he became only notorious, and, by the gravity of the situation, was forced from the country. He lived for a while at Soleur, in Switzerland, then at Venice, in Italy, and only returned to France in 1804. He at once became teacher in the house of Portalis, then minister of cultus, and by his influence Raillon was in 1809 made professor of pulpit oratory in the theological faculty at Paris, and titulary canon of Notre Dame.

In the latter capacity he pronounced the funeral orations upon marshal Lannes and other distinguished countrymen of his, and so markedly acquitted himself in this task that he was given the episcopacy of Orleans in 1810. The unpleasant relations then existing between the government of France and the papacy, however, prevented his confirmation, and in 1816 he went into retirement at Paris. The government, however, was unwilling to suffer the loss of such a faithful and efficient ecclesiastic, and in 1829 he was nominated bishop of Dijon and promptly confirmed as such. In 1830 he was made archbishop of Aix, and there he resided until his death, in 1835. On his departure from Dijon a medal was struck in his honor by his diocese, so greatly was he beloved. The recently expired Dupanloup (1878), who figured as bishop, and more recently as archbishop, of Orleans, at one time involved Raillon in controversy and took offensive ground; but Raillon was universally  supported by the French press and a majority of the French clergy, and for a while bishop Dupanloup lost much of his popularity on account of his conduct in this affair. His works are of a secular character, excepting the Histoire de Saint-Ambrose (which was to form four or five vols. in 8vo, but of which the MS. was lost). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v. (J. H. W.)

## Rails Of The Altar[[@Headword:Rails Of The Altar]]

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

## Raiment[[@Headword:Raiment]]

             SEE CLOTHING; SEE DRESS; SEE GARMENT.

## Raimondi, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Raimondi, Giovanni Battista]]

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

## Raimondi, Marc Antonio[[@Headword:Raimondi, Marc Antonio]]

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

## Rain[[@Headword:Rain]]

             Heb. מָטָר, matar, and also גֶּשֶׁם, geshem, which, however, rather signifies a shower of more violent rain; it is also used as a generic term, including the early and Litter rain (Jer 5:24; Joe 2:23). Another word,  of a more poetical character, is רְבַיבַים, rebibmn (a plural form, connected with rab, “many,” from the multitude of the drops), translated in our version “showers” (Deu 32:2; Jer 3:3; Jer 14:22; Mic 5:7 [Hebrews 6]; Psa 45:10 [Hebrews 11]; 72:6). The Hebrews have also the word a זַרם, zelem, expressing violent rain, storm, tempest, accompanied with hail — in Job 24:8, the heavv rain which comes down on mountains; and the word סִגְרַיר, sagrisr, which occurs only in Pro 27:15, continuous and heavy rain (Sept. ἐν ἡμέρᾷ χειμερινῇ Early Rain means the rains of the autumn, יוֹרֶה, yoreh, part. subst. from יָרָה“he scattered” (Deu 11:14; Jer 5:24); also the Hiphil part. מוֹרֶה, mor/h (Joe 2:23); Sept. ὑετὸς πρώιμος. Latter Rain is the rain of spring, מִלְקוֹש, malkdcsh, (Pro 16:15; Job 29:23; Jer 3:3; Hos 6:3; Joe 2:23; Zec 10:1); Sept. ὑετὸς ὄψιμος. The early and latter rains are mentioned together (Deu 11:14; Jer 5:24; Joe 2:23; Hos 6:3; Jam 5:7).

In a country comprising so many varieties of elevation as Palestine, there must of necessity occur corresponding varieties of climate. An account that might correctly describe the peculiarities of the district of Lebanon would be in many respects inaccurate when applied to the deep depression and almost tropical climate of Jericho. In any general statement, therefore, allowance must be made for not inconsiderable local variations. Contrasted with the districts most familiar to the children of Israel before their settlement in the land of promise — Egypt and the Desert — rain might be spoken of as one of its distinguishing characteristics (Deu 11:10-11; Herodotus, 3:10). For six months in the year no rain falls, and the harvests are gathered in without any of the anxiety with which we are so familiar lest the work be interrupted by unseasonable storms. In this respect, at least, the climate has remained unchanged since the time when Boaz slept by his heap of corn; and the sending of thunder and rain in wheat harvest was a miracle which filled the people with fear and wonder (1Sa 12:16-18); so that Solomon could speak of “rain in harvest” as the most forcible expression for conveying the idea of something utterly out of place and unnatural (Pro 26:1). There are, however, very considerable. and perhaps more than compensating. disadvantages  occasioned by this long absence of rain: the whole land becomes dry, parched, and brown; the cisterns are empty; the springs and fountains fail; and the autumnal rains are eagerly looked for, to prepare the earth for the reception of the seed. These, the early rains, commence about the end of October or beginninlg of November, in Lebanon a month earliernot suddenly, but by degrees: the husbandman has thus the opportunity of sowing his fields of wheat and barley. The rains come mostly from the west or south-west (Luk 12:54), continuing for two or three days at a time, and falling chiefly during the night. The wind then shifts round to the north or east, and several days of fine weather succeed (Pro 25:23). During the months of November and December the rains continue to fall heavily, but at intervals; afterwards they return, only at longer intervals, and are less heavy; but at no period dutring the winter do they entirely cease. January and February are the coldest months, and snow falls, sometimes to the depth of a foot or more, at Jerusalem, but it does not lie long: it is very seldom seen along the coast and in the low plains. Thin ice occa. sionally covers the pools for a few days, and while Porter was writing his Handbook, the snow was eight inches deep at Damascus, and the ice a quarter of an inch thick, Rain continues to fall more or less during the month of March; it is very rare in April, and even in Lebanon the showers that occur are generally light. In the valley of the Jordan the barley harvest begins as early as the middle of April, and the wheat a fortnight later; in Lebanon the grain is seldom ripe before the middle of June. See Robinson (Biblical Researches, i, 429) and Porter (Handlbook, ch. 48). SEE PALESTINE.

With respect to the distinction between the early and the latter rains, Robinson observes that there, are not at the present day “any particular periods of rain or succession of showers which might be regarded as distinct rainy seasons. The whole period from October to March now constitutes only one continued season of rain, without any regularly intervening term of prolonged fine weather. Unless, therefore, there hlave been some change in the climate, the early and the latter rains for which the husbandman waited with longing seem rather to have implied the first showers of autumn which revived the parched and thirsty soil and prepared it for the seed; and the later showers of spring, which continued to refresh and forward both the ripening crops and the vernal products of the fields (Jam 5:7; Pro 16:15). In April and May the sky is usually serene; showers occur occasionally, but they are mild and refreshing. On  May 1 Robinson experienced showers at Jerusalem, and “at evening there were thunder and lightning (which are frequent in wminter), with pleasant and reviving rain. May 6 was also remarkable for thunder and for several showers, some of which were quite heavy. The rains of both these days extended far to the north,... but the occurrence of rain so late in the season was regarded as a very unusual circumstance” (Biblical Researches, i, 430; he is speaking of the year 1838]). In 1856, however, there was very heavy rain accompanied with thunder all over the region of Lebanon, extending to Beirut and Damascus, on May 28 and 29; but the oldest inhabitant had never seen the like before, and it created,” says Porter (Handbook, ch. xlviii), “almost as much astonishment as the thunder and rain which Samuel brought upon the Israelites during the time of wheat harvest.”

During Dr. Robinson's stay at Beiriut on his second visit to Palestine, in 1852, there were heavy rains in March, once for five days continuously, and the weather continued variable, with occasional heavy rain, till the close of the first week in April. The “latter rains” thus continued this season for nearly a month later than usual, and the result was afterwards seen in the very abundant crops of winter grain (Robinson, Biblical Researches, iii, 9). These details will, it is thought, better than any generalized statement, enable the reader to form his jmudgment on the “former” and “latter” rains of Scripture, and may serve to introduce a remark or two on the question, about which some interest has been felt, whether there have been any change in the frequency and abundance of the rain in Palestine, or in the periods of its supply. It is asked whether “these stony hills, these deserted valleys,” can be the land flowing with milk and honey; the land which God cared for; the land upon which were always the eyes of the Lord, from the beginning of the year to the end of the year (Deu 11:12). So far as relates to the other considerations which may account for diminished fertility, such as the decrease of population and industry, the neglect of terrace-culture and irrigation, and husbanding the supply of water, it may suffice to refer to the article on AGRICULTURE SEE AGRICULTURE, and to Stanley (Sinai and Palestine, p. 120-123). With respect to our more immediate subject, it is urged that the very expression “flowing with milk and honey” implies abundant rains to keep alive the grass for the pasture of the numerous herds supplying the milk, and to nourish the flowers clothing the now bare hill-sides, from whence the bees might gather their stores of honey. It is urged that the supply of rain in its due season seems to be promised as contingent upon the fidelity of the people (Deu 11:13-15; Lev 26:3-5), and that as from time to time, to punish  the people for their transgressions, “the showers have been withholden, and there hath been no latter rain” (Jer 3:3; 1 Kings 17, 18), so now, in the great and long-continued apostasy of the children of Israel, there has come upon even the land of their forfeited inheritance a like long-continued withdrawal of the favor of God, who claims the sending of rain as one of his special prerogatives (Jer 14:22). SEE CALENDAR, JEWISH.

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

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

## Rain Dragon[[@Headword:Rain Dragon]]

             THE, a Chinese deity, from whose capacious mouth it is believed the waters are spouted forth which descend upon the earth in the form of rain. This god is worshipped by those who cultivate the soil, only, however, when his power is felt either by the absence of rain or by too abundant a supply. Sometimes the farmers earnestly implore him to give them more rain and sometimes less. In cases of drought each family keeps erected at the front door of the house a tablet on which is inscribed, “To the Dragon King of the Five Lakes and the Four Seas.” Before this tablet. on an altar of incense, they lay out their sacrificial offerings to propitiate the gods.  Processions are also got up, among the farmers particularly, to attract the favor of the gods. On these occasions there may sometimes be seen a huge figure of a dragon made of paper or of cloth, which is carried through the streets with sound of gongs and trumpets.

## Rain-makers[[@Headword:Rain-makers]]

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

## Rainald Of Citeaux[[@Headword:Rainald Of Citeaux]]

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

## Rainaldi, Francesco[[@Headword:Rainaldi, Francesco]]

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

## Rainaldi, Theophilus[[@Headword:Rainaldi, Theophilus]]

             SEE RAYNAUD.

## Rainbow[[@Headword:Rainbow]]

             (Heb. קֶשֶׁת, kesheth, i.e. a bow with which to shoot arrows, Gen 9:13-16; Ezekiel i, 28; Sept. τόξον, so Sir 43:11; Vulg. arcus. In the New Test. [Rev 4:3; Rev 10:11, ιρις), the token of the covenant which God made with Noah when he came forth from the ark that the waters should no more become a flood to destroy all flesh. With respect to the covenant itself, as a charter of natural blessings and mercies (“ the world's covenant, not the Church's”), re-establishing the peace and order of physical nature, which in the flood had undergone so great a convulsion, see Davidson, On Prophecy, lect. iii, p. 76-80. With respect to  the token of the covenant, the right interpretation of Gen 9:13 seems to be that God took the rainbow, which had hitherto been but a beautiful object shining in the heavens when the sun's rays fell on falling rain, and consecrated it as the sign of his love and the witness of his promise. The bow in the cloud, seen by every nation under heaven, is an un failing witness to the truth of God. Was the rainbow, then, we ask, never seen before the flood? Was this “sign in the heavens” beheld for the first time bv the eight dwellers in the ark when, after their long imprisonment, they stood again upon the green earth, and saw the clark, humid clouds spanned by its glorious arch? Such seems to be the meaning of the narrator. Yet this implies that there was no rain before the flood, and that the laws of nature were changed, at least in that part of the globe, by that event. There is no reason to suppose that in the world at large there has been such a change in meteorological phenomena as here implied. That a certain portion of the earth should never have been visited by rain is quite conceivable. Egypt, though not absolutely without rain, very rarely sees it. But the country of Noah and the ark was a mountainous country; and the ordinary atmospherical conditions must have been suspended, or a new law must have come into operation after the flood, if the rain then first fell, and if the rainbow had consequently never before been painted on the clouds. Hence, many writers have supposed that the meaning of the passage is, not that the rainbow now appeared for the first time, but that it was now for the first time invested with the sanctity of a sign; that not a new phenomenon was visible, but that a new meaning was given to a phenomenon already existing. The following passages, Num 14:4; 1 Samuel 12 :l0; 1Ki 2:35, are instances in which נָתִן, nathan, literally “give” — the word used in Gen 9:13, “I do set my bow in the cloud” — is employed in the sense off “constitute,” “appoint.” Accordingly there is no reason for concluding that ignorance of the natural cause of the rainbow occasioned the account given of its institution in the book of Genesis. SEE NOAH.

The rainbow is frequently seen in Palestine in the rainy season, and thus it furnishes a common image to the sacred writers. There is a reference to the rainbow, though not named, in Isa 54:10; and it is mentioned in other passages. “As the appearance of the bow which is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about” (Eze 1:28). “And there was a rainbow round about the throne in sight like unto an emerald” (Rev 4:3). “And I saw another  mighty angel come down from heaven, clothed with a cloud, and a rainbow was upon his head” (Rev 10:1). These three passages correspond with and reflect light upon each other. The rainbow in all of them is the designed token of God's covenant and mercy, and of his faithful remembrance of his promise. “Look upon the rainbow,” says the son of Sirach (Sir 43:11-12), “and praise him that made it: very beautiful it is in the brightness thereof; it compasseth the heaven about with a glorious circle, and the hands of the Most High have bended it.” Among the Greeks and Romans, the personified rainbow, Iris, became the messenger of the gods, and the natural rainbow seems to have been conceived as the passage-way on which Iris came down to men (Serv. on Virgil's AEn. v, 610). The Indian mythology made a yet nearer approach to the Biblical view (Von Bohlen, India, i, 237); but the Edda represents the rainbow as a bridge connecting heaven and earth (see, in general, Menzel, Mythol. Forsch. p. 235 sq.). On the physical views of the ancients with regard to the rainbow. see Forbiger, Handb. d. alt. Geog. i, 596 sq. See Schlichter, Lie Iride ejusque Emblem. (Hal. 1739); Ausfeld, De Iride Diluvii non redituri Signo (Giess. 1756). SEE BOW.

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

## Rainbow, Edward, D.D.[[@Headword:Rainbow, Edward, D.D.]]

             an English prelate, was born at Bliton, Lincolnshire, in 1608, was educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and Magdalen College, Cambridge, and, after taking holy orders and filling minor appointments, was made master of Magdalen College in 1642. In 1650 he was deprived on account  of nonconformity, but in 1660 was restored. In 1661 he was appointed to the deanery of Peterborough, and in the following year became vice- chancellor of the University of Cambridge. In 1664 he was elevated to the episcopacy by being made bishop of Carlisle. He died in 1684. He published three separate Sermons (1634, 1649, 1677). See Athenoe Oxon.; Life, by Jonathan Banks (Lond. 1688, 8vo); Funeral Sermon, by the Rev. Thomas Tully (1688,12mo).

## Raine, James[[@Headword:Raine, James]]

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

## Raine, Matthew[[@Headword:Raine, Matthew]]

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

## Rainerio, Saccioni[[@Headword:Rainerio, Saccioni]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. He was a native of Piacenza. He was originally a Catharist, but abandoned his brethren, entered the Church of Rome, became a Dominican monk, and when made inquisitor became one of the worst persecutors of his former co-religionists. In 1252 a conspiracy against him was discovered in time to prevent his murder, but he was never restful after that time, and when Pallavicino gained the upper hand at Milan, Rainerio was driven from the city. He died in 1259. He wrote much, and wielded a powerful pen, for he was a man of much learning. His Summna de Catharis et Leonistis, written for the information of the Inquisition, is the principal source of information regarding the Catharists. The best edition of this work is by Gretser  (Ingolstadt, 1613). See Gieseler, Kirchengqesch. i, 598; and his De Rainerii Summa (G(ott. 1834); Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity, v, 61- 66; Piper, Monumental Theol. § 140. (J. H.W.)

## Raines, John[[@Headword:Raines, John]]

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

## Rainold(e)s[[@Headword:Rainold(e)s]]

             (also written Raynolds, Reynolds, and occasionally in the Latin Reginaldus), JOHN, was a celebrated English divine of the second half of the 16th century. He was born at Pinhoe, Devonshire, in 1549; was educated at Merton College, Oxford, and Corpus Christi College, of the same university; and was chosen probationer fellow in 1566. He finally took holy orders, and in 1593 was promoted to the deanery of Lincoln. In 1598 he was offered a bishopric, and at the same time was called to the presidency of Corpus Christi College. He cared less for distinctions than for scholarly tasks, and therefore gave the preference to the offer of his alma mater. In this new position he became famous beyond seas, as well as in England. His learning and readiness of application gave him a reputation second to none in Elngland; and the king, who prided himself on his own reputation for scholarship, and desired above all things to maintain this reputation, leaned greatly on this distinguisheld divine, and always favored his projects It is thus that we owe to Rainolds the King James Version of the Sriptures, for it is well known that Rainolds urged the king to the undertaking, and demonstrated its necessity. He was a great Hebraist, and made translations of small portions at first, and, reading these to the king in his private chamber, convinced his roval master of the want, and the good likely to be accomplished as well as the renown to be gained. SEE ENGLISH VERSIONS.

Rainolds died in 1607. Bishop Hall speaks of Rainolds as being near to a miracle in his prodigious treasury of knowledge; John Milton refers to him always as “our famous Dr. Raynolds;” and Wood, in his Athenae Oxon. (ii, 13), calls him “the very treasury of erudition.” Hallam, in his Constitutional Hist. of England, calls him “nearly, if not altogether, the most learned man in England” (i, 297), and in his Literary Hist. of Europe (i, 560), “the most eminently learned man of the queen's reign.” He published a number of separate sermons, treatises against the Church of Rome, and some other theological productions, of which there is a complete list in Wood (Athenoe Oxon. ii, 11-19). We have room here to mention only, Sex Theses de S. Scripture et Ecclesia (Lond. 1580; Ruppelae, 1586; Lond. 1602, 8vo; in English, 1598,12mo; 1609, 4to): — The Summe of the Conference between John Rainoldes and John Hart touchinq the Read and Faith of the Church, etc. (1584, 1588, 1598, 1609, 4to; Latin, Oxon. 1619, fol.): — Orationes duce in Ceoll. Co. Cphristi (Oxon. 1587, 8vo): — De Romance Ecclesiec Idololatria in Cultu Sanctorum Reliquiarum, Imaginunae, Aque, Salis,  Olei, etc. (1596, 4to): — The Overthrow of Stage Playes, by the Way of Controversie betwixt D. Gager and D. Rainoldes, etc. (1599, 4to; Middleburgh, 1600, 4to; Oxf. 1629, 4to); see Collier, Hist. of Dramatic Poetry, iii, 201, and his Bibl. Account of Early English Literature (1865), s.v. “Rainoldes;” Anchceolo Nov. 1841, p. 114: — Defence of the Judgement of the Reformed Churches that a Man may lawfullie not only put awaie his Wife fir her Adultirie, but also marrie Another, etc. (1609- 10, 4to): — Censutra Librorumn Apocryphorumn Veteris Testameenti (Oppenheim, 1611, 2 vols. 4to; very rare); not only in this work, but in the Hampton Court Conference also (where, by the way, he sided with the Puritans), Rainolds protested against the reading of apocryphal lessons in the public service of the Church: The Prophesie of Obadiah, sermons (Oxon. 1613, 4to): — Orationes duodecim [including The Summe of the Conference, etc.] in Coll. Corp. Christi (1614, 1628, 8vo); the first oration was published in an English transl. by J. Leicester (Lond. 1638, 12mo): — The Original of Bishops and Metropolitans (1641, 4to): — Judgment concerning Episcopacy, whether it be God's Ordinance (Lond. 1641, 4to): — Prophesie of Haggai, fifteen sermons (1649, 4to). See the literature quoted in Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Middleton, Ertangel. Biog. vol. ii; Soames, Hist. of the Church of England in the Elizabethan Reign (see Index); Froude, Hist. of Eng. (see Index in vol. 11).

## Rainor, Menzies[[@Headword:Rainor, Menzies]]

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

## Rainssant, Jean Firmin[[@Headword:Rainssant, Jean Firmin]]

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

## Raisins[[@Headword:Raisins]]

             (צַמּוּקַים, tsimmukim, 1Sa 25:18; 1Sa 30:20; 2Sa 16:1; 1Ch 12:20) signifies dried grapes, or rather cakes made of them, such as the Italians still call simmaki. Grapes are often thus preserved for food (Num 6:3). SEE GRAPE; SEE VINE.

## Raisse, Arnold[[@Headword:Raisse, Arnold]]

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

## Rait, John, D.D[[@Headword:Rait, John, D.D]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Aberdeen in 1351. He died in 1355. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 111.

## Raith, Balthasar[[@Headword:Raith, Balthasar]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 8, 1616. He studied at Tubingen, was there in 1656 professor of theology, and died December 5, 1683, doctor of theology. He wrote, Quaestionum Anti-Judaicarum Trias de Messia (Tubingen, 1667): — Vadum: — Talmudicum Quod Priorsa Capita Testatum (1658): — De Proselytismo Judaico-Christiano (1666). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

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

             SEE PAHARI.

## Rakem[[@Headword:Rakem]]

             (1Ch 7:16). SEE REKEM.

## Rakkath[[@Headword:Rakkath]]

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

## Rakkon[[@Headword:Rakkon]]

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

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

             is thought by Lieut. Conder (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 2:263) to be identical with the present Tell er-Rekkeit, close to the Aujeh (supposed to represent Mejarkon), and five an and a half miles along the shore north of Joppa, where "cisterns and traces of ruins are said to exist under the sand"' (ibid. page 275). Tristram strangely says (Bible Places, page 51), ''Mejarkon and Rakkon have recently' been identified with Oyun Kara, in  the plain of Sharon, three miles south-east of Joppa." SEE RAMATH- ELEH.

## Rakshas, Or Rakshasa[[@Headword:Rakshas, Or Rakshasa]]

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

## Rakusians[[@Headword:Rakusians]]

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

## Ralbag[[@Headword:Ralbag]]

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

1. Of the immortality of the soul (on which there are fourteen chapters);

2. On dreams and prophecy (eight chapters);

3. On the omniscience of God and the conflict between philosophy and religion (six chapters);

4. On Providence; viewed from the philosophical and religious standpoints (seven chapters).

The remaining portion of the worl is a cosmogony designed to show the harmony between the statements of the Bible and the phenomena of the universe. That part of his work which treats on astronomy, and which describes an astronomical instrument invented by Gersonides to facilitate observations, was so much appreciated that pope Clement VI, in 1342, had it translated into Latin; and Kepler, as he says in a letter to John Remus, took much trouble to get the book of rabbi Levi, as he calls him (utinam apud Rabbinos invenire posses tractatum R. Levi quintum defensionum Dei). The same was done by Pico de Mirandola and the great Reuchlin, who quotes largely from Gersonides. Though he began his authorship with philosophical and scientific productions when about thirty (1318), yet he published no exegetical work till he was thirty-seven years of age, from which time he unremittingly devoted himself to the exposition of the Bible. His first commentary is on the book of Job, and was finished in 1325. Twelve months later (1326) he published a commentary on the Song of Songs, and in 1328 a commentary on Coheleth, or Ecclesiastes. About the same time Ralbag finished his commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating on the hexahemeron, and shortly after issued an exposition of Esther (1329). The Pentateuch now engaged his attention, and after laboring on it eight years (1329-1337), he completed the interpretation of this difficult part of the Old Test.

In 1338 he finished a commentary on the earlier prophets — i.e. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings — together with his comments on Proverbs, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles. The following are the editions of his exegetical works: פירוש על התורה, Commentary on the Pentateuch (first printed at Mantua before 1480, then by Corn. Adelkind, Venice, 1547, and then again in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible, Amst. 1724-1727): — ראשונים פירוש על נביאים, Commentary on the Earlier Prophets (Leira, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles; latest edition, Kinigsberg, 1860: — excerpts of the commentaries on the Pentateuch and the earlier prophets, entitled תועליות, Utility, were published in 1550, and a Jewish-German version of them is given in Jekutiel's German translation of the Bible [Amst. 1676-78]): — — פירוש על משלי, Commentary on Proverbs (Leira, 1492, and in all the Rabbinic  Bibles); a Latin translation was published by Ghiggheo (Milan, 1620): — —' פירוש על איוב, Commentary on Job (Ferrara, 1477, and in all the Rabbinic Bibles); a Latin translation of ch. i-v was published by L. H. d'Aquine (Paris, 1623), and of ch. iv-viii by Chr. Ludovicus (Leipsic, 1700): — השירים אסתר קהלת ורות פירוש על שיר, Commentary on Song of Songs, Esther, Ecclesiastes, and Ruth, with an introduction by Jacob Morkaria (Riva, 1560): — — דניאל פירוש על, Commentary on Daniel, published in Italy before 1480, in Pratensis's Rabbinic Bible, and in Frankfurter's. The commentaries on Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, which he finished in 1338, are still in MS., Cod. MSS. Opp. 288 Q. and Mich. 623. “As to his mode of interpretation, Ralbag first gives an explanation of the words (ביאור המלות) in each section, then propounds the meaning according to the context (ביאור הפירוש), and finally gives the utility or application of the passage (תועליות).” See Furst, Bibliotheca Judacica, i, 82-84; Steinschneider, Cataloqus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 1607-1615; Wolf, Bibliotheca lfebr. i, 726, etc.; 4:892; Ginsburg. in Kitto, s.v.; Joel, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 9:223, etc. (Leips. 1860), 10:41-60, 93-111, 137-14~ 297-312, 333-344, 11:20-31, 65-75, 101-114; (riitz, Geschichte d. Juden, 7:345-352 (Leips. 1873); Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, iii, 83; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature,.p. 261 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 114 sq. (Germ. transl.); Basnage, Histoire des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 673: Ueberweg, History of Philosophy, i, 421; Prantl, Gesch. d. Logik, ii, 394-396; Margoliouth, Modern Judaism Investigated, p. 253 (LondoL, 1843); Levy, Die Exegese bei den franzus. Israeliten, etc., p. 34 sq. (Leips. 1873). (B. P.)

## Rale (Rasle, Or Rasles), Sebastian[[@Headword:Rale (Rasle, Or Rasles), Sebastian]]

             a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born in 1657 or 1658, in the province of Franche-Comte. Having entered the Order of the Jesuits, he was despatched to the foreign work in 1689. He arrived at Quebec in the fall of that year, and labored faithfully among the Indians for their conversion, and for a time with much show of success. But his venturesome spirit led him into dangerous paths: he frequently went far beyond the territory of those savages friendly to him, and he finally paid for his daring with his life. He was killed in 1724, while out on an expedition with Indians; but not by the savages — he fell pierced with English bullets. He had been guilty of great cruelty to Englishmen who had fallen into the  hands of Indians, and this was only a revenge for his treachery to the whites. His death was a loss not only to Roman Catholics, but to the world of learning. Rale was a superior linguist, and had made himself master of the aboriginal languages and compiled a dictionary of the Abnaki language — of which the MS. is in the Harvard Library — which was published at the express wish of great savants. A monument was erected to his memory by bishop Fenwick, Aug. 29, 1833. See Memoir, by C. Francis, D.D., in Sparks, Amer. Biog. 2d series, vol. vii. (J. H. W.)

## Rale(i)gh, Walter[[@Headword:Rale(i)gh, Walter]]

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

## Raleigh, Alexander, D.D[[@Headword:Raleigh, Alexander, D.D]]

             an English Congregational minister, was born at Castle Douglas, January 3, 1817, and removed to Liverpool in his youth. He was educated at the Blackburn Theological Academy, which became, during his course, Lancashire Independent College. In 1844 he went to Greenock as pastor of the Congregational Church, and there labored until compelled by declining health to resign. In 1850 he became pastor at Rotherham, and in 1855 of the Elgin Place Church, Glasgow. In 1859 he accepted an invitation from the Church at Hare Court, for which the new chapel at Canonbury had then just been built. The church was greatly blessed under his labors. From a very small number, it was increased to nearly one thousand members. Other churches were established in the neighborhood, and, for a time, a joint pastorate was arranged with Stamford Hill. His last pastorate was at Kensington, begun in 1875, and continued, until his death, April 19, 1880. "The work of Dr. Raleigh was of exceptional quality and power, and entered largely into the religious life of the churches. Few ministries have been more fruitful. His preaching was remarkable for the freshness, vigor, beauty. and felicity of his thought and style; but especially for the unwavering belief and fervid affection with which he held and set forth the great evangelical truths of the gospel. He published four volumes of sermons, entitled, Quiet Resting-Places: — The Story of Jonah: — The Little Sanctuary: — The Story of Esther. His widow has published the posthumous volume, The Way to the City. See (Loud.) Cong. Year-book, 1881, page 387.

## Raleigh, Walter, Sir[[@Headword:Raleigh, Walter, Sir]]

             the distinguished English soldier, navigator, and writer of the Elizabethan age, deserves a place here on account of his contributions to sacred song. He was born at Haves, near the coast of Devonshire, in 1552, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. In 1569 — about a year after graduation he entered the volunteer corps which, under Champernon, went to France to fight for the Huguenots. Subsequently he fought, under the prince of Orange, in the Netherlands, against the Spanish. In 1579 he made his first venture in navigation, which through life continued, at intervals, to attract him. He then sailed, in conjunction with his half-brother, Sir Humphrey Gilbert, with the purpose of founding a colony in North America. But the expedition proved unsuccessful; and during the year following he held a captain's commission in Ireland, where, in operations against the rebels, he distinguished himself by his courage and conduct.

He attracted the notice of queen Elizabeth; and, for some years afterwards, he was constant in his attendance upon the queen, who distinguished him by employing him, from time to time, in various delicate offices of trust, and by substantial marks of her favor. The spirit of enterprise was. however, restless in the man, and in 1584, a patent having been granted him to take possession of lands to be discovered by him on the continent of North America, he fitted out two ships at his own expense, and shortly achieved the discovery and occupation of the territory known as Virginia — a name chosen as containing an allusion to the “virgin queen” herself. Elizabeth also conferred on Raleigh the honor of knighthood. If we except the questionable benefit — with which his name remains connectedof the introduction of tobacco into Europe, no immediate good came of the colony; and, after some years of struggle, during which he sent out several auxiliary expeditions, he was forced to relinquish his connection with it. In 1587-88, the country being menaced by a Spanish invasion, Raleigh was actively and responsibly occupied in organizing a resistance, and held  command of the queen's forces in Cornwall. In the latter year he shared, with new access of honor, in the series of actions which ended in the defeat and dispersion of the great Armada, and was thanked and rewarded for his services. His private marriage with Elizabeth Throckmorton, one of the queen's maids of honor, incurred her Majesty's severe displeasure, and he was banished from court. He now recurred to those schemes of conquest and adventure in the New World which formed one main dream of his life, and in 1595 headed an expedition to Guiana, having for its object the discovery of the fabled El Dorado, a city of gold and gems, the existence of which in these regions was then generally believed in. Of this brilliant but fruitless adventure, on returning, he published an account.

Having regained the royal favor, he was made, in 1596, admiral in the expedition against Cadiz, commanded by Howard and the earl of Essex, and was admittedly the main instrument of its success. Also, in the year following, he took part in the attack on the Azores made by the same commanders. In the court intrigues which ended in the downfall of the earl of Essex, he, after this, became deeply involved; and certain points of his conduct — as, notably, the sale of his good offices with the queen in behalf of such of the earl's adherents as would buy them-though easily regarded by the current morality of the time, have fixed somewhat of a stain on a fame otherwise so splendid. With the death of Elizabeth, in 1603, ends his brilliant and successful career. lier successor, James, from the first regarded him with suspicion and dislike. He had, besides, made powerful enemies; and, when accused of complicity in a plot against the king, though no jot of evidence of his being any way concerned in it was produced at his trial, a verdict was readily procured finding him guilty of high-treason. The language of the prosecutor, attorney-general Coke, was outrageously abusive. He called Raleigh “a damnable atheist,” “a spider of hell,” a “viperous traitor,” etc. Sentence of death was passed, but James did not venture to execute him; and he was sent to the Tower, where, for thirteen years, he remained a prisoner, his estates being confiscated, and made over to the king's favorite, Carr, subsequently earl of Somerset. During his imprisonment, Raleigh devoted himself to literary and scientific pursuits, his chief monument in this kind being his History of the World, a noble fragment, still notable to the student as one of the finest models of quaint and stately old English style. Certain of his poetical pieces, giving hint of a genius at once elegant and sententious, also continue to be esteemed. In 1615 he procured his release, and once more sailed for Guiana. The expedition, from which great results were expected, failed miserably.

He himself, in  consequence of severe illness, was unable to accompany it inland; and nothing but disaster ensued. To add to his grief and disappointment, his eldest and favorite son was killed in the storming of the Spanish town of St. Thomas. He returned to England, broken in spirit and in fortunes, only to die. On the morning of Oct. 29, 1618, he was infamously executed, nominally on the sentence passed on him sixteen years before, but really, there is reason to suppose, in base compliance, on James's part, with the urgencies of the king of Spain, who resented his persistent hostility. Raleigh was a man of noble presence, of versatile and commanding genius, unquestionably one of the most splendid figures in a time unusually prolific of all splendid developments of humanity. In the art and finesse of the courtier, the politic wisdom of the statesman, and the skilful daring of the warrior, he was almost alike pre-eminent. The moral elevation of the man shone out eminently in the darkness which beset his later fortunes; and the calm and manly dignity with which he fronted adverse fate conciliated even those whom his haughtiness in prosperity had offended. Raleigh's Life has been written by Oldys, Cayley (Lond. 1806, 2 vols.), and P. F. Tytler (Edin. 1833). His poems were collected and published by Sir E. Brydges (Lond. 1814); his Miscellaneous Writings, by Dr. Birch (1751, 2 vols.); and his Complete Works, at Oxford (1829, 8 vols.).

## Ralph Of Escures[[@Headword:Ralph Of Escures]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was eminent for his literary attainments and for his surpassing affability. The year of his birth is unknown. He was yet very young when he joined his father at St. Martins and became a monk in 1079. In 1089 he served the offices of sub-prior and prior, and in the same year was elected abbot. He remained abbot of Sdez, France, for sixteen years. He became bishop of Rochester in 1108, and was elected to the see of Canterbury April 26, 1114, where he remained until his death, October 20, 1122. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 2:278 sq.

## Ralston, James Grier, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Ralston, James Grier, D.D., LL.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Chester County, Pennsylvania, December 28, 1815. He graduated from Washington College in 1838, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1842, having been licensed meanwhile as a preacher. On account of his weak lungs he was engaged in teaching most of his life, but organized a church at Conshohocken, near Philadelphia, in 1845, and the same year founded the Oakland Female Institute at Norristown, Pennsylvania, of which he continued the head, with a period of intermission (1874-77), until his death, November 10, 1880. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 61; Nevin, Presb. Escyclop. s.v.

## Ralston, Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Ralston, Samuel, D.D]]

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

## Ram[[@Headword:Ram]]

             (Heb. רָם, high), the name of three men in Scripture.

1. (Sept. Α᾿ράμ, v. r. Α᾿ῤῥάν and Ο᾿ράμ; Vul. Aran.) The son of Hezron and father of Amminadab, B.C. cir. 1780. He was born in Egypt after Jacob's migration there, as his name is not mentioned in Gen 46:4. He first appears in Rth 4:19. The genealogy in 1Ch 2:9-10 adds no further information concerning him, except that he was the second son of Hezron, Jerahmeel being the first-born (1Ch 2:25). He appears in the New Test. only in the two lists of the ancestry of Christ (Mat 1:3-4; Luk 3:33), where he is called ARAM.

2. (Sept. ῾Ράμ, v. r. ῾Ράν, Α᾿ράμ, ‘Apait; Vulg. Ram.) The first-born of Jerahmeel, and therefore nephew of the preceding (1Ch 2:25; 1Ch 2:27). B.C. post 1780. He had three sons — Maaz, Jamin, and Eker.

3. (Sept. ῾Ράμ, v. r. Α᾿ράμ; Vulg. Ram.) Elihu, the son of Barachel the Buzite, is described as “of the kindred of Ram” (Job 32:2). Rashi's note on the passage is curious: ‘of the family of Ram,' Abraham; for it is said, ‘the greatest man among the Anakim' (Joshua 14); this [is] Abraham.” Ewald identifies Ram with Aram, mentioned in Gen 22:21 in  connection with Huz and Buz (Gesch. i, 414). Elihu would thus be a collateral descendant of Abraham, and this may have suggested the extraordinary explanation given by Rashli. SEE ARAM.

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

             (אִיל, dyil; κριός ). As this animal, fattened, was a favorite article of food (Gen 31:38; Eze 39:18), it was considered, when offered as sacrifice, of higher value than sheep and lambs (Gen 15:9, Num 15:5-6; Num 23:1 sq.; Num 28:11 sq., Num 28:28 sq.; Mic 6:7), and the legal ritual gave exact directions on the sacrifice of them. The rams were sometimes burnt-offerings (Lev 8:18; Lev 8:21; Lev 9:2; Lev 16:3; Num 7:15; Psalm 46:15; Isa 1:11; Eze 45:23, etc.), sometimes thank-offerings (Lev 9:4; Lev 9:18; Num 6:14; Num 6:17; Num 7:17; Num 28:11, etc.), sometimes trespass-offerings (Lev 5:15; Lev 18:25; Lev 6:6; comp. Lev 19:21; Num 5:8; Ezr 10:19, etc.). The ram, too, appears not only in public and private offerings in general, but especially in the purifying sacrifices of the Nazarite (Num 6:14) and the sacrifices of Priestly Consecration. It was not used as a sin-offering. In 2Ch 29:21 only the seven he-goats belong to the sin-offering, as 2Ch 29:23 shows; the rams, with the other animals, forming the burnt- offering. The use of the ram as thank- and trespass-offering is pointed out in Exo 29:22 (comp. Lev 8:16; Lev 9:19; Isa 34:6). The Greeks and Romans used rams for sacrifice only exceptionally; yet comp. Pliny, H. N. 34:19, 19. In Egypt this was more frequent (Wilkinson, v, 191 sq.); only in the Thebais it was prohibited, save at the great annual festival of Amman (Herod. ii, 42). On the symbolic use of the ram in Daniel to signify the Persian empire, SEE CATTLE, No. II; and on the SEE BATTERING-RAM, see s.v. The use of ram's skins for covering is alluded to in Exo 25:5; Exo 26:14; Exo 36:19; Exo 39:34, and is still common in Palestine, where they are also "dyed red" (Exo 25:5) for the use of the shoemakers (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 139). SEE SHEEP.

## Ram, Battering[[@Headword:Ram, Battering]]

             (כּר; Sept. βελόστασις χάραξ; Vulg. aries). This instrument of ancient siege operations is twice mentioned in the Old Test. (Eze 4:2; Eze 21:22 [27]); and as both references are to the battering-rams in use among the Assyrians and Babylonians, it will only be necessary to describe those which are known from the monuments to have been employed in their  sieges. With regard to the meaning of the Hebrew word there is but little doubt. It denotes an engine of war which was called a ram, either because it had an iron head shaped like that of a ram, or because, when used for battering down a wall, the movement was like the butting action of a ram

In attacking the walls of a fort or city, the first step appears to have been to form an inclined plane or bank of earth (comp. Eze 4:2 — "cast a mount against it"), by which the besiegers could bring their battering-rams and other engines to the foot of the walls. "The battering-rams,'' says Mr. Layard, "were of several kinds. Some were joined to movable towers which held warriors and armed men. The whole then formed one great temporary building, the top of which is represented in sculptures as on a level with the walls, and even turrets, of the besieged city. In some bas- reliefs the battering-ram is without wheels; it was then, perhaps, constructed upon the spot, and was not intended to be moved. The movable tower was probably sometimes unprovided with the ram, but I have not met with it so represented in the sculptures When the machine containing the battering-ram was a simple framework and did not form an artificial tower, a cloth or some kind of drapery, edged with fringes and otherwise or- namented, appears to have been occasionally thrown over it. Sometimes it may have been covered with hides. It moved either on four or on six wheels, and was provided with one ram or with two. The mode of working the rams cannot be determined from the Assyrian sculptures. It may be presumed, from the representations in the bas-reliefs, that they were partly suspended by a rope fastened to the outside of the ma- chine, and that men directed and impelled them from within.

Such was the plan adopted by the Egyptians in whose paintings the warriors working the ram may be seen through the frame. Sometimes this engine was ornamented by a carved or painted figure of the presiding divinity kneeling on one knee and drawing a bow. The artificial tower was usually occupied by two warriors: one discharged his arrows against the besieged, whom he was able, from his lofty position, to harass more effectually than if he had been below; the other held up a shield for his companion's defence. Warriors are not unfrequently represented as stepping from the machine to the battlements Archers on the walls hurled stones from slings and discharged their arrows against the warriors in the artificial towers; while the rest of the besieged were no less active in endeavoring to frustrate the attempts of the assailants to make breaches in their walls. By dropping a double chain or rope from the battlements they caught the ram, and could either destroy  its efficacy altogether, or break the force of its blows. Those below, however, by placing hooks over the engine and throwing their whole weight upon them, struggled to retain it in its place. The besieged, if unable to displace the battering-ram, sought to destroy it by fire, and threw lighted torches or firebrands upon it; but water was poured upon the flames through pipes attached to the artificial tower" (Nineveh and its Remains, ii, 367-370). SEE BATTERING-RAM.

## Ram, Pierre Francois Xavier De[[@Headword:Ram, Pierre Francois Xavier De]]

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

## Rama[[@Headword:Rama]]

             Ραμᾶ, the Greek form of Ramah. found in Mat 2:18, referring to Jer 31:15. The original passage alludes to a massacre of Benjamites or Eph-raimites (comp. Jer 31:9; Jer 31:18) at the Ramah in Benjamin or in Mount Ephraim. This is seized by the evangelist and turned into a touching reference to the slaughter of the innocents at Bethlehem, near to which was (and is) the sepulchre of Rachel. The name of Rama is alleged to have been lately discovered attached to a spot close to the sepulchre. If  it existed there in Matthew's day, it may have prompted his allusion, though it is not necessary to suppose this, since the point of the quotation does not lie in the name Ramah, but in the lamentation of Rachel for the children, as is shown by the change of the υἱοῖς of the original to τέκνα. The allusion is doubtless to Ramah, one of the leading cities of Benjamin, and not, as many have supposed, to some place of that name near Bethlehem. The passage is a difficult one, but the difficulty may be solved by a careful examination of the topography of the district. The difficulties are these:

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

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

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

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

.

## Ramadan[[@Headword:Ramadan]]

             the ninth month in the Mohammedan year. In it Mohammed received his first revelation, and every believer is therefore enjoined to keep a strict fast throughout its entire course, from the dawn — when a white thread call be distinguished from a black thread — to sunset. Eating, drinking, smoking, bathing, smelling perfumes, and other bodily enjoyments, even swallowing one's spittle, are strictly prohibited during that period. Even when obliged to take medicine, the Aloslem must make some kind of amends for it, such as spending a certain sum of money upon the poor. During the night, however, the most necessary wants may be satisfied — a permission which, practically, is interpreted by a profuse indulgence in all sorts of enjoyments.  The fast of Ramadan, now much less observed than in former times, is sometimes a very severe affliction upon the orthodox, particularly when the month — the year being lunar — happens to fall in the long and hot days of midsummer. The sick, travellers, and soldiers in time of war, are temporarily released from this duty, but they have to fast an equal number of days at a subsequent period, when this impediment is removed. Nurses, pregnant women, and those to whom it might prove really injurious, are expressly exempt from fasting. We may add that according to some traditions (Al-Beidlihwi), not only Mohammed, but also Abraham, Moses, and Jesus received their respective revelations during this month. The principal passages treating of the fast of Ramadan are found in the second Surah of the Koran, called “The Cow.” See Wellsted, City of the Calilphs, ii, 245.

## Ramah[[@Headword:Ramah]]

             (Heb. Ramnah', רָמָה) signifies a height, or a high place, from the root רוּם, to be high; and thus it is used in Eze 16:24. Very many of the ancient cities and villages of Palestine were built on the tops of hills, so as to be more secure, and hence, as was natural, such of them as were especially conspicuous were called by way of distinction , הָרָמָה(with the article), the Ileight; and this in the course of time came to be used as a proper name. We find no less than five Ramahs mentioned in Scripture by this simple name, besides several compounds, and in modern Palestine the equivalent Arabic name is of very frequent occurrence. With regart to most of them the traveller can still see how appropriate the appellation was. In the A. V. we have various forms of the word — Rumdath (רָמִת), the status constructus (Jos 13:26), Ramoth ( רָמוֹתand רָמֹת), the plural (Jos 21:36; 1Sa 30:27); and Reamathacimz (רָמָתִים), a dual form (1Sa 1:1). Remaeth (רֶמֵת) appears to be only another form of the same word. InI later Hebrew. ramtha is a recognised word for a hill, and as such is employed in the Jewish versions of the Pentateuch for the rendering of Pisgah. SEE ARIMATHAEA. In the following account we largely follow the usual geographical authorities, with important additions from other sources.

1. RAMAH OF BENJAMIN (Sept. ῾Ραμά and Α᾿ραμά , v. r. Ι᾿αμά, ῾Ραμμά, ῾Ραμμάν, Βαμά, Vulg. Ramah), frequently mentioned in Scripture; Joshua, in enumerating the towuns of Benjamin, groups Ramah between Gibeon  and Beeroth (18:25). This position suits the present Ram-Allah, but the consideratioms named in the text make it very difficult to identify any other site with it than er-Ram. It is probably this place which is mentioned in the story of Deborah, “She dwelt under the palm-tree of Deborah, between Ramah and Iethel in Mount Ephraim” (Jdg 4:5). The Targum on this passage substitutes for the Palm of Deborah, Ataroth-Deborah, no doubt referring to the town of Ataroth. This has everything in its favor, since Atara is still found ol thie left hand of the north road, very nearly midway between er-Rhm anld Beitin. Its position is clearly indicated in the distressing narrative of the Levite recorded in Judges 19. He left Bethlehem for his home in Mount Ephraim in the afternoon. Passing Jerusalem, he journeyed northward, and, crossing the ridge, came in sight of Gibeah and Bainalh, each standing on the top of its hill; and he said to his servant, “Come and let us draw near to one of these places to lodge all night, in Gibeahl or in Ramah” (Jdg 19:13). The towns were near the roaid on the right, and about two miles apart. The position of these two ancient towns explains another statement of Scrilpture. It is said of Saul (1Sa 22:6) that “he abode in (Gibeah under a tree in Ramah.” The meaning appears to be that the site of his standing: camp was in some commanding spot on the borders of the two territories of Gibeah and Ramah. When Israel was divided, Ramah lay between the rival kingdoms, and appears to have been destroyed at the outbreak of the revolt; for we read that “Baasha, king of Israel, went up against Judah, and built Ramah” (1Ki 15:17).

It was a strong position, and commanded the great road from the north to Jerusalem. The king of Judah was alarmed at the erection of a fortress in such close proximity to his capital, and he stopped the work by bribing the Syrians to invade northern Palestine (1Ki 15:18-21), and then carried off all the building materials (1Ki 15:22). There is a precise specification of its position in the catalogue of thle places north of Jerusalem which are enumerated by Isaiah as disturbed by the gradual approach of the king of Assyria (Isa 10:28-32). At Michmash he crosses the ravine; and then successively dislodges or alarms Geba, Ramah, and Gibeah of Saul. Each of these may be recognised with almost absolute certainty at the present day. Geba is Jeba, on the south brink of the great valley; and a mile and a half beyond it, directly between it and the main road to the city, is er-Ram, on the elevation which its ancient name implies. Ramah was intimately connected with one of the saddest epochs of Jewish history. The full story is not told, but the outline is sketched in the words of Jeremiah. In the final invasion of Judea by the Babylonians,  Nebuchadnezzar established his headquarters on the plain of Hamath, at Riblah (Jer 39:5). Thence he sent his generals, who captured Jerusalem. The principal inhabitants who escaped the sword were seized, bound, and placed under a guard at Ramah, while the conquerors were employed in pillaging and burning the temple and palace, and levelling the ramparts. Among the captives was Jeremiah himself (Jer 40:1; Jer 40:5, with 39:8-12). Perhaps there was also a slaughter of such of the captives as, from age, weakness, or poverty, were not worth the long transport across the desert to Babylon. There, in that heart-rending scene of captives in chains wailing over slaughtered kinudred and desolated sanctuaries, wmas fulfilled the first phase of the prophecy uttered only a few years before: “A voice was heard in Ramah, lamentation and bitter weeping: Rachel weeping for her children, refused to be comforted for her children because they were not” (Jer 31:15). That mourning was typical of another which took place six centuries later. when the infants of Bethlehem were murdered, and the second phase of the prophecy was fulfilled (Mat 2:17). As Ramah was in Benjamin, the prophet introduces Rachel, the mother of that tribe, bewailing the captivity of her descendants. SEE RAMA.

Ramah was rebuilt and reoccupied by the descendants of its old inhabitants after the captivity (Ezr 2:26; Neh 7:30). The Ramah in Neh 11:33 is thought by some to occupy a different position in the list, and may be a distinct place situated farther west, nearer the plain. (This, and Jer 31:15, are the only passages in which the name appears without the article.) The Sept. finds an allusion to Ramah in Zec 14:1, where it renders the words which are translated in the A.V. “and shall be lifted up ( רָאֲמָה‘), and inhabited in her place,” by “Ramah shall remain upon her place.” According to Josephus (who calls it ῾Ραμαθών), it was forty stadia distant from Jerusalem (Ant. 8:12, 3); and Eusebius and Jerome place it in the sixth mile north of the holy city (Ononast. s.v. “Rama;” but in his commentary on Hos 5:8, Jerome says in septizmo lapide); and the latter states that in his day it was a small village (ad Sophoniam, i, 15).

Modern travellers are right in identifying Ramah of Benjamin with the village of er-Ram (Brocardus, vii; Robinson, Bibl. Res. i, 576); though Maundrell and a few others have located it at Neby Samwil. Er-Ram is five miles north of Jerusalem and four south of Bethel. The site of Gibeah of Saul lies two miles southward, and Geba about the same distance eastward.  Ram is a small, miserable village; but in the walls and foundations of the houses are many large hewn stones, and in the lanes and fields broken columns and other remains of the ancient capital. The situation is commanding, on the top of a conical hill, half a mile east of the great northern road, and overlooking the broad summit of the ridge; the eastern view is intercepted by bare ridges and hill-tops. The whole country round Ramah has an aspect of stern and even painfill desolation; but this is almost forgotten in the great events which the surrounding heights and ruins recall to memory. On the identity of this Ramah with that of Samuel, SEE RAMATHAIM-ZOPHIM.

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

3. RAMAH OF GILEAD (2Ki 8:29; 2Ch 22:6), identical with Ramoth-Gilead (q.v.).

4. RAMAH OF NAPHTALI (Sept. Α᾿ραήλ v. r. ῾Ραμά; Vulg. Arania), one of the strong cities of the tribe, mentioned only in Jos 19:36, and situated apparently to the south of Hazor, between that city and the Sea of Galilee. Reland seems inclined to identity it with the Ramah of Asher; but  they are evidently distinct cities, as indicated both by ancient geographers and the sacred writer (Paloest. p. 963). Eusebius and Jerome record the name, though they appear to have known nothing of the place (Onomast. s.v. “Rama”). Beth-Rimah ( בֵּית רַימָה), a place in Galilee on a mountain, and famous for its wine, according to the Talmud (Menachoth, 8:6), is thought by Schwarz (Palest. p. 178) to be the Ramah of Naphtali. About six miles west by south of Safed, on the leading road to Akka, is a large modern village called Rameh. It stands on the declivity of the mountain, surrounded by olive-groves, and overlooking a fertile plain. It contains no visible traces of antiquity; but the name and the situation render it highly probable that it occupies the site of Ramah of Naphtali. It was visited by Schultz in 1847 (Ritter, Pal. und Syr. iii, 772), and by Robinson in 1852 (Bib. Res. iii, 79). See also Hackett, Illlustr. of Script. p. 240; Thomson, Land and Book, i, 515. SEE RAMATHITE.

5. RAMAH OF SAMUEL, the birthplace and home of that prophet (1Sa 1:19; 1Sa 2:11, etc.), and the city elsewhere called RAMATHAIM- ZOPHIM.

6. RAMAH OF THE SOUTH SEE RAMATH-NEGEB.

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

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

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

## Ramah Of Asher[[@Headword:Ramah Of Asher]]

             The Ordnance Map exhibits no name corresponding to this in the required locality except Khurbet Rumeh, which lies six miles and a half from the shore, between Ez-Zib (Ecdippa) and Ras en-Nakurah, and is described in the accompanying Memoirs (1:180) as: "heaps of scattered stones; a few cisterns."

## Ramah Of Benjamin[[@Headword:Ramah Of Benjamin]]

             Er-Raim lies five miles north of Jerusalem, and this "a small village in a conspicuous position on the top of a high white hill, with olives. It. has a well to the south. . . . The houses are of stone, partly built from old materials" (Memoirs to Ordnance Survey, 3:13). The remains in the vicinity are described (ibid. page 155).

## Ramah Of Naphtali[[@Headword:Ramah Of Naphtali]]

             Er-Ramieh lies seven miles and a quarter south-west of Safed, and is described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey (1:202) as "a small stone village, containing about one hundred and fifty Muoslems, situated on a hill-top in a valley, with a few figs, olives, and arable land; the valley to the west turns into a swamp in the winter, owing to its having no drainage; there are cisterns and a large pool for water supply." "There are several large sarcophagi round this village, and one olive-press" (ibid. page 255). (See illustration on page 791.)

## Ramanandis[[@Headword:Ramanandis]]

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

## Ramath - mizpeh[[@Headword:Ramath - mizpeh]]

             (Heb. Ramath' ham- Aitspeh', רָמִת הָמַּצְפֶּה, high-place of the watch- tower; Sept. Α᾿ραβὼθ κατὰ τὴν Μασσηφά, v. r. ῾Ραμώθ κατὰ τὴν Μασφά; Vulg. Ramath Masphe). In defining the boundaries of the tribe of Gad, Joshua states that Moses gave them inheritance... : “from Heshbon unto Ramath-mizpeh, and Betonim” (Jos 13:26). This place is nowhere else mentioned; and it appears to have constituted one of the landmarks on the northern border of the tribe, which ran from the banks of the Jabbok, in the parallel of Jerash, to the southern end of the Sea of Galilee. It was in this region Jacob and Laban had their remarkable interview and entered into the covenant. The place where they vowed to each other was marked by a heap of stones, and called both Galeed and Mizpah (Gen 31:48-49). This would seem to suggest the identity of the Mizpah of Jacob and Ramath-Mizpeh. SEE GAD; SEE JEGAR- SAHADUTHA. There was a Mizpeh in Gilead, on the north-east lorder of Gad, and close to the territory of the Ammonites. In later times the latter became the great gatheringplace of Israel east of the Jordan. SEE RAMOTH-GILEAD. It apparently was the same as Ramath-mizpeh. In the books of Maccabees it probably appears in the garb of Masphal (1Ma 5:35), but no information is afforded us in either Old Test. or Apocrypha as to its position. The lists of places in the districts north of es- Salt, collected by Dr. Eli Smith, and given by Dr. Robinson (Bibl. Res. 1st ed. App. to vol. iii), contain several names which may retain a trace of Ramath, viz.Ru7meimin (167 b), Reimunzzu (166 at), Rumrud7 a (165 t); but the situation of these places is not accurately known.

## Ramath-lehi[[@Headword:Ramath-lehi]]

             (Heb. tRamath' Lechi', רָמִת לֶחַי, craggy height [see below]; Sept. Α᾿ναίρεσις σιαγόνος; Vulg. Ramathlechi, quod intienp etatur elevatio maxilloe). The origin of this name, which occurs only in Jdg 15:17, forms one of the most romantic episodes in Scripture history. Samson, having been bound with two new cords, was given up to the Philistines at a place called Lehi, a name which signifies “jawbone.” When the enemy attacked him, he burst his bonds, seized the jawbone (lehi) of an ass that lay upon the ground, and with this odd weapon slew a thousand of them. Then he threw away the jawbone, and, as a memorial of the event, and by a characteristic play upon the old name, he called the place Ramath-lehithat is, the lifting (or wielding?) of the jawbone; and so it is interpreted in the Vulgate and in the Sept. SEE SAMSON.

But Gesenius has pointed out (Thesaur. p. 752 a) that to be consistent with this the vowel-points should be altered, and the words become רְמִת לְחַי; and that as they at present stand they are exactly parallel to Ramath-mizpeh and Ramath-negeb, and mean the “height of Lechi.” If we met with a similar account in ordinary history, we should say that the name had already been Ramath-lehi, and that the writer of the narrative, with that fondness for paronomasia which distinguishes these ancient records, had indulged himself in connecting the name with a possible exclamation of his hero. But the fact of the positive statement in this case may make us hesitate in coming to such a conclusion in less authoritative records. For the topography of the place, SEE LEHI.

## Ramath-lehi (2)[[@Headword:Ramath-lehi (2)]]

             For this Lieut. Conder suggests (Tent Work, 1:277) Aydn Kara, a name, he says, sometimes given to the springs Ayun Abu-Meharib, son the slope of a low hill, seven miles from Beit Athb, a little way (three miles and a half) north-west of Zoreah; and this he thinks represents the ancient En hak- Kore.

## Ramath-mizpeh[[@Headword:Ramath-mizpeh]]

             is conjecturally located by Tristram (Bible Places, page 226), at Tibneh, a little west of Jebel Ajlun, the northerly crest of Gilead. "It is the most conspicuous site in the district, a fine natural fortress on an isolated round mamelon-shaped hill, rising above the wide plateau, and commanding a magnificent view of western Palestine." Merrill argues at length (East of the Jordan, page 365 sq.) for its identity with Kulat er-Rubad, a few miles south of the Ramah of above spot.

## Ramath-negeb[[@Headword:Ramath-negeb]]

             or RAMATH OF THE SOUTH (Heb. Ramath' Ne'geb, רָמִת נֶגֶב; Sept. Βαμὲθ κατὰ λίβα, v. r. Ι᾿αμὲθ κατὰ λίβα; Vulg. Ranath contra australem plagam), a place apparently on the extreme southern border of Simeon. In this form it is only mentioned in Jos 19:8; and, from the peculiarity of the construction, there being no copulative, it would seem to be only another name for BAALATH-BEER, as suggested by Reland (Palaest. p. 964), and interpreted by Keil (ad loc.); yet the Sept. makes the places distinct. Be this as it may, Negeb is manifestly the name of a district, and not a general term, signifying “south.” SEE NEGEB. Ramah is not mentioned in the list of Judah (comp. Jos 15:21-32), nor in that of  Simeon in 1Ch 4:28-33; nor is it mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome. Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 342) takes it as identical with Ramath- lehi, which he finds at Tell el-Lekiyeh; but this appears to be so far south as to be out of the circle of Samson's adventures, and, at any rate, must wait for further evidence.

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

## Ramath-negeb (2)[[@Headword:Ramath-negeb (2)]]

             is regarded by Tristram (Bible Places, page 17) as probably the present “Kurmeh, southwest of Dhullam, wher ane aloe for many miles water is always to be found in plenty, and where the ravine is crossed by a strong dam to retain it. The walls of a fortified town are yet clearly to be traced, with extensive ruins, and it is at the head of the most frequented pass into Palestine from the-south-east."

## Ramathaim-zophim[[@Headword:Ramathaim-zophim]]

             (Heb. with tlme art. ha-Ramathayim Tsophim' הָרָמָתִיַם צוֹפַים, the two heights, watchers; Sept. Α᾿ρμαθαὶμ Σιφά, v. r. Α᾿ρμαθαὶμ Σωφίμ, making the art. הpart of the word; Vulg. Ramathayim Tsophim'), the birthplace of the prophet Samuel (1Sa 1:19), his own permanent and official residence (1Sa 7:17; 1Sa 8:4), and the place of his sepulture (1Sa 25:1). It was in Mount Ephraim (1Sa 1:1). It had apparently attached to it a place called Naioth, at which the “company” (or “school,” as it is called in modern times) of the sons of the prophets was maintained (1Sa 19:18, etc.; 20:1); and it had also in its neighborhood (probably between it and Gibeah of Saul) a great well, known as the well of Has-Sechu (1Sa 19:22). SEE SECHU. This is all we know of it with any degree of certainty.

Ramathaim, if interpreted as a Hebrew word, is dual — “the double eminence.” This may point to a peculiarity in the shape or nature of the place, or may be an instance of the tendency, familiar to all students, which exists in langulage to force an archaic or foreign name into an intelligible form. It is given in its complete shape in the Hebrew text and A. V. but once (1Sa 1:1). Elsewhere (1Sa 1:19; 1Sa 2:11; 1Sa 7:17; 1Sa 8:4; 1Sa 15:34; 1Sa 16:13; 1Sa 19:18-19; 1Sa 19:22-23; 1Sa 20:1; 1Sa 25:1; 1Sa 28:3) it occurs in the shorter form of Ramah (q.v.). The Sept., however (in both MSS.), gives it throughout as Armathaim, and inserts it in 1:3 after the words “his city,” where it is wanting in the Hebrew and A. V. Gesenius questions the identity of Ramathaim-zophim and Ramah (Thesaurus, p. 127); but a comparison of 1Sa 1:1 with 1Sa 1:19 shows without doubt that the same place is referred to. It is implied by Josephus, and affirmed by Eusebius and Jerome in the Onomasticon (“Armathem Seipha”); nor would it ever have been questioned had there not been other Ramahs mentioned in the sacred history. Of the force of “Zophim” no feasible explanation has been given. It was an ancient name on the east of Jordan (Num 23:14), and there, as here, was attached to an eminence. In the Targum of Jonathan, Ramathaim-zophim is rendered “Ramatha of the scholars of the prophets;” but this is evidently a late interpretation, arrived at by regarding the prophets as watchmen (the root of zophim, also that of nizpeh, having the force of looking out afar), coupled with the fact that at Naioth in Ramah there was a school of prophets. The most natural explanation appears to be that Zuph, one of Samuel's ancestors, had migrated from his home in Ephratah (1Sa 1:1; 1Ch 6:35), and settled in a district to which he gave his own name, and which was afterwards called the land of Zuph (1Sa 9:5). Ramah, or Ramathaim, was the chief town of this district, and was hence called Ramathaim-Zophim, that is, “Ramah of the Zuphites” (see Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 7). SEE ZOPHIM.

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

(1.) Eusebius and Jerome locate it near Diospolis or Lydda (Onomasts. s.v. “Armatha Sophim”), and identify it with the Arimathma of the N.T. (Mat 27:57). Jerome's words are: “Armathem Seipha: the city of Helkana and Samuel. It lies near (πλησίον) Diospolis: thence came Joseph, in the Gospels said to be from Arimathaea.” Diospolis is Lydda, the modern Ludd; and the reference is, no doubt, to Ramleh, the wellknown modern town, two miles from Ludd. Jerome agrees with Eusebius in his translation of this passage; but in the Epitaphium Pauloe (Epist. 108) he connects Ramleh with Arimathba only, and places it haud procul a Lyddu. This last identification may be correct; for the Sept. Α᾿ρμαθαίμ seems to be the same name as the New-Test. Α᾿ριμαθαία, and  represents the Hebrew הרמתים, with the article. There is no doubt there was a city called Armatha or Ramathem on the plain near Lydda at an early period; and its modern representative mav be Ramleh, as suggested by Reland and others (Reland, Paloest. p. 580, 959; see, however, Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 238). But Ramah of Samuel could not have been so far distant from Gibeah of Saul; and there is a fatal obstacle to this identification in the fact that Ramleh (“the sandy”) lies on the open face of tle maritime plain, and cannot in any sense be said to be in Mount Ephraim or any other mountain district. Eusebius possibly refers to another Ramah named in Neh 11:33.

(2.) Some would identify this city with Ramah of Benjamin (Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 1275; Winer, Real Worterb. s.v. “Rama”); but this Ramah seems too close to Saul's residence at Gibeah to suit the requirements ot the sacred narrative in 1Sa 19:18. (Yet see below.)

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

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

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

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

(8.) Bonar (Land of Promise, p. 178, 554) adopts er-Ram, which he places a short distance north of Bethlehem, east of Rachel's sepulchre. Eusebius  (Onomast. s.v. ῾Ραβεδέ) says that “Rama of Benjamin” is near (περί) Bethlehem, where the “veoice in Rama was heard;” and in our times the name is mentioned, besides Bonar, by Prokesch and Salzbacher (cited in Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 8, note); but this cannot be regarded as certain, and Stewart has pointed out that it is too close to Rachel's monument to suit the case.

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

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

(a.) In 1Sa 1:1 we read, “There was a certain man of Ramathaim- zophim, of Mount Ephraim.” From this it would appear, at first sight, that Ramathaim was situated in the district called Mount Ephraim. The construction of the Hebrew, however, does not make this quite certain. The phrase מהר אפרים מואּהרמתים צופיםmight possibly mean, not that Ramathaim was in Mount Ephraim (which would be expressed rather by בהר), but that Elkanah was in some way of Mount Ephraim (the  Hebrew is מהר), though residing in Ramathaim. The statement of the sacred writer, therefore, does not form an insuperable objection to a theory that would locate Ramathaim beyond the bounds of Mount Ephraim. Besides, the extent of the region called Mount Ephraim is nowhere defined. It may mean that section of mountain allotted to the tribe of Ephraim, or it may have extended so as to include part, or even the whole, of Benjamin. In the mouth of an ancient Hebrew, the expression would mean that portion of the mountainous district which was. at the time of speaking, in the possession of the tribe of Ephraim. “Little Benjamin” was for so long in close alliance with, and dependence on, its more powful kinsman, that nothing is more probable than that the name of e1phraim may have been extended over the mountainous region which was allotted to the younger son of Rachel. Of this there are not wanting indications. The palm-tree of Deborah was “in Mount Ephraim,” between Bethel and Ramah, and is identified with great plausibility by the author of the Targum on Jdg 4:5 with Ataroth, one of the landmarks on the south boundary of Ephraim, which still survives in Amra, two and a half miles north of Ramah of Benjamin (er-Ram). Bethel itself, though in the catalogue of the cities of Benjamin (Jos 18:22), was appropriated by Jeroboam as one of his idol sanctuaries, and is one of the “cities of Mount Ephraim” which were taken from him by Baasha and restored by Asa (2Ch 13:19; 2Ch 15:8). Jeremiah (ch. 31) connects Ramalh of Benjamin with Mount Ephraim (2Ch 15:6; 2Ch 15:9; 2Ch 15:15; 2Ch 15:18). It could scarcely have embraced any portion of Judah. since the two tribes were rivals for sovereignty. The allusions to Mount Ephraim in 1Sa 9:4; Jos 17:15; Jdg 17:1, appear to confine the name to the territory of the tribe.

(b.) Ramah would appear to have been at some considerable distance from the residence of Saul at Gibeah. Such, at least, is the conclusion one would naturally draw from the following passages: 1Sa 15:34-35; 1Sa 19:18-23. But in neither of these passages is it clearly asserted nor certainly implied. In another passage the immediate proximity of Gibeah and Ramah seems to be directly stated (1Sa 22:6). This passage, it is true, may either be translated (with Junins, Michaelis, De Wette, and Bunsen), “Saul abode in Gibeah under the tamarisk on the height” (in which case it will add one to the scality number of instances in which the word is used otherwise than as a proper name); or it may imply that Ramah was included within the precincts of the king's city. The Sept. reads Bama for Ramah, and renders the words “on the hill under the field in Bama.” Eusebius, in  his Onomasticon, (s.v. ῾Ραμά), characterizes Ramah as the “city of Saul.” In any case, there seems to be no insuperable objection against the identity of Ramah of Saul with Ramah of Benjamin.

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

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

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

## Ramathaim-zophim (2)[[@Headword:Ramathaim-zophim (2)]]

             Lieut. Conder is inined (Tent Work, 2:116) to identify this with Ram Allah, east of Beth-horon, on the west slope of Mt. Ephraim, overlooking the maritime plain but he admits that the connections are very much disputed.

## Ramathem[[@Headword:Ramathem]]

             ( ῾Ραμαθέμ v. r. ῾Ραθαμείν; Josephus, ῾Ραμαθά [Ant. 13:4, 9]; Vulg. Ramathan), one of the three “governments” (νομοί and τοπαρχίαι ( lt)  which were added to Judtea by king Demetrius Nicator out of the country of Samaria (1Ma 11:34); the others were Aphmerema and Lydda. It no doubt derived its name from a town of the name of Ramathaim, probably that renowned as the birthplace of Samuel the prophet. — Smith.

## Ramathite[[@Headword:Ramathite]]

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

## Ramayana[[@Headword:Ramayana]]

             is the name of one of the two great epic poems of ancient India (for the other, SEE MAHA-BHARATA ). Its subject-matter is the history of Rama, one of the incarnations of Vishnu (q.v., and SEE RAMA ), and its reputed author is Valmiki, who is said to have taught his poem to the two sons of Rama, the hero of the history; and, according to this legend, would have been a contemporary of lama himself. But though this latter account is open to much doubt, it seems certain that Valmiki — unlike Vyassa (q.v.), the supposed compiler of the Mahabharata — was a real personage; and, moreover, that the Ramayana was the work of one single poet-not like the Mahabharata, the creation of various epochs and different minds. As a poetical composition, the Ramayana is therefore far superior to the Mahabharata; and it may be called the best great poem of ancient India, fairly claiming a rank in the literature of the world equal to that of the epic poetry of Homer. Whereas the character of the Mahabharata is cyclopoedical, its main subject-matter overgrown by episodes of the most diversified nature, its diction differing in merit, both from a poetical and grammatical point of view, according to the ages that worked at its completion — the Ramayana has but one object in view, the history of Rama. Its episodes are rare, and restricted to the early portion of the work, and its poetical diction betrays throughout the same finish and the same poetical genius. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt as to the relative ages of both poems, provided that we look upon the Mahabharata in the form in which it is preserved as a whole. Whether we apply as a test the aspect of the religious life, or the geographical and other knowledge displayed in the one and the other work, the Ramayana appears as the  older of the two. Since it is the chief source whence our information of the Rama incarnation of Vishnu is derived, its contents may be gathered from that portion of the article VISHNU SEE VISHNU which relates to Ramachandra. The Ramayana contains (professedly) 24,000 epic verses, or slokats, in seven books, or kandas, called the Bdla-Ay-odlhya-, Aranyac-, Kishkindhad-, Sundara-, Yuddha- (or Lankca-), and Uttara- kanda.

The text which has come down to us exhibits, in different sets of manuscripts, such considerable discrepancies that it becomes necessary to speak of two recensions in which it now exists. This remarkable fact was first made known by A. W. von Schlegel, who, in Europe, was the first to attempt a critical edition of this poem; it is now fully corroborated by a comparison that may be made between the printed editions of both texts. The one is more concise in its diction, and has less tendency than the other to that kind of descriptive enlargement of facts and sentiments which characterizes the later poetry of India; it often also exhibits grammatical forms and peculiarities of an archaic stamp, where the other studiously avoids that which must have appeared to its editors in the light of a grammatical difficulty. In short, there canl be little doubt that the former is the older and more genuine, and the latter the more recent, and in some respects more spurious, text. A complete edition of the older text, with two commentaries, was published at Madras in 1856 (in the Telugu characters, vol. i-iii); another edition of the same text, with a short commentary, appeared at Calcutta in two volumes (1860), and a more careful and elegant one at Bombay (1861). Of the later edition, Gaspare Gorresio has edited the first six books (vol. i-v, Paris, 1843-50) without a commentary, but with an Italian, somewhat free, translation in poetical prose (vol. i-x, Paris, 184758). Former attempts at an edition and translation of the Ramayana remained unfortunately incomplete. The earliest was that made by William Carey and Joshua Marshman, who edited the first two books, and added to the text a prose translation in English and explanatory notes (vol. i-iii, Serampore, 1806-10; and vol. i, containing the first book, Dunstable, 1808). Another edition, of an eclectic nature, is that by A. W. von Schlegel; it contains the first two books of the text, and an excellent Latin translation of the first book and twenty chapters of the second (vol. i, pts. i and ii, and vol. ii, pt. i, Bonn, 1846). Various episodes from the Ramayana, it may also be added, have at various times occupied sundry editors and translators.

## Rambach, August Jakob[[@Headword:Rambach, August Jakob]]

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

## Rambach, Friedrich Eberhard[[@Headword:Rambach, Friedrich Eberhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Pfullendorf, near Gotha, August 24, 1708. He studied at Halle, was in 1730 teacher there, in 1734 deacon, in 1736 preacher at Teupitz, in 1740 deacon at Halle, in 1766 member of the upper consistory at Breslau, and died in 1775. Rambach is best known as translator of the works of Sherlock, Roques, Lenfant, Bentley, Saurin, Chatelain, Serces, Doddridge, Kidder, Stackhouse, Waatt, Sarpi, and others. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands,  s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:250, 438, 607, 667, 678, 683. 2:29; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rambach, Johann Jacob[[@Headword:Rambach, Johann Jacob]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born March 7, 1737. He studied at Halle, was in 1760 rector at Magdeburg, in 1765 at Quedlinburg, in 1774 first preacher there, in 1786 pastor at Hamburg, and died August 6, 1818. He wrote, De Adiaphoris in Utronze Sacramento Obviis (Halle, 1758): — De Actionibus Prophetaum Symbolicis (Magdeburg, 1760), besides a number of sermons. See Diring, Die deutschen Kanzelredner, pages 306-315 (B.P.)

## Rambach, Johann Jakob[[@Headword:Rambach, Johann Jakob]]

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

## Ramban[[@Headword:Ramban]]

             SEE NACHMIANIDES.

## Rambarn[[@Headword:Rambarn]]

             SEE MAIMONIDES.

## Rambour, Abraham[[@Headword:Rambour, Abraham]]

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

## Rameau, Jean-Philippe[[@Headword:Rameau, Jean-Philippe]]

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

## Ramenghi, Bartolomeo[[@Headword:Ramenghi, Bartolomeo]]

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

## Rameses[[@Headword:Rameses]]

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

The first mention of Rameses is in the narrative of the settling by Joseph of his father and brethren int. Egypt, where it is related that a possession was given them “in the land of Rameses” (Gen 47:11). This land of Rameses (אֶרֶוֹ רִעְמְסֵס) either corresponds to the land of Goshen, or was a district of it, more probably the former, as appears from a comparison of  a par-allel passage (Gen 47:6). The name next occurs as that of one of the two cities built for the Pharaoh who first oppressed the children of Israel. “And they built for Pharaoh treasure cities (עָרֵי מַסְבְּנוֹת), Pithom and Ramses” (Exo 1:11). So in the A.V. The Sept, however, reads πόλεις ὀχυράς, and the Vulg. turbes tabernaculorum, as if the root had been

שָׁכִן. The signification of the word מַסְכְּנוֹתis decided by its use for storehouses of corn, wine, and oil, which Hezekiah had (2Ch 32:28). We should therefore here read store-cities, which may have been the meaning of our translators. The name of Pithom indicates the region near Heliopolis, and therefore the neighborhood of Goshen, or that tract itself; and there can therefore be no doubt that Raamses is “Rameses in the land of Goshen. “In the narrative of the Exode we read of Rameses at the starting-point of the journey (Exo 12:37; see also Num 33:3; Num 33:5). SEE GOSHEN.

If, then, we suppose Rameses or Ramses to have been the chief town of the land of Rameses, either Goshen itself or a district of it, we have to endeavor to determine its situation. Lepsius supposes that Abu-Kesheid is on the site of Rameses. His reasons are that: in the Sept. Heroopolis is placed in the land of Rameses (καθ᾿ ῾Ηρώων πόλιν, ἐν γῇ ῾Ραμεσσῇ, or εἰς γῆν ῾Ραμεσσῆ), in a passage where the Hebrew only mentions “the land of Goshen” (Gen 46:28), and that there is a monolithic group at Abu-Kesheid representing Tum and Ra, and between them Rameses II, who was probably there worshipped. There would seem, therefore, to be an indication of the situation of the district and city from this mention of Heroipolis, and the statue of Rameses might mark a place named after that king. It must, however, be remembered

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

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

(c) that the mention of Heroipolis in the Sept. would seem to be a gloss. It is also necessary to consider the evidence in the Biblical narrative of the position of Rameses, which seems to point to the western part of the land  of Goshen, since two full marches, and part at least of a third, brolught the Israelites from this town to the Red Sea; and the narrative appears to indicate a route for the chief part directly towards the sea. After the second day's journey they “encamped in Etham, in the edge of the wilderness” (Exo 13:20), and on the third day they appear to have turned. If, however, Rameses was where Lepsius places it, the route would have been almost wholly through the wilderness, and mainly along the tract bordering the Red Sea in a southerly direction, so that they would have turned almost at once. Even could it be proved that it was anciently called Rameses, the case would not be made out, for there is good reason to suppose that many cities in Egypt bore this name. Apart from the ancient evidence, we mav mention that there is now a place called “Remsees” or “Ramsecs” in the Boheireh (the great province on the west of the Rosetta branch of the Nile), mentioned in the list of towns and villages of Egypt in De Sacy's Abd-allatif; p. 664. It gave to its district the name of “Hof-Remsees” or “Ramsees.”

This “Hof” must not be confounded with the “Hof” commonly known, which was in the district of Belbeis. — Smith. Of the old translators, only Saadias and Pseudo-Jonathan point out a place for Rameses; the rest all preserve the name from the Hebrew (comp. Arab. of Erpen, On Exo 1:11). Saadias gives Heliopolis; Jonathan, Pelusiom. The latter is certainly wrong; the former is supported by Jablonski (Opusc. ii, 136), on the ground of a Coptic etymology. But Heliopolis, which Tischendorf also (Reis. i, 175, and Dissert. cde Isr. per Matre Rub. Trans. p. 15 sq.) makes to be Raamses, is elsewhere always called On (q.v.), and is expressly distinguished from Rameses by the Sept. (Exo 1:11; here the Cod. Mediolan. reads indeedἤ καὶ ῎Ων, but this amounts to nothing against the Hebrew text). Others (as Hengstenberg, Moses, p. 48 sq.; Ewald, Isr. Gesch. ii, 52 sq.; Forbiger, Handb. ii, 784) understand Heroopolis (comp. Sept. at Gen 46:28; where, however, the region of Raamses is spoken of, as above, and it is only asserted that Heroopolis lay in this district). To the same purpose is the view of Clericus, Lakemacher (Observ. Philol. 6:321 sq.), and Muller (Satur. Observ. Philol. p. 189) that Rameses is Avaris (Gr. Avaplt, “Ataplt), in the Saitic (or, according to Bernard's plausible emendation, the Sethrotic) district (Ptolemy, 4:5, 53), a place fortified by Salatis, the king of the Hyksos (Josephus, Apion, i, 14, 26; comp. Michaelis, Suppl. p. 2261). For Avaris (according to Manetho, in Josephus, Apion, i, 26) is the city of Typhon, and this is probably Heroopolis itself (comp. Rosenmuller, Alterth. iii, 261; Ewald, ii, 53) — Winer. The location of Rameses is doubtless indicated by  the present Tell Ramsis, a quadrangular mound near Belbeis. SEE RED SEA, PASSAGE OF.

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

## Ramesse[[@Headword:Ramesse]]

             ( ῾Ραμεσσῇ), the Greek form (Jdt 1:9) of the name of the land of RAMESES SEE RAMESES (q.v.).

## Ramiah[[@Headword:Ramiah]]

             (Heb. Ramyah', רִמְיָה, fixed of Jehovah Sept. ῾Ραμία), an Israelite of the sons of Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife under the influence of Ezra (Ezr 10:25). B.C. 458.

## Ramirez, Francisco[[@Headword:Ramirez, Francisco]]

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

## Ramists[[@Headword:Ramists]]

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

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

## Rammohun Roy[[@Headword:Rammohun Roy]]

             a celebrated Hindu convert to Western civilization and a liberal Christianity, is noted especially as the founder of a theistic school of thought among the Hindus, and in a certain sense may be pronounced the forerunner of Sen. Rammohun Roy was born about 1774 at Bordnan, in the province of Bengal, of Brahminic parentage of high caste. Reared like other youths of India, he enjoyed his elementary training at home, and was then placed under the care of the great masters of the Vedas and the Shastras, and, both at Patna and afterwards at Benares, acquired great proficiency in the sacred writings of Hinduism. His familiarity with the Arabic, Persian, and Sanscrit languages led him to an examination of the religious doctrines of the various sects of India, and finally to those of the West. He had evinced a sceptical turn of mind while yet a youth; and, once led away into these inquiries, he was soon forced to abandon the ground of his ancestry. But instead of accepting the inspired religion of the Christians,  he sought the engrafting of its ethics upon the old faith of India, and the restoration of Hinduism in its ancient purity, as the first step to this accomplishment. His parents unyieldingly opposed his purpose. His father sent him away and disinherited him. His mother conceded the superstitious basis of her faith, but pleaded for its observance on the ground of duty towards her people and race. “You are right,” she said to him, when she was about to set out on a pilgrimage to Juggernaut; “but I am a woman, and cannot give up observances which are a comfort to me.” A wanderer from home, he spent two or three years in Thibet, where he excited general anger by denying that the Lama (q.v.) was the creator and preserver of the world. He was finally recalled by his father and restored to paternal favor. But in a short time, as he tells us himself, “my continued controversies with the Brahmins on the subject of their idolatry and superstition, and my interference with their custom of burning widows, and other pernicious practices, revived and increased their animosity against me; and, through their influence with my family, my father was again obliged to withdraw his countenance openly, though his limited pecuniary support was still continued to me.” His father died in 1803, and he then published various books and pamphlets against the errors of the Brahmins, in the native and foreign languages.

He says: “The ground which I took in all my controversies was, not that of opposition to Brahminism, but to a perversion of it; and I endeavored to show that the idolatry of the Brahmins was contrary to the practice of their ancestors and to the principles of the ancient books and authorities which they professed to revere annd obey.” In order to deprive him of caste, the Brahmins commenced a suit against him, which, after many years of litigation, was decided in his favor. Of the body of Hindu theology comprised in the Vedas there is an ancient extract called the Vedant, or the Resolution of all the Veds, written in Sanscrit. Rammohun Roy translated it into Bengalee and Hindostanee, and afterwards published an abridgment of it for gratuitous circulation; of this abridgment he published an English translation in 1816. He afterwards published some of the principal chapters of the Vedas in Bengalee and English. He was at different times the proprietor or publisher of newspapers in the native languages, in which he expressed his opinion freely against abuses, political as well as religious, especially the burning of widows. He was also, in conjunction with other liberal Hindius, proprietor of the Bengal Herald, an English newspaper. His intimate association with the English, and the constant interchange with European thought and familiarity with the West generally, led him at  last to abandon the old ground entirely, and he brought before his countrymen the excellence of the moral theories of Christianity in 1820 in a work which he entitled The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness. It was written in English, Sanscrit, and Bengalee, and consists, besides selections from the New Test., of such commentaries as a Hindu apostate who abandoned heathenism for bald theism would be likely to produce. The divinity of Christ is ignored, the miracles are rejected, and many other portions of the Gospel held to be fundamental in orthodox Christianity; and the simple morality of Jesus is held up as “a guide to happiness and peace.” The position taken in this work not only encountered the opposition of his abandoned friends; his new associates also felt grieved and disappointed, and, in the first hour of disappointment, severely rebuked his false theology.

He was replied to, and a controversy opened on the great question of the Trinity. His Appeal, published not under his own name, but as coming from a “friend of truth,” and, later, his treatise on the unity of God, entitled One Supreme Being, greatly modified his first position, and showed that he took, at least, the advanced ground of a Unitarian of the Old School, and recognised in Jesus Christ the “Son of God, by whom God made the world and all things.” In April, 1831, Rammohun Roy visited England, and he associated generally with the Unitarians, whose chapels he visited as a worshipper. He also took great interest in the political questions of the day. The great question of parliamentary reform was then agitating the country. Of the Reform Bill he wrote that it “would, in its consequences, promote the welfare of England and her dependencies — nay, of the whole world.” His society was universally courted in England. He was oppressed with invitations to attend social parties and political and ecclesiastical meetings. His anxiety to see everything and to please all led him to overtask himself to such an extent that his health, long failing, at last broke down. He died at Bristol, Sept. 27, 1833. The adverse circumstances of his birth were such as might easily have enslaved even his powerful understanding, or, still more easily, might have perverted it to selfish ends; but he won his high position by an inflexible honesty of purpose and energy of will, and had he lived he might have become an important factor in the propagation of Christianity in the East. See sketch of his life, written by himself, in the Athenaeum, No. 310, Oct. 5, 1833; Chambers's Edinburgh Journal, Aug. 2, 1834; Carpenter, Review of Labors, Opinions, and Character of Rajah Ranmmohun Roy; Pauthier, in the Revue Encyclopedique, 1833; Asiatic Journal, vol. xii; Theol. Eclectic, June, 1869; English Cyclop. s.v.

## Rammok[[@Headword:Rammok]]

             SEE DROMEDARY.

## Ramoth[[@Headword:Ramoth]]

             SEE CORAL.

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

             (Heb. Ramoth', רָמוֹת[but רָאמוֹתin Deu 4:43; Jos 20:8; 1Ch 6:73; 1Ch 6:80], heights, plur. of Ramah [q.v.]; Sept. usually ῾Ραμώθ), but ῾Ρημώθ in Ezr 10:29, ῾Ραμμώθ in 2Ch 18:2-3; 2Ch 18:5, etc.), the name of three towns in Palestine, and also of one man.

1. (Sept. ἡ ῾Ραμώθ.) One of the four Levitical cities of Issachar according to the catalogue in 1Ch 6:73. In the parallel list in Jos 21:28-29, among other variations, JARIMUTH SEE JARIMUTH (q.v.) appears in place of Ramoth. It seems impossible to decide which is the correct reading; or whether, again, REMETH SEE REMETH (q.v.), a town of Issachar, is distinct from them, or one and the same.

2. A city in the tribe of Gad (Deu 4:43; Jos 20:8; Jos 21:38; 1Ch 6:80), elsewhere called RAMOTH-GILEAD SEE RAMOTH-GILEAD (q.v.).

3. (Sept. ῾Ραμᾶ.) A city in the tribe of Simeon (“South Ramoth,” 1Sa 30:27). SEE RAMATH-NEGEB.

4. (Heb. text Yirmoth', יַרְמוֹת, marg. ve-Ramoth', וְרָמוֹת, and Ramoth; Sept. Ρημώθ v. r. Μημών.) An Israelitish layman of the sons of Bani, who renounced his strange wife at Ezra's instigation (Ezr 10:29). B.C. 458.

## Ramoth-Gilead[[@Headword:Ramoth-Gilead]]

             Dr. Merrill strongly urges the claims of Jerash as the site of this place (East of the Jordan, page 284 sq.), but Tristram (Bible Places, page 337) adheres to es-Salt.

## Ramoth-gilead[[@Headword:Ramoth-gilead]]

             (Heb. Ramoth' Gilad', רָמֹת גַּלְעָד; Sept. ῾Ρεμμάθ, ῾Ρεμμώθ, and ῾Ραμώθ Γαλαάδ; Ε᾿ρεμαθγαλαάδ v. r. ῾Ραμμώθ; Josephus, Α᾿ραμαθά; Vulg. Ramoth Galaad), the “heights of Gilead;” or RAMOTH IN GILEAD ( ָָראמֹת בִּגַּלְעָדSept. ἡ ῾Ραμὼθ ἐν Γαλαάθ, Α᾿ρημώθ, ῾Ρεμμὰθ Γαλαάδ, v.r. ῾Ραμμώθ, ῾Ραμώθ; Vulg. Ramoth in Galaad,  Deu 4:43; Jos 20:8; Jos 21:38 1Ki 22:3 [in the A.V. only], also written plen, רָמוֹת, in 2Ch 22:5; and simply RAMAH, רָמָהin 2Ki 8:29, and 2Ch 22:6), one of the chief cities of the tribe of Gad, on the east side of the Jordan. It was allotted to the Levites, and appointed a city of refuge (Deu 4:43; Jos 20:8). The latter fact would seem to indicate that it occupied a central position in the tribe, and also probably in the country assigned to the Israelites east of the Jordan. Ramoth played for a time an important part in Israelitish history, and was the scene of many a hard struggle. It was apparently a strong fortress, and considered the key of the country. Hence, when taken by the Syrians, the kings of Israel and Judah regarded it as a national loss, affecting both kingdoms, and they combined to drive out the common enemy (1Ki 22:4 sq.). The united attack was unsuccessful, and the king of Israel was mortally wounded in the battle (22:34-37). At a later period, apparently in the reign of Joram (2Ki 9:14-15; comp. Josephus, Ant. 9:6, 1), Ramoth was taken from the Syrians and held, notwithstanding all the efforts of Hazael to regain it. Joram, having been wounded in the struggle, left his army under the command of Jehu, and returned to Jezreel to be healed (2Ki 8:29). During his absence Jehu was anointed by order of Elisha (9:1, 2), and commissioned to execute vengeance on the wicked house of Ahab (2Ki 8:7-10). Leaving Ramoth, Jehu drove direct to Jezreel. The king, expecting news from the seat of war, had watchmen set on the towers, who saw his chariot approaching (2Ki 8:16-17). The rest of the story is well known. SEE AHAB; SEE JEHU. After this incident Ramoth-gilead appears no more in Jewish history.

The exact position of Ramoth is nowhere defined in Scripture. The name (Ramloth, “heights”) would seem to indicate that it occupied a commanding position on the summit of the range of Gilead. In 1Ki 4:13, we read that when the districts of Solomon's purveyors were arranged, the son of Geber was stationed in Ramoth, and had charge of all the cities of Jair the son of Manasseh, both in Gilead and Bashan; and these cities extended over the whole north-eastern section of Palestine beyond Jordan. Various opinions have been entertained regarding the site of this ancient city. Some would identify it with Jerash, the old Roman Gerasa, whose ruins are the most magnificent and extensive east of the Jordan (see Benjamin of Tudela, by Asher); but this is too far north, and Jerash, besides, lies in a valley. Ewald would locate it at the village of Reisen  among the mountains, five miles west of Jerash (Gesch. Isr. 3:500). For this there is no evidence whatever. Others locate it on a site bearing the name of Jel'ad, exactly identical with the ancient Hebrew Gilead, which is mentioned by Seetzen (Reisen, March 11, 1806), and marked on his map (ibid. iv) and that of Van de Velde (1858) as four or five miles north of es- Salt. Schwarz (Palest. p. 232 sq.) identifies this Ramoth with Kullut el- Rabat, which is situated on one of the highest points of the mountain of Gilead, not far from the Wady Rajib, and west of Ajlin. It is even now strongly fortified, and is visible at a great distance, especially to the northeast. The most probable opinion regarding the site of Ramoth is that which places it at the village of es-Salt. This is indicated

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

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

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

(d) by the statement of Eusebius that Ramoth-gilead lay in the fifteenth mile from Philadelphia towards the west, and this is the exact distance of es-Salt from Rabbath-Ammon (Onomast. s.v. “Rammoth”). The situation of es-Salt is strong and picturesque. The hill on which it stands is separated by deep ravines from the loftier mountains that encompass it, and its lower slopes are covered with terraced vineyards, while the neighboring hill-sides and valleys abound with olive-groves. On the summit stands the castle, a rectangular building with towers at the corners, and defended by a deep moat hewn in the rock. The foundations appear to be Roman, if not earlier, but the upper walls are Saracenic. In the town itself, which contains some three thousand inhabitants, there are few remains of antiquity. In the cliffs and ravines beneath it are great numbers of tombs and grottos (Handbook for Sinai and Palestine, p. 308). Es-Salt is famous for its vineyards, and its raisins are esteemed the best in Palestine. They are carried in large quantities to Jerusalem (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 349; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 321; Ritter, Pal. und Syr. p. 1121-38; Abulfeda, Tab. Syr. p. 92; Buckingham, Travels, p. 20). — Kitto. It is now the only inhabited place in the province of Belka. It is still a place of comparative strength, and overawes the Bedawin by a garrison under the pasha of Damascus.  Tristram says of it, “Ramoth-gilead must always have been the key of Gilead — at the head of the only easy road from the Jordan, opening immediately on the rich plateau of the interior, and with this isolated cone (the Osha) rising close above it, fortified from very early times, by art as well as by nature. Of the fortress only a tall fragment of wall remains, and a pointed archway, with a sort of large dial-plate, carved deeply in stone, surrounded by a rose-work decoration. It appears to be all modern Turkish work” (Land of Israel, p. 555). There is a plateau, he further tells us, on the road towards Jordan, and there probably the battle was fought where Ahab received his mortal wound-that being the only place where chariots could come into play.

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

## Ramoth-negeb[[@Headword:Ramoth-negeb]]

             SEE RAMATH-NEGEB.

## Rampalle, Jeanne[[@Headword:Rampalle, Jeanne]]

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

## Rampart[[@Headword:Rampart]]

             (חֵיל, cheyl, Lam 2:8; Nah 3:8; elsewhere “trench,” “bulwark,” etc.), a fortification or low wall surrounding and protecting a military trench (2Sa 20:15; Isa 26:1, etc.; comp. 1Ki 21:23; Psa 48:14). SEE ARMY; SEE SIEGE. In the Talmud the Hebrew word is applied to'the interior space surrounding the wall of the Temple (Lightfoot, Opp. ii, 193). SEE TEMPLE.

## Rampelogo (Or Rampeloco), Antonio[[@Headword:Rampelogo (Or Rampeloco), Antonio]]

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

## Rampen, Henri[[@Headword:Rampen, Henri]]

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

## Ramrayas[[@Headword:Ramrayas]]

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

## Rams Horn[[@Headword:Rams Horn]]

             (יוֹבֵל, yobel', Jos 6:4; Jos 6:13; elsewhere “jubilee,” “trumpet”). The Hebrew word keren, i.e. horn, is also used for the crooked trumpet, a very ancient instrument. Sometimes it was made of the horns of oxen, and sometimes ram's horns were employed. It is probable that in later times they were made of metal. They were employed in war, and on solemn occasions (Exo 19:13). The latter word is also rendered cornet (Dan 3:5; Dan 3:7; Dan 3:10-15). SEE JUBILEE; SEE MUSICAL INSTRUMENTS.

## Rams Skins[[@Headword:Rams Skins]]

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

## Ramsauer, Otto Heinrich David[[@Headword:Ramsauer, Otto Heinrich David]]

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

## Ramsay, Edward Bannerman, LL.D[[@Headword:Ramsay, Edward Bannerman, LL.D]]

             a Scottish clergyman and author, was born at Balmain, Kincardineshire, January 31, 1793, and graduated from St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1815. He took orders in the Church of England, and was a curate in Somersetshire for seven years. In 1830 he became minister of St. John's, Edinburgh, and in 1841 dean of the Reformed Episcopal Church of Scotland, He died at Edinburgh, December 27, 1872. His publications include, a annual of Catechetical Instruction (6th ed. Edinburgh, 1851; 9th ed. 1863): — Sermons for Advent (1850): — Scripture Doctrine of the Eucharist (1858): — Reminiscences of Scottish Life and Character (eod.): — Diversities of Christian Character Illustrated in the Lives of the Four Great Apostles (eod.): — Present State of our Canon Law Considered (1859): — Christian Life (1862): — Episcopal Church of Scotland (eod.): — Two Lectures on Handel (eod.): — Christian Responsibility (1864): — Thomas Chalmers, D.D.: — Biographical Notice (1867): — Pulpit Table- talk (1868), and other works. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ramsay, James P[[@Headword:Ramsay, James P]]

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

## Ramsdell, Hezekiah S[[@Headword:Ramsdell, Hezekiah S]]

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

## Ramsey, James (1)[[@Headword:Ramsey, James (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was rector of Hamilton and in 1670 was made dean of Glasgow, He was preferred to the see of Dunblane and to the  archiepiscopal see of Glasgow. In May 1684, he was translated from Dunblane to Ross, and here he continued until the abolition of episcopacy in Scotland in 1688. He died at Edinburgh, October 22, 1696. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 204.

## Ramsey, James (2), D.D[[@Headword:Ramsey, James (2), D.D]]

             an Associate minister, was born in Lancaster County, Pennsylvania, March 22, 1771. It is supposed that he commenced; his classical studies under his. minister, Dr. Anderson, when twenty-five years of age. He was licensed. at Buffalo, N.Y., by the Presbytery of Chartiers, in 1803; ordained and installed pastor of the congregation of, Chartiers, September 4, 1805, and in. 1821 was chosen professor in the. Western, Seminary, to. which, office was added the professorship of Hebrew in Jefferson, College. In 1842 he resigned his professorship and continued his duties as pastor. He died March 6, 1855. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, IX, 3:77.

## Ramsey, James Beverlin, D.D[[@Headword:Ramsey, James Beverlin, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Elkton, Maryland, May 20, 1814. He graduated from Lafayette College in 1836, and from Princeton Theological Seminary in 1840; became pastor at West Farms, N.Y., in 1841, after 1846 a missionary to the Choctaw Indians, teacher and stated supply in various places, until his death, July 23, 1871. See Genesis Cat. of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1881, page 112; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Ramsey, Peter de[[@Headword:Ramsey, Peter de]]

             a Scotch prelate, was formerly a monk of Arbroath, but was bishop of Aberdeen in 1250. He died in 1256. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 107.

## Ramsey, William B[[@Headword:Ramsey, William B]]

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

## Ramus, Petrus[[@Headword:Ramus, Petrus]]

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

He undertook to prove the then almost impious task that Aristotle was not infallible. He had gradually withdrawn from Aristotelianism as an authority, and pleaded now for the exercise of individual reason as against the “authority,” which scholasticism imposed on all students of philosophy. Enthusiast as he was, he was led to make the extravagant statement in his thesis that “all that Aristotle had said was false” (qucecunque ab Aristotele dicta essent, commenttitia esse). It speaks, however, a great deal for the ability he showed on this occasion that his judges, although themselves Aristotelians, were compelled to applaiud him. Ramus was immediately made a teacher in the College du Mans, and along with two learned friends opened a special class for reading the Greek and Latin authors, designed to combine the study of eloquence with that of philosophy. His audience was large, and his success as a teacher remarkable. He now turned his attention more particularly to the science of logic, which, in his usual adventurous spirit, he undertook to “reform;” and no one acquainted with his system will deny that many of his innovations were both rational and beneficial. His attempts excited much hostility among the Aristotelians; and when his treatise on the subject (Dialecticoe Partitiones) appeared in 1543, it was fiercely assailed by the doctors of the Sorbonne, the Academy of Geneva, the majority of the high- schools of the Continent, which had all, in alliance with the Church, given Aristotelianism the supreme rule. The University of Paris linked itself with jurists, councillors, the king's ministers, the king himself, to crush this bold innovator. He was charged with impiety and sedition. and with a desire to overthrow all science and religion through the medium of an attack on Aristotle. On the report of an irregular tribunal appointed to consider the charges made against him, the king ordered his works to be suppressed, and forbade his teaching or writing against Aristotle on pain of corporal punishment.

Ramus now devoted himself exclusively to the study of mathematics, and to prepare an edition of Euclid. Cardinals Charles de Bourbon and Charles de Lorraine befriended him, and through their influence he was permitted to begin a course of lectures on rhetoric at the College de Presles, the plague having driven away numbers of students from Paris. He was finally, in 1545, named principal of this college, and the Sorbonne ineffectually endeavored to eject him on the ground of the royal prohibitory decree. The decree was cancelled in 1545, through the influence of the cardinal de Lorraine. Ramus raised the College de Presles from a condition of decay to the height of prosperity, and his reputation went over all the land as an educator as well as philosopher. In 1551  cardinal Lorraine succeeded in instituting for him a chair of eloquence and philosophy at the College Royal, and his inaugural address (Pro Philosophica Disciplina [Paris, 1551]) is reckoned a masterpiece of the kind. He devoted the first eight years of his teaching to the first three of the “liberal arts” (grammar, rhetoric, and logic), which he called elementary or exoteric, and published three grammars successively — Greek, Latin, and French. He also mingled largely in the literary and scholastic disputes of the time, and on account of his bustling activity came under the satire of Rabelais. But though Ramus had innumerable adversaries, he might have defied them all, so great was his influence at court, had his love of “reformation” not displayed itself in religion as well as in logic. In an evil hour (for his own comfort) he embraced Protestantism. He had long been suspected of a leaning that way, and, as we have seen, his intellect was by nature scornfully rebellious towards the ipse dixit of “authority;” but he had for years decently conformed to the practices of the Catholic cult, and it was only after cardiual Lorraine, in reply to the Conference of Poissy (1561), frankly admitted the abuses of the Church and the vices of the clergy that he ventured formally to abjure the older faith. The outbreak of the religious wars in France plunged him into the dangers of the time, and he finally perished in the fatal massacre of St. Bartholomew, August, 1572. It is believed that he was assassinated at the instigation of one of his most violent and persistent enemies, Charpentier, rector of the College de Presles. SEE RAMISTS.

## Ranch, Christian Daniel[[@Headword:Ranch, Christian Daniel]]

             one of the most distinguished German sculptors, and noted for his work in the latter years of his life in sacred art, was born at Arolsen, the capital of the principality of Waldeck, in 1777. He began the study of sculpture as a boy, but the death of his father in 1797 obliged him to accept the humble but profitable position of valet to Frederick William II. king of Prussia. Under Frederick William III, who conceived a great liking for young Rauch, facilities for designing and modelling statues were afforded him, and he was even recommended as a pupil in the Academn of the Fine Arts. A statue of Endymion and a bust of queen Louisa of Prussia, executed at this time, convinced the king of Rauch's abilities; and although his request for dismissal had been repeatedly refused, he was now granted his request, and given a small pension in order to be enabled to proceed to Rome for further improvement. He spent six years in that city, working at hlis profession, and enjoyed the friendship of Thorwaldsen, Canova, and also of William Humboldt, at that time Prassian minister there. Among his works at this time were bass-reliefs of Hippolytus and Phoedra, a Mars and Venus wounded by Diomedes, a colossal bust of the king of Prussia, a bust of the painter Raphael Mengs, etc. In 1811 he was called by the king of Prussia to Berlin, to execute a monumental statue of queen Louisa. This great work obtained for Rauch a European reputation. It is in the mausoleum of the queen in the garden of Charlottenburg. Not quite satisfied with this triumph, he commenced a new statue of the queen, which he finished eleven years afterwards, and which is allowed to be a masterpiece of sculpture. It is placed in the palace of Sans-Souci, near Potsdam. Rauch, after this, lived principally at Berlin, but occasionally visited Rome, Carrara, and Munich. He labored indefatigably in his profession, and by 1824 had executed seventy busts in marble, of which twenty were of colossal size. He died at Dresden, while on a visit there, Dec. 3,1857. His greatest secular work is the magnificent monument of Frederick the Great, which adorns Berlin. His greatest work in sacred art is his Moses Group, in the entry of the Friedenskirche (Church of Peace) at Potsdam. It was begun in 1854 and finished in 1855, and is really his last great work. Noteworthy are also his group of the first two Polish lings in  the cathedral at Posen, his statues of Schleiermacher and Kant, and his representations of Faith, Hope, and Love in the church at Arolsen.

## Ranch, Christian Henry[[@Headword:Ranch, Christian Henry]]

             distinguished as that missionary of the Moravian Church who began its work among the North American Indians, was born at Bernburg, Germany, July 5, 1715. He arrived in this country July 16, 1740, and soon after visited Shekomeko, Dutchess County, N. Y., a village inhabited by Mohicans and Wampanoags, notorious for their evil ways, and especially for their love of strong drink. Various other missionaries had attempted to convert them without success. Ranch, on his arrival, went into the hut of the worst savage of the whole clan, Wasamapah by name, commonly known as Tschoop, seated himself at his side, told him of the Saviour, and then, saying that he was very tired in consequence of his long journey, lay down by the fire and went to sleep. This simple act of trust made a deep impression upon the Indians. He won their confidence. Tschoop was converted and baptized, and became an eloquent and enthusiastic preacher of the Gospel; other converts were gathered in, and a flourishing mission was established at Shekomeko, which subsequently spread to New England. In 1757, Rauch went to Jamaica as missionary to the negroes. He died on the island of Jamaica, Nov. 11, 1763. See Spangenberg, Account of the Manner in which the United Brethren carry on their Missions (Lond. 1788), p. 62, 63; Amer. S. S. Union, Tschoop, the Converted Indian Chief; Schweinitz, Life and Times of Zeisberyer, ch. v. (E. de S.)

## Ranco, Armand Jean Le Bouthillier De[[@Headword:Ranco, Armand Jean Le Bouthillier De]]

             the well-known founder of the reformed order of La Trappe, was born Jan. 9, 1626, at Paris, where he was educated. Having taken his degree in the Sorbonne with great applause, and embraced the ecclesiastical profession, he soon became distinguished as a preacher, and through the favor of cardinal Richelieu obtained more than one valuable benefice. He possessed as a young man a large fortune, and, notwithstanding his clerical character, was carried away by the gayety and dissipation of Parisian life. After a time, however, having embraced the cause of cardinal Retz, he displeased and finally forfeited the favor of cardinal Mazarin; and being deeply moved by the death of a lady, the duchess de Montbazon, to whom he was much attached, he withdrew altogether from Paris, resolved to distribute all his property among the poor, and to devote himself exclusively to the practice of piety and penitential works. Finally, he resigned all his preferments (of which, by the abusive practice of the period, he held several  simultaneously) with the exception of the abbacy of La Trappe, to which convent he retired in 1662, with the intention of restoring the strict discipline of the order. The history of the reforms which he effected will be found under the head TRAPPISTS. He lived in this seclusion for thirty- three years, during which he published a large number of works, chiefly ascetical. He died Oct. 27,1700. The only remarkable events of his literary life are his controversy with Mabillon, in reply to his Etudes Monastiques, on the subject of the studies proper for the monastic life, which is entitled Traite de la Saintete des Devoirs de ‘Etat Monastique, and his controversy with Arnauld, which drew upon Rance the hatred of the Jansenists. Rance's works are numerous. In his vouth he edited Anacreon in one volume, octavo (Paris, 1639), with a dedication to cardinal Richelieu. His most noteworthy publications of his religious life, aside from those referred to, are, Explication sur la Regle de St. Benoit (Paris, 1689, 2 vols. 4to): — Abrege des Obligations des Chretiens: — Reflexions Morales sur les Quatres Evangelistas (Paris, 1699, 12mo): — Conferences (on the same, 1699): — Relation de la. Vie et de la. Mort de Quelques Religieux de la Trappe (1696. 4 vols. 12tmo), and other works on monastic life and its reforms, etc. See Tillemont, Vie de Rance (1719, 2 vols. 12mo); Marsollier, Vie (1703); Chateaubriand, Vie; Moreri, Dict. Hist. s.v. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ranconnier, Jacques[[@Headword:Ranconnier, Jacques]]

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

## Rand, Asa[[@Headword:Rand, Asa]]

             an American Congregational divine, born at Rindge, N. H., Aug. 6, 1783, was educated at Dickinson College, where he took his degree in 1806, studied for the ministry, and was ordained at Gorham, Me., Jan. 18, 1809,  as pastor of a Congregational Church. In 1822 he undertook the editorial care of the Christian Mirror at Portland, Me., and held this until 1825, when he took the principalship of a female seminary at Brookfield. In July, 1826, he accepted the editorship of the Boston Recorder, the Youth's Companion, and the Volunteer, the last a religious monthly. His health, which had for some time been failing, and had originally forced him from the ministry, finally compelled him also to leave the editorial chair, and he connected himself with a book-store and printing-office at Lowell, Mass. He finally went back to editorial work, and started the Lowell Observer, a weekly paper. In 1835 he again began to preach and address public audiences. He took up the slavery question and spoke in behalf of abolition in Maine and Massachusetts. From 1837 to 1842 he preached in Pompey, N. Y., then became pastor of the Presbyterian church in Peterborough, N. Y., the home of the celebrated abolitionist Gerritt Smith. His last years Mr. Rand spent at Ashburnham, Mass., where he died Aug. 24, 1871. He was, while at Gorham, a frequent writer for the religious quarterly published at Portland for 1814-18, and, besides occasional sermons, put in print a volume of Familiar Sermons: — a Review of Finney's Sermons: — New Divinity Theology, a vindication of the same: — and a Letter to Dr. Lyman Beecher. See Sprague, Anals of the Amer. Pulpit, vol. i.

## Rand, William[[@Headword:Rand, William]]

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

## Randall, Benjamin[[@Headword:Randall, Benjamin]]

             the founder of the Free-will Baptists, was born in 1749, and converted under the preaching of Whitefield. He-joined the Baptists, but in 1779 was silenced: for holding Armiinian views respecting the atonement and the will. He was nevertheless ordained at Durham, N.H., in 1780, by a, party of seceders, and disseminated his opinions so successfully that in 1781 he was joined by a company who, in 1751, had seceded on similar grounds in North Carolina, called "Separate Baptists," and thus the Church now called Free Baptists was formed. Randall died in 1808.

## Randall, David Austin, D.D[[@Headword:Randall, David Austin, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Colchester, Connecticut, January 14, 1813. He united with the Church in 1827; removed west, and was licensed to preach June 30, 138; was ordained at Richfield, Ohio, December 1839, where he was pastor of the Church for five years, during which period he edited a Washingtonian paper, and was an earnest advocate of temperance. He removed to Columbus in 1845, and became one of the editors of the Journal and Messenger. From 1850 to 1855 he was pastor of the Church  at Columbus, then spent several years abroad, and on his return published a volume entitled The Handwriting of God in Egypt, Sinai, and the Holy Land. For six years Dr. Randall was corresponding secretary of the Ohio Baptist Convention. He died at Columbus, July 27, 1884. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 955. (J.C.S.)

## Randall, George Maxwell, D.D[[@Headword:Randall, George Maxwell, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Warren, R.I., November 23, 1810. He graduated from Brown University in 1835, and from the General Theological Seminary in New York in 1838. Soon after he became rector of the Church of the Ascension at Fall River, Massachusetts, where he remained six years, and then removed to Boston to take charge of the newly constituted Church of the Messiah, where he continued from 1844 to 1866. During most of this time he was the editor of the Christian Witness, the leading organ of the Episcopal Church in New England. He was chosen, in the fall of 1865, missionary bishop of Colorado, Wyoming, and New Mexico, and performed the duties of that office most faithfully for seven years. He died at Denver, Colorado, September 28, 1873. Bishop Randall published several sermons and tracts.

## Randall, John[[@Headword:Randall, John]]

             an English divine of note, was born about the middle ofthe 16th century. He was educated at Oxford University, in St. Mary's Hall, and Trinity College, and, after taking holy orders, became rector of St. Andrew Hubbard, London, in 1599. He died in 1622. His published works are: Sermons on Mat 5:20, and on 1Pe 2:11-12 (1620, 4to): — Sermons on Rom 8:38-39 (1623, 4to): — Nature of God and Christ (1624, 4to): — Great Mystery of Godliness (1624, 4to; 3d ed. 1640): —  The Sacraments (1630, 4to): — Lectures on the Lord's Supper (1630, 4to): — Twenty-nine Lectures of the Church (1631, 4to).

## Randall, Matthew[[@Headword:Randall, Matthew]]

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

## Randallites[[@Headword:Randallites]]

             SEE FREE-WILL BAPTISTS.

## Randle, Richmond[[@Headword:Randle, Richmond]]

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

## Randle, Thomas Ware[[@Headword:Randle, Thomas Ware]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Stewart County, Tenn., April 13, 1815. He was admitted on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1832, and continued to be an active and very efficient  preacher until within a few months of his death, which took place Aug. 26, 1859. He was several times a delegate to the General Conference. Mr. Randle was a Christian gentleman, modest and kind. His talents as a preacher were excellent, and his zeal knew no abatement. — Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1859, p. 116.

## Randle, William[[@Headword:Randle, William]]

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

## Randolph, Francis[[@Headword:Randolph, Francis]]

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

## Randolph, John[[@Headword:Randolph, John]]

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

## Randolph, John, DD[[@Headword:Randolph, John, DD]]

             a bishop in the Church of England, was born in 1749. He was the son of Dr. Thomas Randolph, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, at which college John was educated. After occupying different academical posts and ecclesiastical preferments, he was, in 1790, raised to the see of Oxford, translated to that of Bangor in 1807, and thence to London in 1811. He performed with zeal and assiduity the duties of his function, and died July 28, 1813. His publications were chiefly occasional sermons and charges, and a Latin praelection on the study of the Greek language. See (Lond.) Annual Register, 1813, page 120.

## Randolph, Samuel E[[@Headword:Randolph, Samuel E]]

             a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Tennessee. He entered the Tennessee Conference, from which he wmas  transferred in 1860 to the Florida Conference. He enlisted in 1861 with the Lowndes Volunteers, and in three months fell a victim to disease at Camp Alleghany, Va., Aug. 29, 1861. — Minutes of Annual Conf. M. E. Church, South, 1861, p. 345.

## Randolph, Thomas[[@Headword:Randolph, Thomas]]

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

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

## Ranew, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Ranew, Nathaniel]]

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

## Ranfaing, Marie Elisabeth De[[@Headword:Ranfaing, Marie Elisabeth De]]

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

## Ranft, Michael[[@Headword:Ranft, Michael]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 9, 1700. He studied at Leipsic, was in 1726 assistant preacher to his father at Droysig, in 1729 deacon at Nebra, and succeeded his father in 1743. In 1749 he was preacher at Beerwalde, Altenburg, and died April 18, 1774. He is the author of, Acta Lipsiensium Academica (Leipsic, 1723-24, 15 parts): Leben und Thaten Pabst Benedict XIV. (Hamburg, 1743): — Corpus  Doctrinae Evangelico-Lutheranae (Leipsic, 1754-56): — Commentatio Philologica de Amicis Sponsi ad Joh 3:29 (1758): — Deutliche Erklarung des ix., x., und xi. Capitels der Epistel Pauli an die Rimer (1760), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:694, 857. (B.P.)

## Range[[@Headword:Range]]

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

1. כַּיר, kir (only in the dual, כַּירִיַם, kira'yim, Lev 11:35, “ranges for pots”), apparently a cooking-furnace, perhaps of pottery (as it could be broken), and double (as having places for two pots or more, or, perhaps, consisting of two stoves set together). SEE OVEN; SEE POT.

2. שְׂדֵרָה, sederah', a rank, or row, of soldiers, drawn up in cordon (“range,” 2Ki 11:8; 2Ki 11:15; 2Ch 23:14); also timbers or chambers in the stories of a building (“board,” 1Ki 6:9). SEE ATHALIAH, TEMPLE

.

## Rangier(us)[[@Headword:Rangier(us)]]

             a French cardinal of mediaeval times. was born, about 1035, in the diocese of Rheims. St. Bruno of that place was his tutor. One of his pupils was Eudes of Chatillon, pope under the name of Urban II. Rangier went, to take the habit of Benedictine, to Marmontiers, where he would probably  have died in obscurity, had it not been for contention which arose among the monks, and Raoul of Sangeais, archbishop of Tours. Rangier's abbot, Bernard of Saint-Venant, charged him with a mission to Rome, to maintain the rights of the abbey. The two ecclesiastics obtained a bull conformed to their wishes; but Rangier was kept at Rome by Urban II, who soon made him cardinal, and, in 1090. archbishop of Reggio. In 1095 he went with the pope to France, and took part in the Council of Clermont, where the first crusade was decided upon. After the Council, Rangier followed Urban II to Limoges and to Poitiers, and found himself, March 10,1096, at the consecration of the abbev of Marmontiers. He soon after returned to his own diocese, and left it no more. excepting to assist Pascal II at the Council of Guastalla (1106). Ughelli speaks of him as a man of great power (“vir magne auctoritatis”). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ranieri[[@Headword:Ranieri]]

             ST., an Italian ascetic of mediaeval times, was born, in or about the year 1100, of a noble family of Pisa. In his youth, the Romish legends say, he hadl a vision: an eagle appeared to him, bearing in his beak a blazing light, and said, “I come from Jerusalem to enlighten the nations.” But Ranieri refused to heed this call to a religious life, and gave himself up to pleasure. But, in the midst of his debaucheries, he was one day surprised by the visit of a holy man, who persuaded him to desert his sinful life. Soon he embarked for Jerusalem, where he took off his own garments, and wore the schiavina, or slave-shirt, ever after in token of humility. For twenty years he was a hermit in the deserts of Palestine, and during this time is reiputed to have had numberless visions. On one occasion, he felt his vows of abstinence to be almost more than he could keep. He then had a vision of a golden vase, set with precious stones, and full of oil, pitch, and sulphur. These were set on fire, and none could quench the flames. Then there was put into his hands a small ewer of water; and when he turned on but a few drops, the fire was extinguished. This vision he believed to signify human passions by the pitch and sulphur, but the water was the emblem of temperance. IHe then determined to live on bread and water alone. His reverence for water was very great, and most of his miracles were performed through the use of it; so that he was called San Ranieri dell' Acqua. But when he tarried with a host who cheated his guests by putting water in his wine, the saint did not hesitate to expose the fraud; for he revealed to all present the figure of Satan, sitting on one of the wine- casks, in the form of a huge cat with the wings of a bat. He did many  miracles after his return to Pisa, and made converts by the sanctity of his life and example. When he died (July 17, 1161), many miraculous manifestations bore witness to his eminent holiness. All the bells in Pisa were spontaneously tolled; and the archbishop Villani, who had been sick in bed for two years, was cured to attend his funeral. At the moment in the funeral service when it was the custom to omit the Gloria in Excelsis, it was sung by a choir of angels above the altar; while the organ accompanied them without being played by any perceptible hands. The harmony of this chant was so exquisite that those who heard it thought the very heavens were opened. He was buried in a tomb in the Duomo. After the plague in Pisa in 1356, the life of this saint was painted in the Campo Santo by Simone Memmi and Antonio Veneziano. These frescos are most important in the history of art, and consist of eight scenes from the life of St. Ranieri:

1. His conversion;

2. He embarks for Palestine;

3. He assumes the hermit's dress;

4. He has many temptations and visions in the desert;

5. He returns to Pisa;

6. He exposes the fraud of the innkeeper;

7. His death and funeral obsequies;

8. His miracles after death.

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

## Ranke, Carl Ferdinand[[@Headword:Ranke, Carl Ferdinand]]

             doctor of theology and philosophy, and brother of the famous historian, Leopold Ranke, was born at Wiehe, in Thuringia, in 1802. Having finished his preparatory studies at the gymnasium in Pforta, he betook himself to the study of philology and theology. He soon became the head of the Qued. lbinburg Gymnasium. In 1837 he was called to Gottingen, and in 1842 to Berlin, where he not only superintended the Frederic-William Gymnasium, hut also the Royal Real-school, the Royal Elizabeth School, etc. He died March 29, 1876. Ranke was not only an able philologist and pedagogue, but also an excellent Christian, and took an active part in the inner mission and Bible Society. He wrote, Plan und Bau des Johanneischen Evangeliums (Berlin, 1854): — De Libris Historicis Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1855): — Clemens von Alexandrien v. Origenes als Interpreten der heiliqen Schrift (ibid. 1861): — Das Klagelied der  Hebraer (ibid. 1863), etc. As a contributor to Piper's Evangelical Year- book, he wrote on the apostles Andrew (vii, 94), James the Elder (v3:139), Timothy (i, 70). Titus (i, 68): on Symphorianus (xix, 60), Perpetua and Felicitas (ix, 56), Saturnius (xx, 63), Arethas (x3:129), Eustasius (xv3:96), Olaf Petersen (xix, 170), and contributed the German translation of Clement of Alexandria's hymn, Στόμιον πώλων ἀδαῶν, to Piper's monograph on that hymn (xix, 29, 31). See Schneider, Theol. Jahrbuch (1877), p. 227; Literarischer Handweiser (1876), p. 235. (B. P.)

## Ranke, Friedrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Ranke, Friedrich Heinrich]]

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

## Ranke, Leopold Von, D.D[[@Headword:Ranke, Leopold Von, D.D]]

             a German historian, was born at Wiehe, Thuringia, December 21, 1795. He embraced the profession of teacher, and in 1818 became head master of the Gymnasium at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. In 1825 he was invited to Berlin as professor extraordinary of history in the university, and was sent in 1827 by the Prussian government to Vienna, Rome, and Venice, to examine the historical materials there. In 1841 he was appointed historiographer of Prussia, and in 1848 he was elected a member of the National Assembly at Frankfort. He was ennobled in 1866. He collected a large and valuable library pertaining to historical matters, which. after his death, May 23, 1886, was purchased and presented to Syracuse University, N.Y. He was the author of many volumes, chief of which are his History of the Popes, and German History in the Time of the Reformation.

## Ranken, David[[@Headword:Ranken, David]]

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

## Rankin, Thomas[[@Headword:Rankin, Thomas]]

             a somewhat noted minister of the early Methodist Episcopal Church — one of Wesley's general assistants — was born in Dunbar, Scotland, 1738. He was religiously trained by his parents. and, at an early age, expressed the  desire to become a minister of the Gospel. After the death of his father, he formed bad acquaintances, and gave himself up to worldly amusements. When he was seventeen years of age, Dunbar was visited by troops of dragoons, among whom were a number of devout Christians, who held meetings morning and evening. Young Rankin attended, and was deeply impressed. He afterwards removed to Edinburgh, where he came under the personal influence of Mr. Whitefield, and was decided to devote himself to Christian work. With this purpose in view, he prepared to enter the College at Edinburgh. Circumstances, however, occurred which prevented his taking a collegiate course; and, by the advice of a friend, he sailed for America, to engage in a commercial enterprise. Wearying of this life, he was glad to find himself once more in Scotland, breathing a more congenial religious atmosphere. Shortly after his return, he met a Methodist minister, who saw the unsettled condition of his mind, and invited Rankin to visit, with hinm the different Methodist societies of the North. He was even prevailed upon to preach, though he consented with great reluctance, and was so dissatisfied with himself that he was often well-nigh resolved to attempt it no more. While in this state of mind, he listened to the preaching of Wesley, and from that time hlad the most intense admiration for him. After a great spiritual conflict, he sought Wesley, and related to him his experience of the two preceding years. Wesley advised him to persevere in his religious work, and so removed his doubts that he expressed himself willing to be known everywhere “as a poor, despised Methodist preacher.” He was regularly appointed in 1761 to the Sussex Circuit, and in the following year to the Sheffield Circuit. At the next Conference, he was appointed to the Devonshire Circuit. In 1764 he became assistantpreacher in the Cornwall Circuit. In 1765 he was appointed to spend a part of the year in the Newcastle and a part in the Dales Circuit. In 1766 he was stationed upon the Epworth Circuit, and, upon request of the people, was returned the second year.

In 1768 he was appointed to labor again in the west of Cornwall. In 1769 he was sent to the London and Sussex Circuit, and also travelled with John Wesley on his preaching tour through the kingdom. In 1770 he accompanied Wesley to the west of England, and everywhere their labors met with great success. In 1771 he was once more stationed with his friends in Cornwall. While at the conference held at Leeds, he met captain Webb, lately arrived from America. Wesley had become greatly dissatisfied with the management of the American mission, and, when the question came up before the conference, intimated his desire to send Rankin as general superintendent. The appointment was made; and  he, together with George Shadford, sailed for America in 1773. Soon after his arrival, Rankin called a conference, the first ever held in America, July 4, 1773, at Philadelphia. Asbury had been previously appointed and sent over as the general assistant of the societies in America; but as Rankin had travelled several years longer, he took precedence over Asburv when he reached here. Besides, the displeasure of Wesley against the American work had probably led him to select for the place a man who could claim superiority over Asburv. Rankin, therefore, held the place of ‘general assistant” while here, and presided at the conferences which convened while he was in America. He was stationed at New York and Philadelphia alternately, and remained in this country until 1778, when he again appears at work in England. He visited, while here, many of the churches then within the territory klnown as the Philadelphia Conference, and would probably have remained, had not the Revolutionary struggle made his stay ill-advised. Immediately after his return to England, he was stationed at London, where he lived two years. In 1783 he asked to be made a supernumerary; and after this date he lived quietly in the English metropolis until his death, May 17,1810. He was buried in City Road, near Wesley. He was a truly pious man, but too stern and uncompromising to succeed as a leader; and he failed in this country to be of any especial service to Asbury, whom he was intended to assist. He never wavered in difficulties and trials and showed a truly heroic spirit in the hour of need. His irregular education had probably as much to do with his inconsistencies of conduct as his natural propensity to the severe aspects of life. See Stevens, Hist.of Methodism, i, 239; and his Hist. of the M. E. Ch. (see Index); Bangs, Hist. of the M. E. Ch. (N.Y. 1838, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 77-124; Wakeley, Lost Chapters (see Index); Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:28-34.

## Ransom[[@Headword:Ransom]]

             (פַּדְיוֹן, Exo 21:30; “redemption,” Psa 49:8; or פַּדְיוֹם, pidyom', “redemption,” Num 3:49; Num 3:51; elsewhere ַֹכּפֶר, kopher, forgiveness, or גָּאֵל, to act the part of Goel [q.v.]; N.T. λύτρον, or ἀντίλυτρον), a price paid to recover a person or thing from one who detains that person or thing in captivity. Hence prisoners of war or slaves are said to be ransomed when they are liberated in exchange for a valuable consideration (1Co 6:19-20). Whatever is substituted or exchanged in compensation for the party is his ransom; but the word ransom is more extensively taken in Scripture. A man is said to ransom his  life (Exo 21:30); that is, to substitute a sum of money instead of his life as the penalty of certain offences (Exo 30:12; Job 36:18). The poll-tax of half a shekel for every Hebrew was deemed the ransom, or atonement money, and was declared to be a heave-offering to Jehovah, to propitiate for their lives (Exo 30:12-16). Some of the sacrifices (as the sin- and trespass-offerings) might be regarded as commutations or ransoms (Lev 4:1-35; Lev 5:1-19). In like manner, our Blessed Lord is said to give himself a ransom for all (1Ti 2:6; Mat 20:23; Mar 10:43) — a substitute for them, bearing sufferings in their stead, undergoing that penalty which would otherwise attach to them (Rom 7:23; 1Co 1:30; Eph 1:7; Eph 4:30; Heb 9:13). SEE REDEMPTION.

## Ranters[[@Headword:Ranters]]

             is (1) one of the many names by which the Presbyterians designated the most advanced of the mystical radicals of the Cromwellian period. They were Antinomian heretics, and were probably related to the Familists (q.v.), to whom Fuller (Ch. Hist. 3:211 sq.) traces them. In Ross's Παναεβεία, the Ranters are described as making an open profession of lewdness and irreligion; as holding that God, angels, devils, heaven, hell, etc., are fictions and fables; that Moses, John the Baptist, and our Lord were impostors; that praying and preaching are useless; that all ministry has come to an end; and that sin is a mere imagination. He says that in their letters the Ranters endeavored to be strangely profane and blasphemous, uttering atheistical imprecations; and he gives a specimen which quite bears out his words. He also alleges that they sanctioned and practiced community of women (ed. 1655, p. 287). Much the same account, also, is given a few years later by Pagitt (Heresiography [ed. 1662], p. 259, 294). Baxter also writes respecting them: “I have myself letters written from Abingdon, where, among both soldiers and people, this contagion did then prevail, full of horrid oaths and curses, and blasphemy not fit to be repeated by the tongue and pen of man; and this all uttered as the effect of knowledge and a part of their religion, in a fanatic strain, and fathered on the Spirit of God” (Own Life and Times, p. 77). The following passage is found in a Life of Bunyan, added to an imitation of his work which is called The Third Part of the Pilgrim's Progress: “About this time” (in Bunyan's early life), “a very large liberty being given as to conscience, there started up a sect of loose, profane wretches, afterwards called Ranters and Sweet Singers, pretending themselves safe from, or being  incapable of, sinning; though, indeed, they were the debauchest and profligate wretches living in their baudy meetings and revels. For, fancying themselves in Adam's state, as he was in Paradise before the fall, they would strip themselves, both men and women, and so catch as catch could; and to it they went, to satiate their lust under pretence of increasing and multiplying” (An Account of the Life and Actions of Mr. John Bunyan, etc. [London, 1692], p. 22). (See Weingarten, Revolutions-Kirchen Englands [Leips. 1868], p. 107 sq.; Blunt, Dict. of Sects, s.v.). (2.) In recent times — since 1828 — the name of “Ranters” has been given to those Primitive Methodists who separated from the main body of Methodists, and were distinguished by their unusual physical demonstrations.

## Raoul de Flaix[[@Headword:Raoul de Flaix]]

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

## Raoul de St. Trond[[@Headword:Raoul de St. Trond]]

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

## Raoul de Vaucelle[[@Headword:Raoul de Vaucelle]]

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

## Rapaport, Salomo Jehuda Low[[@Headword:Rapaport, Salomo Jehuda Low]]

             a noted Jewish scholar, was born at Lemberg, in Austrian Galicia, in 1790. He first attracted attention among his coreligionists by notes to a Talmudical work of his father-inlaw, and subsequently rose to the highest rank among the Hebrew writers of the age by critico-biographical sketches of Saadia Gaon, Rabbi Nathan, Hai Gaon, the poet Eleazar Kalir, etc., in the Bikkure ha-Ittim (Vienna, 1828-31); by contributions to the Kerem Chemed (Vienna and Prague, 1833-43); and by numerous other dissertations in Hebrew and German, inserted in various other publications. He translated into Hebrew verse Racine's Esther, entitled שארית יהודה  (Vienna, 1827). He also published, under the title of מַלַּין סֵ עֵרֶךְ, a linguistic and archeological lexicon, of which only one part has as yet appeared (Prague, 1852). His poetical contributions in the Bikkcure may be identified by the cipher שיר. Having officiated for some time as rabbi at Tarnopol, he was elected, in 1840, to fill a similar office at Prague, where he died, Oct. 16, 1867. Besides his numerous essays, which are to be found in the different reviews and periodicals, he published, in 1861, a criticism on Frankel's Darke ha-Mishna, entitled Dibre Shalom ve-Emneth. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:131 sq.; Etheridge, Introduction to Hebrew Literature, p. 482; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 11:485 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u.s. Secten, 3:343 sq.; Stern, Gesch. d. Judenthums, p. 218 sq.; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israceliten, p. 533 sq.; Geiger, Jud. Zeitschrift (1867), p. 241 sq.; id. Nachgqelassene Schriften (Berlin, 1875), ii, 262; Zunz, Die Monatstage des Kalendenjahres (Eng. transl. by the Rev. B. Pick, in the Jewish Messenger, N. Y., 1874-75); Cassel, Leitf.jden zur jud. Gesch. u. Literatur (1872), 1). 114; Delitzsch, Zvr Gesch. d. judischen Poesie, p. 102, 118, 155; Kurlander, S. L. Rapaport: eine biographische Skizze (Pesth, 1868). (B. P.)

## Raper, William H[[@Headword:Raper, William H]]

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

## Rapha or Raphah[[@Headword:Rapha or Raphah]]

             (Heb. Rapha', רָפָא, as in 1Ch 8:2), or Ra'phah (Heb. Raphah', רָפָה, as in 2Sa 21:16, meaning giant [q.v.]. as translated in 1Ch 20:4; 1Ch 20:6; 1Ch 20:8; 2Sa 21:16; 2Sa 21:18; 2Sa 21:20; 2Sa 21:22; Sept. ῾Ραφής, v. r. ῾Ραφά and ῾Ραφαία), the name of two men. SEE BETH-RAPHA.

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

2. The son of Binea, and father of Eleasah; eighths in lineal descent from David's friend Jonathan (1Ch 8:37, “Raphah”). B.C. post 1000. He is called REPHAIAH in 1Ch 9:43.

## Raphael[[@Headword:Raphael]]

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

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

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

“Be strong, live happy, and love! but first of all

Him whom to love is to obey, and keep

His great command. Take heed lest passion sway

thy judgment to do aught which else free-will

Would not admit. Thine and of all thy sons

The weal or woe in thee is placed. Beware!” (Milton).

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

## Raphael, Or Raffaello, Santi Or Sanzio[[@Headword:Raphael, Or Raffaello, Santi Or Sanzio]]

             called by his countrymen “Il Divino,” i.e. “the Divine,” is ranked by almost universal opinion as the greatest of painters. He was certainly the Sophocles of the glorious art of form and color. He was born at Urbino April 6, 1483. In 1497, on the death of his father, Giovanni Santi, who was his first instructor, he was placed under Pietro Perugino (q.v.), the most distinguished painter of the period, who was then engaged on important works in the city of lerugia. The profound feeling, the mystic ecstasy, which characterized the Umbrian school while yet uinder the leadership of its founder, the Perugian, and before it degenerated into the mannerism and facile manufacture at which Michael Angelo sneered, took possession of the soul of Raphael. He soon acquired a wonderful facility of execution. He showed such great talent that Perugino employed him on his own works; and so well did he perform his task that it is difficult now to separate the work of the master from that of the pupil. In 1504 Raphael visited Florence, and improved his style by studying composition and expression in the works of Masaccio, the sweet and perfect modelling of Leoniardo da Vinci, and color and effect in those of Fra Bartolomeo. He seems to have lived in Florence till 1508, when he went to Rome, on the invitation of  pope Julius II. His celebrated frescos in the Vatican, and numerous important works, were then commenced. Julius died in 1513, but his successor, Leo X, continued Raphael's services, and kept his great powers constantly in exercise. Raphael and Rome are synonymous terms in the history of Italian art of the 16th century. Though Michael Angelo labored at Rome, and the impress of his genius is everywhere in the avenules of Roman art, yet by common consent the Roman school of art owes its origin and life to Raphael. It became the grandest of all the Italian schools of painting, and gave concrete reality to the aspirations and longings of his predecessors by carrying art to a height all but ultimate. The Roman school combined the virility and boldness of Florence with the simplicity and the devotional swneetness of Umbria and Siena; in short, all Italian excellences Raphael gathered in his Roman creation; but with the artist who gave it birth the school alone can be identified, and, illustrious as were many of his pupils. His own death marks the fading hour of the Roman school. Of all the Roman painters, it was Raphael alone who made his works not less the expression and measure of all the knowledge, philosophy, and poetry of his time than witnesses to his genius and vouchers for what we call the immortality of his fame. He achieved the labors of a demigod; his successors wrought like mere men. Raphael hiad scarcely reached his prime when a sudden attack of fever carried him off, on the anniversary of his birth, in 1520. “‘The works of Raphael are generally divided into three classes: his first style, when under the influence of Perugino's manner; his second, when he painted in Florence from 1504 to 1508; and his third style, which is distinguishable in the works executed by him after he settled in Rome. Each of these styles has its devoted admirers. Those who incline to art employed in the service of religion prefer the first manner, as embodying purity and religious feeling. His last manner, perfected when the taste for classical learning and art was strongly excited by the discovery of numerous valuable works of the classic period, is held by many connoisseurs as correctly embodying the highest art; while his middle, or Florentine, style is admired by some as exemplifying his powers freed from what they deem the rigid manner of Perugino, anti untainted by the conventionalism of classic art. In all these different styles he has left works of great excellence. The Coronation of the Virgin, in the gallery of the Vatican, and the Sposalizio, or Marriage of the Virgin, in the Brera Gallery at Milan, which is an improved version of Perugino's Sposalizio, painted in 1495 for the cathedral of Perugia, belong to the first period. The St. Catharine, in the National Gallery, London; the Entombment, in the  Borghese Gallery, Rome; Let Belle Jardinziere, in the Louvre, belong to his second period. The St. Cecilic, at Bologna; the Madconna di San Sisto, at Dresden; the Cartoons, at Hampton Court; the Transfiguration, and all the Vatican frescos, except Theology, of the Dispute on the Sacrament, the first he executed on his arrival from Florence are in his third manner, or that which peculiarly marks the Roman school in its highest development” (Chambers). The two great Madonnas of Raphael are the Madonna dellac Sedia and the Madonca di San Sisto. The former, which is at the Pitti Palace, Florence, is, according to critical standards, not so perfect as others of the same painter which have failed to obtain universal popularity. But as a representation of the Roman view of the Holy Family, nothing could be more beautifully expressed. We see only a happy mother bending over the lovely child in the intensity of her affection and content, while the babe looks forth from the picture with a strange glance of conscious superiority. The Madonna di San Sisto cannot be described, and no copies of it, photographs or engravings, can convey a correct idea. In this work Raphael reached the perfection of his type, humanity raised to divinity. The grace and beauty of the Virgin seem apart from and atbove earthly associations. In the solemn, thoughtful, yet childlike expression of the infant Christ there is the foreshadowing of the sufferer, the Saviour, and the Judge. It is singular that not until 1827. when the picture was cleaned, were the innumerable heads of angels surrounding the Virgin discovered. The Transfiguration which was Raphael's last and also his greatest work, he left unfinished. It seems as if he had labored while already on the way to heaven, and we do not wonder that Vasari, in his ecstasy of joy over this work by human hands, with so much of heavenly skill in it, is led to exclaim, “Whosoever shall desire to see in what manner Christ transformed into the Godhead should be represented, let him come and behold it in this picture.” “Raphael,” says Lanzi, “is by common consent placed at the head of his art, not because he excelled all others in every department of painting, but because no other artist has ever Dossessed the varir-ns parts of the art united in so high a degree.” See, besides Vasari and Lanzi, Robertson, The Great Painters of Christendom (published by Cassell, Lond. and N. Y., and handsomely illustrated), p. 79-95; Radcliffe, Schools and Masters of Painting (N.Y. 1877, 12mo), ch. viii et al.; Mrs. Clement, Painters, etc. (ibid. 1877,12mo), p. 473-485; Duppa, Life of Raphael (in Engl., Lond. 1815); Wolzogen, Raphael (tr. by Burnett, ibid. 1866); Quatremere de Quincy, Vie de Raphael (tr. into Engl. by Hazlitt, 1846);  Perkins, Raphael and Michael Angelo (Lond. and Bost. 1878); Lond. Quar. Rev. April, 1870.

## Raphah[[@Headword:Raphah]]

             (1Ch 8:2). SEE RAPHA.

## Raphaim[[@Headword:Raphaim]]

             ( ῾Ραφαϊvν ‘, but some MSS. omit), a name given (Jdt 8:1) as that of the son of Gideon and father of Acitho in the ancestry of Judith. It is evidently = רפאים, Rephaim (q.v.).

## Raphall, Morris Jacob[[@Headword:Raphall, Morris Jacob]]

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

## Raphel, Georg[[@Headword:Raphel, Georg]]

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

## Rapheleng, Francis[[@Headword:Rapheleng, Francis]]

             a famous Dutch Hebraist, was born at Lanov, near Ryssel, February 27, 1539, and died at Leyden, July 20, 1597, professor. He wrote, Grammatice Hebraicae Libellus (printed in the Antwerp Polyglot, 1569-72): — Conpendium Thesauri Santis Pagyrni Linguae Hebraica (1572): — Vatrie Lectiones et Emendationes in Chaldaicam, Bibliorum Paraphrasim (in the Antwerp Polyglot), and published the Syriac New Test. in Hebrew letters (1575). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:133; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:122; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. "Ravlenghien." (B.P.)

## Raphon[[@Headword:Raphon]]

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

## Raphu[[@Headword:Raphu]]

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

Rappists, also known as Harmonists, are a Christian people living in community of goods, and in celibate state, at Economy, Pa., in the vicinity of Pittsburgh, and hence also not infrequently called Economites. They  owe their origin to George Rapp, a German, who was born at Iptingen, in Wirtemberg, in October, 1757, of humble parentage, and had enjoyed only a moderate education. Having always been a devout Christian and a close reader of the Bible, he became convinced that the lifeless condition of the churches was in accord with the vital character of apostolic Christianity, and in 1787 began to preach among those of like mind with himself in the little village where he was then living. The clergy resented this interference with their office, and both Rapp and his adherents were visited with all manner of persecution, and denounced as “Separatists,” a name which they bore ever after while in Germany, and which they themselves accepted gladly. In the course of six years the Rappists numbered not less than 300 families, scattered over a distance of twenty miles from the home of George Rapp. The consistent manner in which the Separatists bore themselves gave little opportunity for positive accusation, yet they were constantly annoyed by government and clergy, and in 1803 finally determined to end all strife by emigration to a land of freedom.

Rapp, accompanied by his son and two other followers, came to this country in advance to select a home for all like-minded with himself. In the course of one year 600 persons came over, and were settled by Rapp in different parts of Pennsylvania and Maryland, while he himself. with several skilful mechanics and ingenious persons, prepared for a family home for the Separatists the land he had purchased in Butler County, Pa., along the Conequenessing Creek. On Feb. 15, 1805, those who had come with Rapp, and such others as had followed thither, organized themselves formally and solemnly into the “Harmony Society,” agreeing then to throw all their possessions into a common fund, to adopt a uniform and simple dress and style of house, to keep thenceforth all things in common, and to labor for the common good of the whole body. Later in the spring they were joined by fifty additional families; and thus they finally began wmith what must have made up all together less than 750 men, women, and children. But these were all accustomed to labor, and with such a leader as Rapp then was — in the prime of life, only forty-eight years old, of robust frame and sound health, with great perseverance, enterprise, and executive ability, and remarkable common-sense — the society got on very successfully. In the first year they erected between forty and fifty log-houses, a church and school-house, a grist-mill, a barn, and some workshops, and cleared 150 acres of land. In the following year they cleared 400 acres more, and built a saw-mill and a tannery, and planted a small vineyard. A distillery was also a part of this year's building — a thing not so very strange in those days of  general tendency towards strong drink among the laboring classes — though they themselves indulged only very moderately in any intoxicating liquors. Rapp was the general in all departments. He planned for all. He was their preacher, teacher, guide, and keeper.

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

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

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

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

“Whereas, by the favor of Divine Providence, an association or community has been formed by George Rapp and many others upon the basis of Christian fellowship, the principles of which, being faithfully derived from the Sacred Scriptures, include the government of the patriarchal age, united to the community of property adopted in the days of the apostles, and wherein the simple object sought is to approximate, so far as human imperfections may allow, to the fulfilment of the will of God, by the exercise of those affections and the practice of those virtues which are essential to the happiness of man in time and throughout eternity:  “And whereas it is necessary to the good order and well-being of the said association that the conditions of membership should be clearly understood, and that the rights, privileges, and duties of every individual therein should be so defined as to prevent nmistake or disappointment, on the one hand, and contention or disagreement, on the other;

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

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

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

“Article 3. If, contrary to our expectation, it should so happen that we could not render the faithful obedience aforesaid, and should be induced from that or any other cause to withdraw from the said  association, then and in such case we do expressly covenant and agree to and with the said George Rapp and his associates that we never will claim or demand, either for ourselves, our children, or for any one beholden to us, directly or indirectly, any compensation, wages, or reward whatever for onr or their labor or services rendered to the said conmininity, or to any member thereof; but whatever we or our families jointly or severally shall or may do, all shall be held and considered as a voluntary service for our brethren.

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

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

“Article 6. And if it should so happen, as above mentioned, that any of the undersigne d should violate his or their agreemen)t, and would or could not submit to the laws and regulations of the Church or the community, and for that or any other cause should withdraw from the association, then the said George Rapp and his  associates agree to refund to him or them the value of all such property as he or they may have brought into the community, in compliance with the first article of this agreement, the said value to be refunded without interest, in one, two, or three annual instalments, as the said George Rapp and his associates shall determine. And if the person or persons so withdrawing themselves were poor, and brought nothing into the community, notwithstanding they depart openly and regularly, they shall receive a donation in money, according to the length of their stay and to their conduct, and to such amount as their necessities may require, in the judgment of the superintendents of the association.”

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

“

1. The sixth article [in regard to refunding] is entirely annulled and made void, as if it had never existed; all others to remain in full force as heretofore.

2. All the property of the society, real, personal, and mixed, in law or equity, and howsoever contributed or acquired, shall be deemed, now and forever, joint and indivisible stock. Each individual is to be considered to have finally and irrevocably parted with all his former contributions, whether in lands, goods, money, or labor; and the same rule shall apply to all future contributions, whatever they may be.

3. Should any individual withdraw from the society or depart this life, neither he, in the one case, nor his representatives, in the other, shall be entitled to demand an account of said contributions, or to claim anything from the society as a matter of right. But it shall be left altogether to the discretion of the superintendent to decide whether any, and, if any, what allonwance shall be made to such member or his representatives as a donation.”

On the death of “Father” Rapp, Aug. 7, 1847, the articles were re-signed by the whole society, and two trustees and seven elders were put in office to perform all the duties and assume all the authority which their founder had relinquished with his life.  Under this simple constitution the Harmony Society has flourished for sixty-nine years; nor has its life been threatened by disagreements, except in the case of the count de Leon's intrigue. It has suffered three or four lawsuits from members who had left it, but in every case the courts have decided for the society, after elaborate, and in some cases long-continued trials. It has always lived in peace and friendship with its neighbors.

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

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

1. They hold that Adam was created “in the likeness of God;” that he was a dual being, containing within his own person both the sexual elements, reading literally, in confirmation of this, the text (Gen 1:26-27), “And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness, and let them have dominion;” and, “So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them;” which they hold to denote that both the Creator and the first created were of this dual nature. They believe that had Adam been content to remain in this  original state, he would have increased without the help of a female, bringing forth new beings like himself to replenish the earth.

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

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

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

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

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

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

8. They reject and detest what is commonly called “Spiritualism.” — Nordhoff, Communistic Societies, p. 81-86.

## Rappolt, Friedrich[[@Headword:Rappolt, Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 26, 1615, at Reichenbach, Silesia. He studied at Leipsic, was there professor in 1651, and died December 27, 1676, doctor of theology. He wrote, Observationes in Epistolas ad Titum et Coloss.: — Theologia Aphoristica Sancti Joannis: — De Inspiratione Divina: — De Peccato Originis: — De Gratia Justificationis. ad Mich. 7:18-20: — De Christo Sacerdote Novi Testamenti ad Heb 9:24-26. J.B. Carpzov published Rappolt's Scripta Theologica et Exegetica (1695). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:510; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Raratongan Version[[@Headword:Raratongan Version]]

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

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

             By way of supplement, we add that a revised edition of the Rarotonganm Bible was printed at London in 1872. The revision was undertaken by the Reverend R.W.E. Krause, who returned to Europe on account of illness. The revisers' chief object was to substitute native words, wherever it was possible, for the foreign words which had been used to a large extent in the version in the first instance. In this labor Mr. Krause was aided by the advice and suggestions of the Reverend G. Gill, who had to complete the latter portion, owing to the alarming and serious illness of the original reviser. From the report of the British and Foreign Bible Society for 1884,  we learn that the Reverend W. Wyatt Gill, who has had forty years' experience of the South Sea, is now engaged for the Bible Society Committee on a thorough revision of the Rarotongan Bible, and from the report for 1885 we see that the reviser has reached the close of the New Test. (B.P.)

## Rashba[[@Headword:Rashba]]

             (רשבא), the initials of RABBI SOLOMON BEN-ABRAHAM Ibn-Adrat, a native of Barcelona, who was born about 1285, and died in 1310. He studied under Nachmanides (q.v.), and in 1280 he was acknowledged president of the school of Barcelona, and a kind of oracle with the East and the West, with which he maintained an extensive correspondence. He was an acute thinker, an enemy to all equivocation, and an advocate of the open truth. He wrote a large colleetion of חדושים, or Novellas, discussive and expository nf Talmudic law, published in successive portions and times: — שאלות ותשובות, Questions and Answers on law and ritual subjects (Lemberg, 1812): — אגרות, Letters (ibid. 1809): — עבודת הקדש, On Sabbath and Festival Observances (Buda, 1820): — תורת הבית, The  Law of the House, domestic regulations from the Talmud (Prague, 1811): — פרוש אגדות, Explanations of the Agadoth (Furth, 1766). He also prohibited the study of Grecian philosophy until after twenty-five years of age. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. i, 18 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), p. 26; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 7:157 sq.; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, p. 112; Finn, Sephardim, p. 301 sq.; Etheridge. Introd. to Hebrew Literature, p. 252; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten, p. 295; but especially the monograph by Dr. Perles, Salomo ben-Abrahams ben-Aderet, sein Leben u. s. Schriften, nebst handschriftlichen Beilagen zum ersten Male herausgegeben (Breslau, 1863), and the reviews of that monograph in Frankel's Monaetsschrift, 1863, p. 183 sq.; Geiger, Jud. Zeitschrift, 1863, p. 59 sq. (B. P.)

## Rashbam[[@Headword:Rashbam]]

             (רשבם), the initials of RABBI SAMUEL BEN-MEIR, Rashi's daughter's son, who was born at Ramero about 1065, and died in 1154. He was a sober exegete, appealing to the “intelligentes.” He completed the commentaries on certain Talmudic treatises left unfinished by his grandfather Rashi (q.v.), and also the commentary on Job. Rashbam's literal, grammatical, and exegetical principles in the interpretation of the Word of God convinced his grandfather to such a degree that he declared that if he had to rewrite his expositions he would adopt those principles. In this manner Rashbam wrote his commentary on the Pentateuch, tunder the title of פֵ הרשבם, The Expositions of Rashbam, which was published for the first time in the edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with several commentaries (Berlin, 1705). It was republished in the imperfect condition from Oppenheimer's MS., beginning with Genesis 18 and ending with Deu 33:3, in the excellent edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch, with sundry commentaries (Amsterdam, 1727-29). Dr. A. Geiger published from a Munich MS. a portion of the missing commentary, extending from Gen 1:1-31, in the Kerem Chemed (Berlin. 1854), 8:41-51, which, however, has not been inserted in the excellent edition of the Pentateuch, with sundry rabbinic commentaries, published at Vienna in 1859, in which Rashbam's commentary is given. A supercommentary, entitled שמואל קרן, The Horn of Samuel, on Rashbam's exposition, by S. S. Hessel, was published in Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1727. Rashbam also wrote a Commentary on the Five Megilloth, of which that on the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes was published by A. Jellinek (Leipsic, 1855), while  excerpts from the other three Megilloth were also edited by the same author (ibid. 1855). Rashbam is also said to have written a commentary on the Psalms, which was edited by Isaac Satanow, Berlin, and reprinted in Vienna in 1816; but it is very doubtfiul whether he is really the author. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:239 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), p. 285; Ginsburg, in Kitto's Cyclop. s.v.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 6:158 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, ii, 391; 3:34; Levy, Exegese bei den franzcs. Juden (Leips. 1873), p. 17 sq.; Ginsburg, Commentary on Ecclesiastes, p. 42 sq., where the first chapter of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given in English (Lond. 1861); id. Song of Songs (ibid. 1857), p. 43 sq.; Zunz, Zur Geschichte u. Literatur (Berl. 1845), p. 70 sq.; Geiger, in נטעי נעמנים(ibid. 1847), p. 29-39; id. Parshandatha (Leips. 1855), p. 2024; Jellinek, in his edition of the Song of Songs and Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1855), p. 7 sq. (B. P.)

## Rashbaz[[@Headword:Rashbaz]]

             (רשבוֹ), the initials of RABBI SIMON BEN-ZEMACH Duran, who belonged to a family which, originally of Provence, was then settled in Spain, and ultimately emigrated to Algiers. In the persecution that took place in 1391, Simon Duran, with a number of his coreligionists, emigrated to Algiers, where, from his profound learning, he obtained the title of the Great. Here he succeeded Ribash (q.v.), who had also fled from Spain, as the head of all the Jewish congregations which position he occupied until his death, in 1444. He wrote various works, some so violent against Christianity and Moslemism that they have very properly been suppressed by his coreligionists. Of his works we mention אוהב משפט, The Lover of the Just, a commentary on Job, with an introduction on the principles upon which it should be expounded; edited by Jos. Malcho (Venice, 1590), and reprinted in Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible: — מגן אבות, Shield of the Fathers, a great theological work, in three parts, treating of different subjects, especially of the fundamental articles of religion; to be found in the Bodleian and in Oppenheimerianac; one part is a commentary on the treatise Aboth (Livorno, 1762: Leipsic, 1855), while the second part, which is very severe against Christians and Turks, has been published by his son under the title of קשת ומגן, Bow and Shield. He was also famed for his medical abilities, and practiced with great reputation in Aragon. His profound erudition in Rabbinical lore, philosophy, and medicine procured for him the esteem of the learned Israelites of his time. His learned  solutions of upwards of 700 points of law are consulted at the present day. See First, Bibl. Jud. i, 216 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico deqli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transl.), p. 92; id. Bibliotheca Antichristianla, p. 109, 111; Lindo, Hist. of the Jews in Spain, p. 194; Finn, Sephardim, p. 387; Basnage, Hist. des Juifs (Taylor's transl.), p. 657; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, p 128; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebrew Literature, p. 289; Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden (1875), 8:101, 154, 170 sq.; Jost. Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten. 3:87; Zunz, Literaturgesch. d. synasqog. Poesie (Berl. 1865), p. 251; Cassel, Leitfaden der jid. Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 13; but especially Jaulus, R. Simeon ben-Zemach Duran, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1874, p. 241 sq. (B. P.)

## Rashi[[@Headword:Rashi]]

             (רשי), formed of the initials of RABBI SOLOMON IZCHAKI, or ISAAKI = BEN-ISAAC, the great Talmudic scholar and commentator, founder ot the Germano-French school of Biblical exegesis, and erroneously called Jarchi, was born in 1040 at T'roes, in Champagne, and not at Lunel, in Perpignan. He was the son of a thorough Talmudist, and thus from his youth imbibed an insatiable desire to become master of Rabbinic lore. He was a pupil of B. Isaac ben-Jakar, the greatest pupil of Rabbi Gershom (q.v.). As to the extent of his scholarship, it is a matter of dispute. Basnage terms him one of the most learned of the rabbins, while Jost takes but a low estimate of his scientific and literary attainments. However this may be, he was certainly a master in Israel in the ordinary learning of his people, the Holy Scriptures, and the whole cycle of Talmudic lore. He spent much of his life in wandering from place to place, visiting the different seats of learning in Italy, Greece, Palestine, Egypt, Persia, and Germany, giving lectures and maintaining disputations in the Jewish schools. At Worms they may still show, as they could a few years ago, the chamber where he taught a class of students, and the stone seat hewn in the wall from which he dispensed his instructions. His famous lectures secured for him the distinguished and witty title of Parshandatha (פרשנדתא), i.e. Interpreter of the Law, Nvhich is the name of one of Haman's sons (Est 9:7). Under the title פ תלמוד בבלי, He wrote a commentary on thirty treatises of the Talmud, printed in the editions of that work, and the several books separately in many different editions; they are also published wvith supercommentaries and glossaries: — פ פרקי אבות, A Commentary on Aboth (Cracow, 1621, a. o.): — פ המשניות, A Commentary on the  Mishna, condensed from that on the Talmud (Berlin, 1716): — A Commentary on the 100 Chapters of the Bereshith Rabba, סברשית ס מדרש רבה(Venice, 1568): — a collection of Halachoth, entitled ס הפרדם (Constant. 1802): — penitential hymns, or Selichoth. Besides these, and other works too many to be enumerated, he also wrote on the Old Test., under the general title of Perush al Esrimz vacarba, פרוש על עשרים וארבע, which, for the most part, is found in the Rabbinic Bibles. They have also been published in different portions in numerous editions, with and without the text, especially that on the Pentateuch, a good and critical edition of which has been edited by Dr. A. Berliner (Berlin, 1866). Various parts have also been translated into Latin by different authors, but more extensively by B. J. F. Breithaupt, 1710-14 (viz. Pentateuch, 1710; historical books, 1714; Prophets, Job, and Psalms, 1713), who also accompanied the translation with very learned and extensive annotations, besides giving the supercommentaries entitled גור אריהby Lowe (Prague, 1578), and שפתי חכמים by Sabbatai Bass. Rashi, having been long engaged in writing annotations on the Talmud, formed the habit of composing after the manner of that work, in an extremely concise and obscure style, and with the frequent use of its terms and idioms. He condensed as much as possible, and endeavored to give the precise original thought by a natural method of interpretation, by explaining the grammar of the passage, by paraphrasing its meaning, by supplying the wanting members of elliptical forms, and by sometimes rendering a word or expression into the French of that day. At the same time, he did not fail to bring forward the received interpretations of the Talmud and Midrashim, and to point out the support which the Rabbinical Halachoth receive from such passages as he thought available. The rigid brevity of his style, which often leaves the reader in perplexity as to his meaning, has served to call forth a number of supercommentaries on his works by several Jewish authors, which are enumerated in Furst. In his commentaries on the Bible he combines the traditional exposition contained in the Talmud and Midrashim with a simple and liberal explanation of the text, and does not see any inconsistency in putting side by side with the Halachic and Hagadic interpretation his own verbal interpretations, which are sometimes at variance with tradition. Though unacquainted with the labors of the Spanish grammarians and expositors, he incorporates in his commentaries all the lore contained in the cyclopedias of Jewish tradition, as well as the learning of the French expositors, and all are made tributary to the  elucidation andl illustration of the Scriptures. Rashi's piety and learning were so great, and his influence upon the Jewish nation by- means of his expositions was so extraordinary, that his comments are almost looked upon as part of the Bible, and his interpretations in the present day are regardedl by the most orthodox Jews as the authoritative import of Holy Writ. Rashi died July 13, 1105. See Fiirst. Bibl. Jud. ii, 78-90; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico ldeli Autori Ebrei (Germ. transi.), p. 125 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Theolog. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Steinschneider, Catalogus Librorum Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleian. col. 2340-2357; Turner, Jewish. Rabbis, p. 17 sq., 69 sq., 110 sq.; Basnage, ltist. des J,/fs (Taylor's transl.), p. 630; Geiger, Jid. Zeitschrif, 1867, p. 150 sq.; id. Parshandatha (Leips. 1855), p. 12, etc.; Zmlnz, in Zeitschriftfuir die Wissenschaft des Jucdenthuzms (Berl. 1822), p. 277, etc.; id. Heisst Rashi Jar-chi? in Jost's Annalen, i, 328 and 385, etc.; Zunz, Zue Geschichte u. Literatur (ibid. 1845), p. 62, etc.; id Literatusrgesch. zur syynagogalen Poesie (ibid. 1865), in 252 sq.; Synagogale Poesie (ibid. 1855), p. 181-183, Kimnchi, Liber Radicum, p. 43 sq. (Berol. 1847, ed. Biesentbal and Lebrecht); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1871), 6:70 sq.; Braunschweiger, Gesch. d. Judeln it den Roman. Staaten (Wiirzb. 1865), p. 53 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, ii, 230 sq.; Dessauer, Gesch. d. Israeliten (Bresl. 1870), p. 311; Adams, Hist. of the Jews (Bost. 1812), i, 256; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 282 sq., 406 sq. Ginsburg, Levita's Masoreth ha-Masoreth (Lond. 1867), p. 105; id. Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1861), p. 38 sq.; and Song of Songs (ibid. 1857), p. 40 sq.; Keil, Introd. to the Old Testament (Edinb. 1870), ii, 383 sq.; Bleek, Einleitung in das de Testament (Berl. 1865), p. 100, 103, 105; Diestel, Gesch. d. Alten Testaments (Jena, 1869), p. 196, 199, 339, 522; Levy, Die Exegese bei dentfi'acnzCsischen Israeliten avom 10ten bis 14 ten J'ahrhundt. (Leips. 1873), p. 10 sq.; and the interesting essay in Merx's Archiv fur wissenschiftliche Erfinirschutg des AIten Testamnents, i, 428 sq.; Siegfried, Rashi's Einfluss auf Nicolaus von Lya und Luther in der Auslegung der Genesis (Halle, 1870). (B. P.)

## Rask, Erasmus[[@Headword:Rask, Erasmus]]

             a Danish Orientalist was born November 22, 1807, and died November 14, 1832, at Copenhagen, professor. He is the author of, Der aeldeste hebraiske Tidsregning indtil Moses, efter kilderne pa ny bearbejdet og forsynet sned et Karl over Paradis (Copenhagen, 1828; Germ. transl. by Mohnike, Leipsic, 1836): — Ueber das Alter und die Echtheit der, Zend- Sprache (Germ. transl. by Hagen, Berlin, 1826). See Winer, Handbuch de theol. Lit. 1:158, 520; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v., Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Raskolniks[[@Headword:Raskolniks]]

             (that is, Schismatics), the general name used to denote the various sects which have dissented from the Russo-Greek Church. The first body that left the Established Church was the sect of the Strigolniks, which arose in the 14th century. Another more remarkable sect appeared in the latter part of the 15th century in the republic of Novgorod, teaching that Judaism was  the only true religion, and that Christianity was a fiction because the Messiah was not vet born. The chief promoters of this sect were two priests called Dionysius and Alexius, the protopapas of the cathedral of Novgorod, together with one named Gabriel, and a layman of high rank. These secret Jews conformed outwardly to the Greek Church with so great strictness that they were reputed to be eminent saints, and one of them, Zosimus by name, was raised, in 1490, to the dignity of archbishop of Moscow, and thus became head of the Russian Church. By the open profession of adherence to the Established Church of the country, the members of this Jewish, or rather Judaizing, sect managed to conceal their principles from public notice; but they were at length dragged to light by Gennadius, bishop of Novgorod, who accused them of having called the images of the saints logs; of having placed these images in unclean places, and gnawed them with their teeth; of having spit upon the cross, blasphemed Christ and the Virgin, and denied a future life. The grand-duke ordered a synod to be convened at Moscow on Oct. 17,1490, to consider these charges; and although several of the members wished to examine the accused by torture, they were obliged to content themselves with anathematizing and imprisoning them. Those, however, who were sent back to Novgorod were more harshly treated. “Attired,” says count Krasinski, “in fantastic dresses intendedl to represent demons, and having their heads covered with high caps of bark, bearing the inscription, ‘This is Satan's militia,' they were placed backwards on horses, by order of the bishop, and paraded through the streets of the towIn, exposed to the insults of the populace. They had afterwards their caps burned upon their heads, and were confined in a prison — a barbarous treatment, undoubtedly, but still humane considering the age, and compared to that which the heretics received during that as well as the following century in Western Europe.”

The metropolitan Zosimus, finding that the sect to which he secretly belonlged was persecuted as heretical, resigned his dignity in 1494, and retired into a convent. About the beginning of the 16th century, a number of these Jmldaizing sectarians fled to Germany and Lithuania, and several others who remained in Russia were burned alive. The sect seems to have disappeared about this time; but there is still found, even at the present day, a sect of the Raskolniks which observes several of the Mosaic rites, and are called Subotniki, or Saturday-men, because they observe the Jewish instead of the Christian Sabbath.  Soon after the Reformation, though Protestant doctrines were for a long time unknown in Russia, a sect of heretical Raskolniks arose who began to teach that there were no sacraments, and that the belief in the diivinity of Christ, the ordinances of the councils, and the holiness of the saints was erroneous. A council of bishops convened to try the heretics condemned them to be imprisoned for life. Towards the middle of the 17th century various sects arose in consequence of the emendations introduced into the text of the Scriptures and the Liturgical books by the patriarch Nicon. This reform gave rise to the utmost commotion in the country, and a large body both of priests and laymen violently opposed what they called the Niconian heresy, alleging that the changes in question did not correct, but corrupt, the sacred books and the true doctrine. The opponents of the amended books were numerous and violent, particularly in the north of Russia, on the shores of the White Sea. By the Established Church they were now called Raskolniks. They propagated their opinions throughout Siberia and other distant provinces. A great number of them emigrated to Poland and even to Turkey, where they formed numerous settlements. Animated by the wildest fanaticism, many of them committed voluntary suicide, through means of what thev called a baptism of fire; and it is believed that instances of this superstition occur even now in Siberia and the northern parts of Russia.

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

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

## Rasponi, Cesare[[@Headword:Rasponi, Cesare]]

             an Italian cardinal, was born at Ravenna, July 15, 1615, of noble family, and lived at Rome in his youth. He studied under the Jesuits with such success that they made him speak in public at fourteen years of age. Urban VIII gave him, among other presents, an abbey with a rental of 300 crowns. A poem entitled Princeps Hiero-politicus, dedicated to the pope, testified to the gratitude of the young beneficiary. He studied Greek; wrote some poetry, both serious and comic, in Italian; and, by the advice of cardinal Barberini, he abandoned his studies of antiquity for canonical law. Admitted to the degree of Doctor, he took possession, in 1636, of a prebendaryship of the Collegiate Church of St. John Lateran. The office of keeper of the records of that chapter gave him the opportunity to collect materials for the history of that church, which he published in 1656. He showed so much zeal and prudence in fulfilling the important duties with which he was intrusted that Innocent X, enemy of the Barberinis, loaded himm with additional favors. During a voyage which he made to France, he reconciled cardinal Barberini with the pope, and was so happy as to put an end to the division which had existed so long between these two families, arresting the marriage of the niece of Innocent X with Maffeo Barberini. There is a curious manuscript of this voyage in existence, commencing Nov. 5 1648, and ending March 19,1650. Being appointed health officer by Alexander VII, he saved the pontifical domain from the pestilence and famine which ravaged the neighboring countries. In the great quarrel which happened betweein the Corsican guards and the duke de Crequi, ambassador of the king of France, armed with full power by the pope, he  showed such a spirit of conciliation that, after the treaty of Pisa, concluded in 1664, the pope accorded to him the cardinal's hat (1666), and called him to the government of the duchy of Urbino, which he kept in spite of great bodily suffering. He died at Rome, Nov. 21, 1675. His tomb is in the Church of St. John Lateran. He left a large part of his wealth to the hospital of the catechumens. We have of his works Historia Basilica S. Joannis Laterani; he also left, in manuscript, Memoires stur sa Vie: — Recueil des Statuts, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rasponi, Felice[[@Headword:Rasponi, Felice]]

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

## Rasses, Children Of[[@Headword:Rasses, Children Of]]

             (υἱοὶ ῾Ρασσεῖς; Vullg. filli Tharsis), one of the nations whose country was ravaged by Holofernes in his approach to Judea (Jdt 2:23 only). They are named next to Lud (Lydia), and apparently south thereof. The old Latin version reads Thiras et Rasis, with which the Peshito was probably in agreement before the present corruption of its text. Wolff (Das Buch Judith [1861], p. 95, 96) restores the original Chaldee text of the passage as Thars and Rosos, and compares the latter name with Rhosus, a place on the Gulf of Issus, between the Ras el-Khanzir (Rhossicus Scopulus) and Iskenderun, or Alexandretta. If the above restoration of the original text is correct, the interchange of Meshech and Rosos, as connected with Thar, or Thiras (see Gen 10:2), is very remarkable; since if Meshech be the original of Muscovy, Rosos can hardly be other than that of Russia. SEE ROSH. — Smith. The Vulg. reads Tharsis, which has led some to suppose  that the original was תרשיש, and that Tarsus is meant. Fritzsche proposes to find the place in ῾Ρῶσος, ῾Ρῶσσος, a mountain-range and town south from Amanos (Exeg. Handb. p. 143).

## Rastall, John[[@Headword:Rastall, John]]

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

## Rastenburg, Conversation At[[@Headword:Rastenburg, Conversation At]]

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

## Rastignac, Armand Anne Auguste Antonin Sicaire, De Chapt[[@Headword:Rastignac, Armand Anne Auguste Antonin Sicaire, De Chapt]]

             a French prelate, nephew of Louis Jacques (q.v.), was born in 1726. Hle had scarcely received the degree of D.D. when he was made vicar-general by the archbishop of Arles. In the conference of the clergy in 1755 and 1760, he voted for the refusal of sacraments to the opponents of the bull Unigenitus. Three times he refused the bishopric; and when, in 1773, his uncle, marshal Biron, obtained for him, without his knowledge, the Abbey of Saint-Mesmain, in the diocese of Orleans, he hastened to resign a priory which he held in commendam. He was deputed by the clergy to the States- general in 1789; but in August, 1792, he was imprisoned, and on the 3d of September following he was massacred. Among his works are — Questions sur la Propiete des Biens-fonds Ecclesiastiques en France  (Paris, 1789, 8vo): — Accord de la Revelation et de la Raison comte le Deisume (ibid. 1791, 8vo). See Hoefer. Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rastignac, Aymeric, De Chapt De[[@Headword:Rastignac, Aymeric, De Chapt De]]

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

## Rastignac, Louis Jacques, De Chapt De[[@Headword:Rastignac, Louis Jacques, De Chapt De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Rastignac in 1684. He was the third son of Francois de Chapt, marquis of Rastignac. In 1714, after having been made prior of the Sarbonne, and also grand vicar of Lucon, he received the degree of D.D. In 1720 he was made bishop of Tulle; and in 1723 the king gave him the abbey La Couronne, in the diocese of Angouleme, and, two days afterwards, transferred him to the archbishopric of Tours. Pope Benedict XIII eulogized him in a short speech in 1725, on account of the zeal which he showed in opposing the Jansenists; but the many dissensions which he afterwards had with the Jesuits caused him to favor the Gallican body, and even the Jansenists. He had displayed so much talent in the meetings of the clergy in 1726, 1734, and 1743 that he was chosen to preside over those of 1745, 1747, and 1748; and the speeches which he delivered during the different sessions are monuments of his knowledge and eloquence. In 1746 he established the foundling hospital, Adeleille, at Tours. By a mandamus in 1747, he condemned tle book of pere Pichon, L'Esprit de l'Eiglise; and, in order to counteract the pernicious principles of this Jesuit, in 1748 and 1749 he wrote three works — one upon repentance, one upon communion, and the third upon Christian justice in relation to the sacraments of penance and the eucharist. So many complaints were made that cardinal Rohan, by order of the king, instructed four bishops to examine the work. They wrote to M. de Rastignac, asking  for explanations; but he refused to make any. He used the greater part of his income in assisting the poor. He died Aug. 2, 1750. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rat[[@Headword:Rat]]

             SEE MOLE.

## Ratcliffe, William P[[@Headword:Ratcliffe, William P]]

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

## Ratel, Louis Jean Baptiste Justin[[@Headword:Ratel, Louis Jean Baptiste Justin]]

             a French priest, was born at St. Omer, Dec. 14, 1758. He was the son of a hatter, and was placed by his uncle, a dignitary in one of the abbeys of Artois, in the Seminary of the Thirty-three at Paris, where he studied theology. Having taken license, he was, while yet very young, appointed to the living of Dunkirk. But, although French, this parish was dependent on the Dutch diocese of Ypres; and each nomination of a curate became the occasion of litigation. The abbot Ratel defended this benefice when the Revolution broke out. Having taken up arms in 1792, he did not wait to be exempted from the service on account of the weakness of his sight; and, during the terrors of the period, he took refuge with his family in the village of La Roche-Guyon. He afterwards returned to Paris, and organized and directed the correspondence with the Vendeans and the Norman Federation. He aided, also, the famous English admiral Sir William Sidney Smith to escape from the Temple, and published many pamphlets which attracted attention, particularly that one which related to the coup d'etat of 18th Brumaire. Concealed in Boulogne, he there secretly fulfilled the duties of agent of count d'Artois, then succeeded, amid a thousand dangers, in escaping to England, where he was long known under the names of Dubois and Lemoine. His relations with lord Castlereagh and the principal members of the English cabinet enabled him to be of great service to French emigrants. It was also by his mediation that Pichegru and Moreau  were reconciled. Although absent, he was accused of various conspiracies; and he was condemned to death, and a price set on his head. He was long searched for by the imperial police. He did not return to his native city till April, 1814. During the Hundred Days he retired to Ypres, where he fell sick; and, after the return of the Bourbons, he went to live on his place at Maigiral, where he died. Jan. 26, 1816. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rates, Church[[@Headword:Rates, Church]]

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

## Rathbun, Valentine[[@Headword:Rathbun, Valentine]]

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

## Rathel, Wolfgang Christopher[[@Headword:Rathel, Wolfgang Christopher]]

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

## Ratherius (Rathier) Of Liege[[@Headword:Ratherius (Rathier) Of Liege]]

             a monastic of mediaeval times, was born of a noble family, probably in 890. He was reared in the convent at Lobach, in the diocese of Liege, and was afterwards one of its monks. In 926, when his friend Hilduin, also a monk, went to Italy to visit his nephew, king Hugo, Ratherius accompanied him. Hilduin was made first bishop of Verona (931), and shortly after archbishop of Milan; and upon this promotion, his friend Ratherius was placed in the vacated see of Verona. In 934, when Arnold of Bavaria invaded Italy, Ratherius sided with the invader; and when Arnold was successfully disposed of, Ratherius was promptly deposed and imprisoned at Pavia. During his incarceration he wrote his Proeloquia (in six books). By the intercession of powerful friends he was put into the custody of the bishop of Arno, and thence escaped, in 939, to Southern France. He was private tutor for a time, and in 944 returned to Lobach. He was full of ambition, and pined for the opportunity to return to Italy. Finally, made bold by hope of regaining the king's favor inl open confession, he hastened to Hugo's presence, and really secured the forfeited place. But though restored to the see, he could not recover the favor of his parishioners; and, after various vicissitudes, he returned to the dwelling-place of his youth once more. In 952 Otho the Great called him into the vicinity of his brother Bruno; and when he was elevated to the archbishopric of Cologne, Ratherius was made bishop of Liege. He proved, however, very soon that the disappointments of life had told too greatly upon his whole character to fit him any longer for great responsibilities. He failed in all his undertakings, politically and ecclesiastically; and the discontent in the see was so great and widespread that the emperor felt compelled to dispossess him, and retire him to the little abbey of Alna, a dependence of Lobach. Even here he made himself extremely unpopular by his overzealous defence of the sacramental views ofPaschasius Radbertus. In 961, for the third time, the see of Verona was given to him, but the clergy of the diocese succeeded again in effecting his removal. He was once more after this a monk at Lobach and abbot at Alna. He died before he had secured the Abbey of Lobach, for which he strove finally as if an honor to be coveted. He died at the house of the count of Namur, April 25, 974. His writings, which are numerous and valuable, are collected in one edition by P. and H. Ballerini (Verona, 1765). See Vogel, Ratheius von Verona (Jena, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo); Lea, Hist. of Celibacy; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. vol. 2, Gieseler,  Eccles. Hist.; Foulkes, Divisions of Christendom, 1, 7; Milman, Hist. Lat. Christianity, 3:171, 172. (J. H. W.)

## Rathlef, Ernst Ludwig[[@Headword:Rathlef, Ernst Ludwig]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1709, and died April 19, 1768, superintendent at Nienburg, in the county of Hoya. He wrote, De Simular Nebucadnezaris Aureo, ad Dan 3:1 (Helmstadt, 1730): — De Corpore Mosis ad Epist. Judae 8 (Hanover, 1733): — De Maccabaeis Saccorum Antiqui Foederis Librorum Exulibus (1739): — Historia Autographorum Apostolicorum (1752), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:78, 416, 432, 567; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:133 sq. (B.P.)

## Rathmann, Herrmann[[@Headword:Rathmann, Herrmann]]

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

## Rathumus[[@Headword:Rathumus]]

             ( ῾Ράθυμος v. r. Ράθυος; Vulg. Rathimus), “the story-writer” (1Es 2:16-17; 1Es 2:25; 1Es 2:30), the same as “Rehum the chancellor” (Ezr 4:8-9; Ezr 4:17; Ezr 4:23).

## Ratich, Wolfgang[[@Headword:Ratich, Wolfgang]]

             a distinguished German educator, was born in 1571, at Wilsten, in Holstein. A difficulty in speech compelled him to give up the ministry, for which he had intended fitting himself; and he applied himself to the study of the Hebrew and Arabic languages and mathematics. He claimed to be the inventor of a new system of instruction, vastly superior to the prevailing ones, and in 1612 addressed a memorial to the Diet of Frankfort, in which he asserted that not only could old and young in a short time easily learn Hebrew, Greek, Latin, German, philosophy, theology, and the arts and  sciences, but that uniformity of language and religion could be introduced into the whole empire. Several princes were led to interest themselves in his scheme. Professors Helwig and Jung, of Giessen, and Granger, Brendel, Walter, and Wolf, of Jena, were invited to investigate it. They judged it excellent in theory, and made a favorable report upon it. Ratich agreed with prince Ludwig of Anhalt-Kithen and duke John Ernest of Weimar to instruct children by his new system, and also by it to qualify teachers to give instruction in any language, in less time and with less labor than by any other method used in Germany. A printing-office was furnished him in Kbthen, and his books were printed in six languages. A school was established for him, with one hundred and thirty-five scholars. But Ratich proved incompetent to give practical effect to his theories. He became unpopular, and, being an earnest Lutheran, fell under the ban of the religious prejudices of a community attached to the Reformed faith. His school failed in a short time. Prince Ludwig quarrelled with him, and, in 1619, imprisoned him but he was released in 1620, after having signed the declaration that “he had claimed and promised more than he knew or could bring to pass.” His system was now attacked by some who had been his friends. The countess Sophia von Schwarzburg-Rudolstadt, however, recommended him to the Swedish chancellor, Oxenstierna. At the request of that statesman, Drs. BrUckner, Meyfart, and Ziegler examined his method; and they again made a favorable report upon it in 1634.

Ratich, without doubt, had a practical conception of the objects of education. He preferred to give instruction in those branches which could be made useful in life rather than to pay so much attention to the dead languages. In his memorial to the Diet at Frankfort, he held that a child should first learn to read and speak the mothertongue correctly, so as to be able to use the German Bible. Hebrew and Greek should then be learned as tie tongues of the original text of the Bible, after whlich Latin might be studied. His views were embodied in a number of rules, or principles, the chief of which are: 1. Everything should be presented in its order, a due regard being always had to the course of nature. 2. Only one thing should be presented at a time. 3. Each thing should be often repeated. 4. Everything should be taught at first in the mothertongue; afterwards other languages may be taught. 5. Everything should be done without compulsion. 6. Nothing should be learned by rote. 7. There should be mutual conformity in all things. 8. First the thing by itself, and afterwards the explanation of it; that is to say, a basis of material must be laid in the mind befire any rules can be applied to it. Thus, in teaching grammar, he gave no rules, but began with  the reading of the text, and required that the rules should be deduced from it. 9. Everything by expression, and the investigation by parts. In his Methodus he has left minute directions to teachers concerning the details of the course, and the proper methods of instruction; but they are very prolix, and impose an immense amount of labor on the teacher, without seeming to call for a corresponding degree of exertion on the part of the pupil. Comenius, after reading his book, remarked that he “had not ill displayed the faults of the school, but that his remedies weire not distinctly shown.” Ratich's works were written in Latin, and are diffuse, tedious, and somewhat pedantic. He died in 1635. See Biographie Universelle, s.v.

## Ratier, Vincent[[@Headword:Ratier, Vincent]]

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

## Ratification[[@Headword:Ratification]]

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

## Rationale[[@Headword:Rationale]]

             (1.) The chairs of theology and philosophy (during the scholastic ages) were the oracular seats from which the doctrines of Aristotle were expounded as the rationale of theological and moral truth. “There cannot be a body of rules without a rationale, and this rationale constitutes the science. There were poets before there were rules of poetical composition; but before Aristotle, or Horace, or Boileau, or Pope could write their arts of poetry and criticism, they had considered the reasons on which their precepts rested, they had conceived in their own minds a theory of the art. In like manner, there were navigators before there was an art of navigation; but before the art of navigation could teach the methods of finding the  ship's place by observations of the heavenly bodies, the science of astronomy must have explained the system of the world.” Anthony Sparrow, bishop of Exeter. is the author of a work entitled A Rationale upon the Book of Common Prayer.

(2.) A peculiar form of the bishop's pallium (pectorale, λογύον), appropriated by the bishops of Rome to themselves from the time in which they began to assume the title of pontifices maximi and the dignity of the high-priests of the Old Testament. It was sometimes sent by the Roman pontiffs to other bishops as a mark of distinction and favor. It was in the form of a trefoil, quatrefoil, or oblong square, like the piece of stuff worn by the Aaronic high-priest. It appears in England on bishop Gifford's monument at Worcester in 1301. It was worn, perhaps for the last time on record, at Rheims. The pope has a formal, and cardinals and Italian bishops wear superb brooches to clasp their copes. The Greek περιστέθιον, worn by patriarchs and metropolitans over the chasuble, is an oblong plate of gold or silver, jewelled.

(3.) The word rationale is also the name of a treatise explaining the meaning, and justifying the continuance, of that ceremonial which it was thought fit to retain in the Church of England in the year 1541. The members of the committee to whom this subject was intrusted were warmly attached to the splendor of the Roman ritual, and, of course, made few alterations. The collects in which prayers were offered for the pope, and the offices for Thomas a Becket and some other saints, were omitted; but so slight were the changes introduced that in many churches the missal and breviary already in use were retained. The Rationale Divinorum Officiorum of Durand, bishop of Mende, written in the latter part of the 13th century, gives the “reasons” of the forms and ceremonies of Romish worship. See Collier, Eccles. Hist. v, 106; Burnet, Hist. of the Ref. 1, 63; Riddle, Christian Antiq. (see Index).

## Rationalism[[@Headword:Rationalism]]

             a term applied to a specific movement in theology which assumed definite shape about the middle of the 18th century, and culminated in the first decades of the 19th. Its chief seat was in Protestant Germany. Its distinguishing trait consisted in erecting the human understanding into a supreme judge over the Word of God, and thus, by implication, denying the importance, and even necessity, of any miraculous revelation whatever.  But a tendency to rationalism has existed to some degree wherever human thought has made the least advances. Especially are its outbreaks distinctly recognisable at several points along the course of the history of theology; and in several countries it had existed as a clearly defined movement even before its full development in Germany. (In the chief features of this article, we shall follow the paper of Dr. Tholuck in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. 12:537-554.)

I. English Rationalism. — Sporadic tendencies towards rationalism existed among the Averrhoists in the Middle Ages, and among the anti- Trinitarians of the 16th century; but these were largely of a philosophical or a mystical type. But in English deism the tendency became definitely theological and anti-Biblical. In reaction against the confessional persecutions and intolerance of the 17th century, not a few gifted minds were led to look for a really tenable position only in the elementary traits that are common to all confessions, and even to all religions whatsoever. This led gradually to a denial of the necessity of revelation, and to an exclusive reliance upon the light of nature (lumen natura). This lumen became thus both the source and the judge of all religious truth. This movement was variously styled naturalism, deism, and occasionally also rationalism. English deism differs, however, in this respect from German- that it proceeded mainly from non-theologians, and was openly hostile to the Bible; whereas German rationalism sprang from theologians eminent in the Church, and it professedly honored the Scriptures as a valuable summary of the highest religious truths. The former, according to Nitzsch (System, § 28), was largely a denier of revelation; the latter was a philosophical exegete. But as the former relied, in the last instance, on the lumen naturae, and the latter on the so-called “sound human understanding,” the ultimate result was identical.

II. Rationalisms in the Netherlands. — This arose simultaneously with English deism. Here, also, the toleration of different confessions led to latitudinarianism. The tendency was further promoted by a revival of classical humanism. Forerunners of rationalism appeared before the middle of the 17th century. Voetius (Disput. Theol. i, 1) mentions a work (of 1633) which did not hesitate to hold thus: Naturalis ratio judex et norma fidei. The tendency was systematically prepared for by the Cartesian philosophy. Without directly touching the foundations of faith, it yet silently undermined them by the fundamental maxim, De omnibus  dubitandum. This maxim, though reverently intended, yet resulted, in practice, in a thoroughly anti-Biblical drift. Duker and Roell held that human reason is as infallible as God, its author; and that if it ever errs, this results from mere lack of attention to its inner light. The influence of Spinoza was in the same direction. In his Tractatus Theologico-politicus, he had subjected the religion of the Bible to a philosophical interpretation which was fatal to its positive validity. His disciple, L. Meyer, taught unhesitatingly (1666), Quidquid rationi contrarium, illud non est credendum. Also from the time of Spinoza forward there appears, even among devout theologians, a tendency to break loose from orthodox traditions. This is further promoted by the works of gifted French refugees- Bayle, Le Clerc, and others.

III. German Rationalism. — This subject falls naturally into the following five subdivisions: the period of preparatory discussion (1660-1750); the period of historical criticism (1750 -1780); the period of philosophical criticism (1780-1800); the period of the socalled rationalismus vulgaris (1800-1814); the period of philosophical rationalism (from Kant to Feuerbach).

1. Preparatory. — It was only incidentally that foreign rationalism attracted the attention of German theologians before the close of the 17th century. The earliest assailant of Herbert of Cherbury and of Spinoza was Musaeus, in 1667 and 1674. But a German basis for rationalism had already been laid. In the midst of the violence of orthodox polemics, Calixtus had laid the foundations for a less rigid tendency. The Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) had spread immorality among the masses and indifference among the nobility. The succeeding years of material prosperity and of French luxury still further undermined the power of the old orthodoxy. But the Lutheran Church still firmly held its old position till towards the close of the century. The Reformed Church was the first to be affected. Duisburg became the rallying-point of suspected Cartesians from all quarters. Here H. Hulsius (1688) defended the principle of Roell, that reason is the ultimate judge in matters of faith, and substituted syllogistic argumentation for the testimonium internum. He also declared that theology was the handmaid of philosophy, instead of the converse. The same views were found elsewhere in Reformed circles. Bashuvsen held, in a dissertation (Zerbst, 1727), that reason is the test of faith, and that none but fanatics appealed to a testimonium spiritus. Similar sentiments soon found place in Lutheran schools, though not in the theological faculties.  Thomasius, first at Leipsic, then at Halle, was the first to give to them much prominence. His main endeavor of life was the “dissipation of prejudices” from every field of thought or inquiry, and the criterion of his efforts was a prudential regard for the “useful;” and as the only judge of the “useful” was the so-called common-sense of the educated classes, it is plain that the rationalistic foundation was already fully laid. But the name rationalism was as yet almost wholly unknown, and in outward form the authority of the Scriptures was still almost universally admitted.

Inside of the German Church of the 17th century, and down to the middle of the 18th, there prevailed two parallel streams of life — the subjective devotion of pietism, and a subjective proclivity to individual criticism — both of them having this in common, that they opposed the objective validity of formal orthodoxy. On the part of pietism, this opposition was not consciously intended; but in laving such exclusive emphasis on the Bible as opposed to creeds, and on the witness of the Spirit as opposed to priestly guidance, it actually did so in fact. Thus the venerable Michael Lang, of Altdorf, allowed himself, in his zeal for vital piety, to stigmatize the orthodox symbols as ape-Bibles and sectarian documents. Speller found the yoke of these symbols insupportable in some points; Joachim Lange and others actually disregarded them on occasion. Haferung seriously objects to the formula that goodworks spring from faith. The pious Rambach virtually undermines the orthodox theory of inspiration. The form of dogmatics began to undergo a change. Breithaupt (1700) and Freylinghausen (1703) purposely avoided the traditional phraseology in their systems of theology. And this tendency from within the Church was promoted by influences which came now from England and Holland. The force of this influence may be judged of by the opposition it at first met with. Lilienthal mentions, between 1680 and 1720, no less than forty-six works against atheism, twenty-seven against rationalism, and fifteen against indifferentism. The forms of the opposition varied all the way from a natural desire for a clear understanding of the grounds of faith to an absolute indifference, or even a frivolous atheism. The eminent Leipsic pastor Zeidler (1735) thought to honor the Bible by the utmost contempt of systems of doctrine. Out of pietism there sprang a number of warmhearted mystics, who laid exclusive stress on the “inner spark, the inner word,” thus opening the path to every sort of vagary. Under the guidance of this “inner word,” Dippel presented, in 1697, a very free criticism of the dogmas of inspiration and atonement. Loscher complained,  in 1725, that even good theologians were falling into the danger of insisting simply on Christian love and morals, and forgetting the danger from assaults of false teachers. In the same year, an eminent publicist called for a consolidation of the Lutheran and Reformed confessions, asserting that, after all. piety and love were the only things essential. Edelmann began, in 1735, with slight variations from strict orthodoxy, and ended, with Spinoza, in denying the personality of God and the immortality of the soul. The aged Loscher sorrowfully laments, in 1746, that, after his fortyseven years of faithful ministry, the condition of theology and of the Church was only growing worse and worse; and sadder still is the lament of Koch, in 1754, that the Bible had almost lost all respect on the part of the cultured classes, and that it was abandoned to the ignorant as a collection of childish fables.

All the preceding inroads upon orthodox tradition had been carried out under the demands of the so-called sound human understanding. It was mostly the work of non-theologians. But from the beginning of the 18th century, a definite philosophical system was made to serve the interests of rationalism. Leibnitz and Wolff threw out thoughts that powerfully contributed to ends which their authors were very far from intending. Leibnitz's distinction of doctrines into those which can be rationally proved and those which are above reason was used to cast positive suspicion upon the whole of the latter class. Wolff's distinction of theology into the two parts, natural and revealed, was turned to the same service. As natural theology could give a reason for its dicta, and revealed theology could not, it came to pass that almost the whole stress was laid upon the former. But this incipient undermining process was as yet hardly felt outside of the professional circles. The pulpit remained almost unaffected. The most eminent example of the union of the old with the new tendencies was in the case of Matthew Pfaff, professor in Tubingen (1716), then in Giessen (1756), who died in 1760. Holding fast to the chief old landmarks, he vet relaxed much from confessional rigidity, and earnestly labored for the union of the two German churches. The mention of Pfaff brings us to the close of this first phase of German rationalism.

2. The Period of Historical Criticism. — The condition of theology, and, indeed, of science and art also, about the middle of the 18th century, was that of a mummylike stiffness and a shallow systematization. The vital contest which had broken out in Spener's time between pietism and orthodoxy had lost its vigor and died away. The second generation of Halle  pietists had left the stage, J. H. Michaelis in 1738, J. Lange in 1744; G. Francke outlived his age — until 1770. So, also, had departed the last champions of the old orthodoxy — Wernsdorf in 1729, Cyprian in 1745, Loscher in 1749; Wolff, having outlived the vitality of his own system, departed in sadness in 1754. The superficial and pedantic Gottsched still held his mastery in the fine arts. An unproductive, compiling spirit prevailed in science and theology. “Most of our preachers,” says Erenius, “give now large attention to the making of collections of curiosities, stamps, and old coins.” There was wanting a fresh wind to fill the weary sails of life. But just now the lacking stimulus was abundantly supplied; it was furnished by the furor of criticism which broke out first on the field of history, then on that of philosophy.

Although Thomasius and others had already done something in the field of historical criticism, this was only from a superficial, empirical standpoint. It was only when historical criticism assumed a thorough and systematic form that it wrought its full clarifying and revolutionizing effects on the whole field of theology. New investigations were now instituted; every nook and corner of antiquity, linguistics, and science of every form was subjected to a searching and sifting such as had never before been paralleled; and the results attained were such as clearly required a re-examination and reconstruction of the whole circle of the religious sciences. It is true the main motive which inspired the critical movement was devoid of deep religious character, and hence many of its boasted results have proved to be untenable; but many others are admitted, and accepted by all parties as absolutely unassailable.

Also, on this critical field, English deism had been in the advance, and had contributed no insignificant results. Toland, Collins, Tindal, and Bolingbroke had unsettled the popular faith in the authenticity of the canon, insisting that the multiplicity of apocryphal books, some of them accepted by the fathers, threw doubt upon all the others; that many passages in the Gospels were manifestly spurious; that the time of the settlement of the canon was absolutely unknown; that the genuine sacred books of the Jews had perished in the time of the Exile, etc. Hobbes gave lengthy reasons for disbelievingl the Pentateuch; Collins threw discredit upon Daniel; Morgan gave to the views of Toland nd Bolingbroke an attractive rhetorical expression, thus disseminating them among the uneducated. Collins assailed the very foundations of the historical argument to wit, the prophecies — insisting that the predictions of the Old  Testament relate, when properly interpreted, to very different things from those to which the New-Testament writers apply them. Only in one of the Prophets — Daniel — are there real predictions; but these relate, not to Christ, but to political events. Moreover, these prophecies of Daniel “were written after the events.”

In Germany the full tide of revolutionary criticism takes systematic form in Semler of Halle. By Semler almost the whole circle of orthodox landmarks was thrown into confusion: the Bible-text was assailed; the pertinency of standard proof-texts was denied; the genuineness of Biblical books was contested; the foundation was dashed away from numerous usages and dogmas which had hitherto passed as absolutely unassailable. Although many of the points which Semler made were subsequently further developed and accepted as sound, yet the immediate effect in his day was to throw doubt into the whole arsenal of orthodoxy.

The general effect was to set in motion an unparalleled vigor of critical investigation. It spread like wildfire among all the universities and all ranks of the clergy. Biblical criticism and exegesis, the history of the Church and of doctrine, were speedily enriched and enlarged. In Halle, Semler found an able and like-spirited pupil in Gruner, at Leipsic labored the cautious but progressive Ernesti (since 1759); Michaelis represented the movement at Gottingen (since 1750); Griesbach, Doderlein, Eichhorn, at Jena; Henke at Helmstedt, Tollmer, Steinhart, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder. Under the labors of these and kindred critics there was scarcely a single dogma that remained unscathed. But the general inspiration, the purpose, of the whole is not the overturning, but only the clarification, the correct construction, of the Biblical teachings. Even the authority of the Church is held fast to by Semler, though in a peculiar manner. The symbols and forms of the Church are useful in preserving external unity and uniformity. Criticism is simply the right of the private judgment of the individual. His position seemed practically to involve a doubt of the possibility of attaining to objective truth; his radical mistake was the assumption that religion can exist without a doctrinal basis. Starting out from the warm atmosphere of pietism, he gradually descended until he had little more reverence for the oracles of God than for the fables of Ovid. Holding that the inner conviction of our own truth-loving heart is the sole test as to the inspiration of a book, he decided against the claim of Ruth, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, and the Canticles; he doubted the genuineness of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Daniel; he held that the Pentateuch is but a collection of legendary  fragments. The New Testament is better than the Old, though some of its parts are positively pernicious; the Apocalypse is the fabrication of a fanatic; the Gospel of John is the only one which is useful for the modern Church. There are two elements in the Bible, the transitory and the eternal. It is the prerogative of criticism to sift among the chaff and select out the scattered grains of pure truth. Much of the Bible was written simply for local or party purposes: it was never intended for general use. A principle of which Semler made large use was the celebrated “accommodation theory.” He insisted, namely, that Christ and the apostles taught many things by way of mere accommodation to the whims and prejudices of the age. They did not abruptly contradict many false views that prevailed, but they partially accepted them, though planting within them a substratum of absolute truth. To sift out this truth from the encasement of rubbish is the privilege of the clear-sighted modern critic. In the field of dogmatics Semler was almost ferocious in his iconoclasm. For the Protestant or even the apostolical fathers he showed the most thorough disrespect. One after another of the central dogmas of orthodoxy fell under the hammer of his criticism, and seemed to be dissipated forever. And what Semler did at Halle, a bold choir of like-minded men did in other parts of Germany.

Of very considerable influence in this second half of the 18th century were translations of the works of English and Dutch rationalists and deists. Semler himself acknowledges his great indebtedness to Wettstein and Le Clerc. The biographies of the day are full of references to the wide influence of Toland and Tindal. The same fact is evinced by the scores and scores of clerical attempts at refuting these sceptics.

From the lawless subjectivism of Semler the descent was easy to the most absurd and degrading consequences. Two theological writers especially carried out the logical consequences in both their writings and their lives. Edelmann took up the tradition of Thomasius, and constructed his whole system of theology from a superficial utilitarian standpoint. Not what is true, but what is of use to the subject, was his whole inquiry. The result was that he simply reduced Christianity to a feeble and insipid deism. But the climax was reached in Bahrdt. This man used his eminent popular talents to ridicule the Bible, to blaspheme Christ, and to degrade to the very lowest infamy the name of theologian. His popular treatises were read by the ten thousand, and produced great evil. But his career as a whole marked a turning-point in the tide of rationalism. Criticism, when left unguided by any fixed principle of objective truth, was found to be fruitless  and to lead only to destruction. It became necessary to look about for some corner-stone of truth upon which to stay the tottering edifice of theology and religion. The various attempts to discover this constitute —

3. The Period of Philosophical Criticism (1780-1800). — After the decline of the popularity of Wolff, the vitality of philosophy in Germany stood at the zero point. So long as philosophy was represented by the feeble eclecticism of Mendelssohn, Garve, Sulzer, Meiners, Platner, Reinhard, and Flatt, the criticism of the Semler school could flatter itself with standing upon philosophical ground; for both tendencies were built upon the one principle of the so-called “sound human understanding.” But when Kant came, both systems were overturned at a blow. Kant showed that our transcendental knowledge reaches no further than our experience, and that our knowledge of supernatural objects is defensible only as postulates of the practical reason. Philosophy and theology must concede that the proofs for the existence of God avail no further than simply to establish a probability. The subjective morality of utility was overthrown by the principle that no morality is possible save where it is grounded upon a purely objective “ought.” It was shown that the whole duty of theology was, by the help of religious ideas, to contribute to the supremacy of the “ought” in human society. But also the philosophy of Kant took on somewhat of the coloring of the age, and many of the old rationalists interpreted it as favorable to them. Thus the three Kantian postulates of the practical reason were metamorphosed into mere hypotheses of the theoretical reason. The objective categorical imperative was identified with the subjective voice of conscience; and that “morality is the chief thing in religion” was said to be the very essence of the old subjectivism. But there were two phases to the matter: while one current of rationalistic theology welcomed Kant and vainly hoped to force the new wine into the old bottles, another current mocked at it as mere mysticism and scholastic jargon. Oaly a few deeper-sighted men, such as Schmidt, Vogel, and Tieftrunk, saw the folly of both of these positions — saw that the new was utterly subversive of the old.

4. The Period of the So-called Rationalismus Vulgaris (1800-1833). — The attitude of the theology dominant at the dawn of the 19th century was thus: The Holy Scriptures rationally interpreted were still revered as the codex of a rational religion and morality. But with every advance step in what was called historical exegesis, the discrepancy between the traditional sense of the Bible and the new construction which reason endeavored to  put upon it became more strikingly apparent. Semler's accommodation theory was made to apply to every narrative and every doctrinal statement of the whole Bible. Every passage in the Scriptures was thought to be so enveloped in a Judaistic haze as to render necessary a great deal of clarification before the true sense could be reached. The New Testament citations from the Old were thought to be totally misapplied. Jesus was thought by some to have been a veritable fanatic. John the Baptist regarded him as sinless; but did Jesus think so himself? The myth theory began now to play its role. L. Bauer published in 1800 a Hebrew mythology of the Old and New Testaments; the miracles were explained away as mere natural events.

As early as 1794 the aspect of matters was thus summed up by Riem: “The champions of the religion of pure reason have already advaniced so far that all the best theologians are going over to them, and all candidates for position hold them in great honor. It has already come to be a settled matter that reason is the court of highest appeal; and that this court will not decide against itself is easy to see.” A writer in 1792 had said: “The truth of a doctrine rests upon rational grounds. If it can stand the test of reason; if it does not contradict any of the results of science and experience; if it commends itself to all rational men, then it is true, and no fanatic can prove the contrary.” Krug went so far in 1795 as to deny to Christian truth any more permanent worth than that of the teachings of any other transitory system of philosophy. “Let no one say that God could make none other than a perfect revelation. There is no perfect revelation. The utterances of holy men spring up from their souls just as the utterances of other men; hence they necessarily bear the coloring of the environment from which they sprang.” Such sentiments were legislatively condemned in some parts of Germany; but not so in Prussia. Here the chief Church councillor, Teller, on being asked whether any positive confession was any longer to be exacted of candidates for Church membership, replied that, apart from baptism and the eucharist, no other yoke was to be imposed; on the contrary, every applicant was to be unhesitatingly received with the simple formula: “I baptize thee upon thy confession of Christ, the founder of a more spiritual and more joyous religion than that of the society [the world] to which thou hast hitherto belonged.”

With the changed phase of things at the close of the 18th century, the term “rationalism” came into more frequent use. At first it was chiefly used by opponents. Men like Gabler contrasted rationalism with the fundamental  principle of Protestantism. to wit, the normative authority of the Bible, showinlg the utter inconsistency of the two. Henceforth it is used mainly as a term of reproach; it was never cordially accepted by those to whom it was applied.

As soon as rationalism became clearly conscious of its attitude towards revelation, it felt more fully than ever the necessity of defining its own fundamental principles. Also an external stimulus urged it to this step. Hitherto it had peaceably reclined its head on the bosom of each successively rising system of philosophy; but since the rise of the speculative systems of Fichte and Schelling, such an alliance was impossible. The haughty speculative systems disdained to fraternize with the superficial reasonings of the “sound human understanding.” Also, even rationalism stood aghast at the bottomless abyss of the pantheistic mysticism of Schelling; and numerous works of rationalistic source assailed the new “atheism.” But the empirical platitudes of rationalism met with only ridicule and sneers from the new lords of the intellectual world. Fichte, Schellilng, and Gothe agreed in stigmatizing the best principles and the whole system of the rationalists as commonplace and vulgar.

At last, however, there appeared a system of philosophy under the wings of which the rationalists felt that they could flee for refuge; this was the faith- philosophy of Jacobi. The radical weakness of the old rationalism was that it gave no scope to the spontaneities of sentiment and the heart, but rather measured everything by the cold, dry processes of argumentation. It was utterly ungenial, unpoetic; a mere probability was the highest word it could say in behalf of the most central truths. The system of Jacobi remedied this. It supplemented the coldness of mere intellectual probability by the “immediate certainty of feeling;” it restored to faith its colegitimacy with knowledge. Accordingly, all the better representatives of honest rationalism hailed the faith-philosophy of Jacobi, and used it to rescue the sinking bark of the current theology. Notably was this the case with Gabler, who now urged as the deepest proof of the truth of religion a “Nithigungsgefiihl mit Urausspriichen der allgemeinen Vernunft” — that is, he held that religious truth commends itself directly to our inner consciousness with all the compelling force of intuition. From this time forward it became common to lay great stress upon what, with Kant, was the imperative of the practical reason, and to style it the faith of reason (Vernunftglauben). This procedure was partially justified by Kant himself, who claimed to have set limits to reason only in order to give greater play  to faith. It was still more justified by the Half-Kantians, such as Bouterweck, who derives all the ideas of reason from a so-called truth- feeling and truth-faith. This is the philosophic ground upon which are based the definitions of reason and the understanding as given in the theology of Bretschneider and Wegscheider; to wit, that reason is the faculty for generating ideas directly out of consciousness without the intervention of the discursive activity, while understanding is the faculty for confirming and elucidating these ideas.

Thus rationalism has, since the beginning of the 19th century, made considerable advances beyond its previous dry and shallow common- senseism. It was helped to this by the philosophy of Fries, who, by his doctrine of faith and insight, placed reason in antagonism to the understandinlg; and still more so when this philosophy was adopted by the gifted and noble-minded De Wette. For a long while yet — into the third decade — the tone and foibles of rationalism remained largely the same as those given to it by the abstract, shallow prosiness of Nicolai and of Teller, of Semler, and in some respects of Gabler, Rohr and Paulus follow in the steps of Teller; Bretschneider and Wegscheider reproduce much of the loose syncretism of a Semler. The chief scientific weakness of Wegscheider's celebrated Institutiones lies in its dearth of definitely fixed ideas and in its avoidance of decided utterances. He asserts: “In rebus gravissimis ad religionem pertinentibus convenire omnes gentes.” Hase raises the question whether any real student of the history of philosophy could agree to this. Wegscheider's only defence is to timidly insert a fere omnes. He reiterates the old demonstrations of the existence of God; and when Kant's antinomies stare him in the face, he concedes that, taken singly, these demonstrations are not conclusive, but thinks that they are so when taken all together. Hahn declares that deism and naturalistic rationalism are identical. Wegscheider indignantly protests, inasmuch as rationalism accepts revelation thus far: that God endowed the founder of Christianity with extraordinary inner gifts, and gave him many outward tokens of special guidance.”

At this point there rises the so-called supernaturalist school. It includes those who protested against the absolute autonomy of reason in matters of religion; and though many of its adherenlts still clung to views irreconcilable with due reverence for the Bible, still it formed the platform upon which a higher and more Biblical standpoint was subsequently reached. Among these supernaturalists were men like Storr and Flatt in  Wurtemberg, and Reinhard in Dresden. But by the beginning of the second decade of the century even these feeble supernaturalist voices were silent, and rationalism seemed to remain solitary and victorious upon the field of battle. Yet the dry crumbs of rationalism could not satisfy the deep wants of the German nation; the stimulus to a deeper insight and a richer faith came from without. It was from the thunder-strokes of the Leipsic and the Waterloo victories that the rejuvenation of German life went forth. This rejuvenation brought, in its train a restoration of life, first in the German Church and then in German theology. Inside of theology the rationalistic movement continued until 1825. Among its ablest assailants at this time are Tittmann and Sartorius; but outside of the schools many signs indicated that its reign was over. The new policy of the Prussian government discountenanced it; the religious and patriotic enthusiasm occasioned by the tercentenary of the Reformation (1817) was uncongenial to it, the theses of Harms and the disputation of Leipsic (which had the courage to summon the rationalistic clergy to resign their clerical positions) were of the same purport. In 1830 the new Kirchenzeitung of Hengstenberg went so far even as to call for the expulsion of rationalistic professors from the universities. As yet, however, it was but a small band who opposed rationalism. But they had the courage of faith and the vitality of truth on their side, and their influence was very deeply felt.

Just at this time the decisive influence of Schleiermacher came to the help of the opponents of rationalism. With all its rationalistic methods, the system of this great theologian was hostile to rationalism as a whole. It promoted a positive faith in a positive Christianity; it was powerfully influential in implanting a reverence for positive religion in the higher and learned circles of German life; it regarded religion as one of the essential necessities of human nature, and it saw in the Church an organization essential to the nurture of religion. The period was now past when faith and culture were regarded as uncongenial to each other. In effecting this change in public sentiment, Fichte and Schelliing contributed no inconsiderable increments to the potent influence of Schleiermacher. The very last scientific effort of rationalism was made on the appearance of Hase's Inutterus Redivivus. In this book Hase transports himself into the sphere of ancient Protestant orthodoxy, and attempts such a presentation of it as shall harmonize with the rich fruits of modern culture. The school of Rohr assailed (1833) this book with desperate earnestness; but the very choice of its weapons betrayed tlie forlorn hope of the cause. The replies  which Hase made to these assaults may be regarded as having given the death-blow to scientific rationalism. As a result of the contest, rationalism was forced to confess that the “reason” upon which it leans for support is simply the common-sense of man in general. Henceforth the system is branded with the title rationalismus vulgaris, against which Rohr himself has no other objection to make save that the adjective communis would be a little more polite.

5. Philosophical Rationalism. — During the whole pcriod of theological rationalism there had existed a current of philosophical rationalism. The climax of this current was reached when Hegel persuaded himself that he had imposed upon Christianity such an interpretation as presented it as the adequate expression of the very highest philosophical truth. But this climax-period was but of momentary duration. When the vapors of enthusiasm were dissipated, it was seen that this transfiguration. of Christianity was but a delusion. The downward flow of speculative rationalism begins with Strauss's Dogmatik (1840). In this work it is shoown that the connection between speculative thought and Christian doctrine is only of the very slightest kind. The next downward step was taken by the Young Hegelians, when they taught, with Feuerbach, that philosophy alone can give any real satisfaction to thought, and that religion can serve at best only a practical need. Thlis changel opinion in regard to tlie nature of religion sprang from a changed position in philosophhy. The pro nd monism of Hegel had given place to a feeble dualism. Feuerbach denies that speculative thought is the only instrument for philosophizing, and insists that the telescope of the astronomer and the hammer of the geologist arc also entitled to respect. Thus induction is substituted for deduction, and the entering wedge for the whole stream of modern materialism is started in its course. The climax of speculative degradation was reached when, in the hands of the more advanced Young Hegelians, philosophy completely discrowned itself, and confessed that the sum total of attainable useful truth is to be found in the path of material experiment and practical observation.

We have now reached the close of rationalism as a vital movement. It sprang out of a reaction against the stiff, formal orthodoxy of the opening 18th century. It expired in 1833, under the critical strokes of Hase and the religious inspiration that went out from Schleiermacher. Taking up the inspiration of Schleiermacher, and rising to a much higher theological position than he, a noble company of the most gifted theologians of any  age have completely rescued German scientific theology from the dishonor and obscuration which had befallen it during the rationalistic period. Pre- eminent among these rehabilitators of orthodoxy are such men as Neander, Nitzsch. Ewald, Julius Stiller, Dorner, Twesten, Olshausen, Sack, Ebrard, Ullmann, Hundeshagen. Licke, Umbreit, Stier, Hagenbach, Gieseler, Bleek, Tholuck, Rothe, and their disciples. In the hands of' these men Christian theology ihas been raised to the dignity of the noblest of sciences; and supreme reverence for Christ and the Bible have been shown to consist well with the profoundest learning and the greatest speculative ability.

But the scattered echoes of German rationalism were long in entirely dying away. Faint imitations of the movement went out over all the other Protestant nations. It invaded modern Holland and England and France and America. But in these countries it was but a foreign importation, and it has shown no vital power of original production. And even in Germany there are individual representatives of the dead system. But these are without popular power or scientific significance. They are simply echoes from a buried past.

IV. Literature. — On the general subject of rationalism, consult Staudlin, Gesch. des Rationalismus und Supranaturalismus (1826); Saintes, Hist. du Rationalisme (1841); Hagenbach, Gesch. des 18ten und 19ten Jahrhundeerts (1856); Hiundeshagen, Der deutsche Protestantismnus (1850); Auberlen, Die gottliche Offenbarunq (Basle, 1861-64); Beyschlag, Ueber das “Leben Jesu” von Renan (Halle, 1864); Bockshammer, Onenbarung und Theologie (Stuttg. 1822); Bretschneider, Ueber die Grundprincipien der evang. Theologie (1832); La Saussaye, La Crise Religieuse en Hollande (Leyd. 1860); Cornil, Feuerbach und seine Stellung zur Religion und Philos. der Gegenwart (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1851); Engelhardt, Scheznkel utnd Strauss (Erlangen, 1864); Feldmann. Der Wahre Christus und sein rechtes Symbol (Altona, 1865); Van Prinsterer, Le Parti Anti-revolution naire et Confessionnal dans Anqlise Reformee des PaysBas (Amsterdam, 1860); Haffner, Die deutsche Aufkluruzg (Miainz, 1864); Held, Jesus der Christ (Zurich, 1865); Henhofer, Der Kamnpf des Unglaubens (Heidelberg, 1861); Henke, Rationalismus aund Traditionalismus im 19ten Jahrhundert (1864); De Groot, Die Groninger Theologen (Gotha, 1863); Hurter, Ueber die Rechte der Vernunft und des Glaubens (Innspruck, 1863); Kahnis, Der innere Ganng des deutschen Protestantismus seit der Mitte des vorigen Jahrhunderts (Leipsic, 1854); Nicolas, Die Gottheit Jesu (Regensburg,  1864); Noacl, Die Freidenker in der Religion (Berne, 1851); Riggenbach, Der heutige Rationalismus (Basle, 1862); Riickert, Der Rationalismus (Leipsic, 1859); Schott, Briefe iber Religqion (Jena, 1826); Schwartz, Zur Gesch. der neuesten Theologie (Leipsic, 1864); Tholuck, Die Gesch. des Rationalismus (Berlin, 1865); Astie, Les Deux Theologies Nouvelles (Paris, 1862); Colani, Ma Position (ilid. 1860); Fazet, Lettres h un Rationaliste (ibid. 1864); Franchi, Le Rationalisme (Brussels, 1858); Lups, Le Traditionalisme et le Rationalisme (Liege, 1859); Remusat, Philosophie Religieuse (Paris, 1864); Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought (Lond. 1863); Draper, Intellectual Development of Europe (N. Y. 1863); Hedge, Reason in Religion (Bost. 1865); Jelf, Supremacy of Scripture (Lond. 1861); Mansel, Limits of Religious Thought (ibid. 1859); Pusey, Historical Inquiry (ibid. 1826); Rigg, Modern Anglican Theology (ibid. 1859); Schaff, Germany, its Theology (Philadel. 1857); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism (N. Y. 1865); Wuttke, Christian Ethics (N. Y. 1873), vol. 1; Lecky, Rationalism in Europe (ibid. 1866); Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (ibid. 1877), vol. i. (J. P. L.)

## Ratisbon[[@Headword:Ratisbon]]

             a city of Germany, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the seat of several important Church councils (Concilia Ratisponenses). The first of these was held in 792. In this council the errors of Felix, bishop of Urgel, who maintained that Christ is only the adoptive Son of God, were condemned, and he himself sent to Rome to pope Adrian, before whom he confessed and abjured his heresy in the church of St. Peter; he maintained, with Elipandus, that Christ, as to his human nature, was the Son of God by adoption only. See Labbe, Concil. 7:1010. SEE FELICIANS.

A second council was held in 796. Grievous complaints having been made both by the priests and laity of the ministrations of the chorepiscopi, it was decided in this council that the latter had no power to perform episcopal functions, being only priests, and that, consequently, all the previous acts were null and void; it was also forbidden to make any new chorepiscopi. This rank, however, among the clergy did not entirely cease until the middle of the 10th century. See Labbe, Concil. 7:1152.

A third council was the conference held in 1541, and generally called the Diet of Ratisbon. Though it had in view the settlement of all religious differences between the Protestants and the adherents to papal authority, it only resulted in effecting a mutual agreement to refer the settlement of  their differences to a general council. See Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist.; Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1872, p. 143; Marsden, Hist. of the Sects of Christendom; Buchanan, Treatise on Justification; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought. SEE REFORMATION.

## Ratisbonne, Alfonso Maria[[@Headword:Ratisbonne, Alfonso Maria]]

             head of the Roman Catholic religious Society of Zion, at Jerusalem, was born at Strasburg, of a respectable Jewish family, his father being the president of the Israelitish Consistory. According to the Notizia sulla sua Conversione (Venice, 1842), Ratisbonne owed his conversion to the apparition of the Virgin Mary, which took place at Rome, January 20, 1842, in the Church of San Andrea delle Fratte. He became henceforth the devotee of the Virgin, and desired to bury himself forever in a monastery, and to retain in his own breast the secret of the mysterious vision with which 'he was favored. But he was led to publish what he had seen, for the good of others, and was for some time subsequently the lion of the day. The general of the Jesuits came to visit him, and he was even presented to  the pope. In honor of the auspicious event, a three days' annual festival was appointed to be held in the Church of San Andrea delle Fratte. Ratisbonne died May 6, 1884. (B.P.)

## Ratramnus Of Corbey[[@Headword:Ratramnus Of Corbey]]

             an Aquitanian monk of the first half of the 9th century, is noted in ecclesiastical history as the controversialist of Paschasius Radbertus on the subject of the holy eucharist (q.v.). Ratramnus's personal history is scarcely known, except that he was the personal friend of Godeschalcus, and was regarded in his day as one of the ablest defenders of Augustinianism. He is sometimes called Bertram the Monk, or Bertram the Priest, but it is thought that this is a corruption of B. Ratramnus, “Beatus” being sometimes prefixed to the names of venerated writers, even when there had been no act of beatification. His literary activity falls between 830 and 868. One of the works in defence of Augustinianism which proves its author to have been more than ordinarily versed in patristic literature is by Ratramnus, and is entitled De Predestinatione Dei. It was written at the request of king Charles the Bald in 850. He lays down the following Augustinian dogmatics: “The elect are destined to mercy and salvation; the godless to eternal punishment; the latter are given over to sin only in so far as, on account of their foreseen hard-heartedness and wickedness, the divine help towards goodness is denied them.” More important is his controversy with Paschasius on the eucharist, which led to the composition of his work Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini, also written at the express wish of the king in 844, and being a defence of pure symbolical sacramental doctrine. To the question of Charles the Bald, “Quod in ecclesia ore fidelium sumitur, corpus et sanguis Christi utrum in mysterio fiat an in veritate?” he answered with the distinction of what occurred really, perceivably, “in veritate,” and what “in mysterio” comes to pass.

A change, he held, occurred in the eucharist, but not a real, perceivable one; it is the mere act of faith which makes bread and wine the spiritual food and drink of the body and blood of Christ. The book was lost sight of after a time, and it was even ascribed, when met with, to Scotus Erigena, anid as such it was burned in 1050 by the Synod of Vercelli in the Berengarian Controversy. During the English Reformation the work was suddenly resurrected from its obscurity, and had much influence. It was published at Cologne in 1532, after having been brought into notice by bishop Fisher, of Rochester, as early as 1526, that prelate referring to it as maintaining the  Catholic doctrine of the eucharist. It largely influenced the minds of archbishop Cranmer and bishop Ridley; and, as it proved of more service to the Protestants than to the Romanists, it was put into the Index in 1559 by the censors of the Tridentine Council. In England an edition was brought out in English by William Hugh, under the name of The Book of Bertram, in 1548. In the Bibliotheca Maxima, containing Ratramnus's writings, this work is omitted, on the ground that it is a forgery of the Reformers, or is, at least, so hopelessly interpolated by supposititious heretics that it is not worth while to attempt its restoration. Yet there are theologians even in the Church of Rome who maintain the position assumed by Ratramnus as defensible. Against Hincrnar of Rheims Ratramnus defended Godeschalcus in the dispute over the trinat deitas; but this apology is lost. Another work is his Liber de Eo, quod Christus ex Virgine natus est, in which it is not questioned that Mary, utero clauso, conceived, but rather the opinion which sprang up at about that time, that the conception had been incerto tramsite. Ratramnus gained most renown among his contemporaries by his work Contra Grcecorum Opposita, with which, by request of Hincmar of Rheims, he opposed the encyclica of Photius in 867, and defended the Oriental Church and her dogmas. In the Migne edition, these works are in the Patrologie, 121, 1-346 and 1153-1156. See Mabillon, Benediktiner Annalen, vol. 2 and 3; Hist. Litteiraire de la France, v, 332-351; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschriftf. hist. Theol. 1858, p. 546 sq.; Baur, Dogmengesch. vol. ii; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist.; Soames, Hist. of the Reformation, 3:118 sq.

## Ratte, Guitard De[[@Headword:Ratte, Guitard De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Montpellier in 1552. He was advisory clerk in the Parliament of Toulouse. When imprisoned with the president, Duranti, he showed so much opposition to the government that his house and library were pillaged, and he was condemned by Parliament to be executed. Henry IV indemnified Ratte by giving him the abbev of Saint-Sauveur of Lodeve, and a life-pension of 12,000 francs. For his fidelity to the king, he afterwards received the abbey of Val-Richer, in the diocese of Bayetx, and that of Saint-Chinian, in the diocese of Saint-Vous. He was made vicar- general at Montpellier and archdeacon of Valence, and in 1596 bishop of Montpellier. On his way to Toulouse he was attacked by three large dogs, and mortally wounded. He died July 7, 1602. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rattles[[@Headword:Rattles]]

             (Fr. crecelle, tarturelle, rattelle; Lat. crotalum). Prior to the introduction of bells (q.v.), rattles of wood or of iron were struck or shaken by the hand to summon the people to worship. The Celtic cloc, which preceded the use of bells. was a board with knockers. The Greeks used the ἁγιοσίδηρον (sacred iron), a mallet and plate of iron, and the ἄγια ξύλα (sacred wood), two clappers, as a summons to prayer. The latter are mentioned by John Climacus as used for rapping at the cell-doors in the monasteries of Palesline, in the 6tli century, as a night signal and wakinghammer. At University and New colleges, Oxford, fellows are summoned to a meeting in common room by the blow of a hammer at the stair-foot. By the rule of Pachomius a trumpet was used. At Burgos the clappers are called matraca; in Italy, serandola; and in some parts of France, symandites, which sound for service between tlhe Mass ol Maundy-Thursday and the Gloria in Excelsis, sung on Easter eve in the Mass after Nones, when the bells are disused, in memory of the Lord's silence in the tomb, and the speechless timidity of the apostles — a custom dating from the 8th century. At Caen the ceremonial gives the signal for censing with tablets. Neogorgus says boys carried rattles in the procession of Good-Friday.

## Rattoone, Elijah, D. D.D[[@Headword:Rattoone, Elijah, D. D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1787; was ordained deacon, January 10, 1790; soon after tools charge of St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N.Y.; in 1792 became professor in Columbia College of Latin and Greek, and in 1794 was made professor of Grecian and Roman antiquities; resigned in 1797 to assume the rectorship of Grace Church, Jamaica, L.I., in which position he remained until April, 1802, when he became associate rector of St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, Maryland. A few years after he resigned this charge, and Trinity Church, in the same city, was built for him, where he ministered until the fall of 1809, when lie left Baltimore for Charleston, S.C., having been selected president of the Charleston College. His death occurred there in the summer of 1810, of yellow fever. He was an accomplished scholar, and an eloquent preacher. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5:265.

## Rattray, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Rattray, Thomas, D.D]]

             an English prelate, flourished in the first half of the 18th century. He was educated at Oxford University, took holy orders shortly after graduation, and, after fillilg various ecclesiastical preferments, became in 1727 bishop of Dunkeld, and in 1739 primus. He died in 1743. His publications are, Essay on the Nature of the Church. etc. (Edinb. 1728): -The Ancient Liturgy of the Church of Jerusalem (Lond. 1744, 4to): — Some Particular Instructions concerning the Christian Covenants (ibid. 1748).

## Ratze(n)berger, Matthaeus[[@Headword:Ratze(n)berger, Matthaeus]]

             a physician at the tourt of the elector Joachim in the Reformation period. He took such an important part in the Protestant movement that he deserves a place here. He was born at Wangen, in Wurtemberg, in 1501. and was educated at the University of Wittenberg, where he was the constant companion of Luther; and when, by the decided part he had taken at the court of the elector Joachim, where he was court physician, he was obliged to abandon a most lucrative position and practice, he was, by the intercession of his dear school friend, made body physician of the count of  Mansfield, and held this position until, in 1538, the elector John Frederic of Saxony made him his court doctor. He was also the house physician of the great Reformer himself, and frequent]y together the two friends discussed the exciting questions of the day, the physician being daily drawn closer and closer towards the earnest evangelical preacher. Ere he was aware of it, Ratzenberger was as much a student of theology as of medicine, and finally he wrote theological treatises, many of which have retained their value, and attest the unconscious influence of Martin Luther upon him. All his writings betray a desire of approval for the Lutheran position, and they are therefore valuable as an index of much that Luther thought, but never wrote himself. IHence, also, Ratzenberger's Historia Lutheri, newly edited by Neudecker (Jena, 1850), is one of the most valuable contributions to the material for Luther's memoirs. The Historica Relatio de Johanne Friderico, etc., first mentioned in Arnold's Kirchen- u. Ketzergesch., later as historia Arcana, and finally published under the title D. M. Ratzenberger's geheimne Geschichte, etc. (Altorf, 1775), is now generally regarded as a forgery of the anti-Melancthonians, and W. von Reiffenstein, of Stolberg, is supposed to have been its author (1570). After the death of Luther, Ratzenberger was one of his executors, and an editor of the German edition of the Reformer's writings published at Jena. See the Life of Luther by Seckendorf; Biographie von Andreas Poach (Jena, 1559).

## Ratze, Johann Gottlieb[[@Headword:Ratze, Johann Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died at Zittau, September 29, 1839, teacher at the gymnasium, was the author of, Die hochsten Principien der Schrifterklarung (Leipsic, 1824): — Betrachtungen uber die kantische Religionslehre innerhalb der Grenzen der blossen Vernunft (Chemnitz, 1794): — Erlauterung einiger Hauptpunkte in Schleiermacher's Glaubenslehre (Leipsic, 1823): — Ansichten von dem Naturlichen und Uebernaturlicheni in der christl. Religion (1803): — Die Nothwendigkeit den Rationalis mus und sein Verhaltnfiss zur christlichen Offenbarung zu prufen (Zittau, 1834): — Das Suchen nach Wahrheit (1823), etc, See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:108, 284, 305, 366, 372,373, 405,481, 505; 2:238; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rau[[@Headword:Rau]]

             a name common to many literati, of whom we mention the following:

1. CHRISTIAN, was born Jan. 25,1613, at Berlin, studied at Wittenberg, and was made magister in 1636. He then went to Konigsberg, Leipsic, Rostock, Hamburg, and Upsala, where he was offered a pastorate, which he declined. In 1638 he visited England, and in 1639 set out for the Orient, and resided a short time at Smyrna. where he learned Turkish, Persian, Italian, Spanish, and Modern Greek. In Constantinople he made a valuable collection of old books, and in 1642 was made professor of Oriental languages at Oxford; in 1644 he was called to Utrecht; in 1645 he lectured at Amsterdam, in 1650 at Upsala, in 1669 at Kiel, and finally settled at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1671, where he died, June 21, 1677. His best work is Concordanticarum flebr. et Chald.. J. Buxtofio Epiitome (Berl. and Frankf. 1677). A number of other works are enumerated in Jocher's Gelehrten-Lexikon, 3:1926. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:134; Winer, Handbuch  der theolog. Literatur, p. 121, 721; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 114.

2. HERIBERT, a rationalist and preacher of the so-called German-Catholic Congregation, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in 1813, where he also died, Sept. 26, 1876. He wrote, Allgemeine Geschiclhte der christl. Kirche von ihrem Eosntstehen bis (atf die Gegemcart (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1846): — Neue Stunden de Andacht (4th ed. Leips. 1863, 3 vols.): — Sermons, etc., published at different times. See Literaorischer Handweiser, 1876, p. 551; Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. ii, 1032.

3. JOACHIM JUSTUS, doctor and professor of theology, was born April 11, 1713, at Berlin, studied at Jena, and in 1736 was called to Konigsberg as professor of theology and Oriental languages, where he died, Aug. 19, 1749. He wrote, Diatribe Hist. philos. de Philosophia Lactantii Firm. (Jena, 1733): —Anfangsgrunde der hebr. Grammatik nech den luhoi satzen des D. Danz (Konigsb. 1739; published by G. 1). Kypke, ibid. 1749, etc.). See Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexikon, s. v: Furst Bibl. Jud. 3:134; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 114; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literutur, i, 40, 909; ii, 721.

4. JOHANN EBERHARD, professor of theology, was born at Altenbach, in the principality of Siegen, and died in 1770 at Herborn. He wrote, Dissertatio de Precibus Hebroeorum (Marburg, 1717): — Diatribe de Synagoga Magna (Utrecht, 1725): — Dissert. Philologicotheologica de Libamine Facto in Sacra Mensa Exo 25:29, ventilta (Herborn, 1732): — Notoe et Aninadversiones in Hadr. Relandi Antiquitates Vetelrunm tebr. (ibid. 1743): — Exercitatio Academica de Vube super Arcam Fuderis (ibid. 1757-58; reprinted, Utrecht, 1760): — Duce Dissertationes Sacrl Antiquarioe (ibid. 1760). See First, Bibl. Jud. 3:134; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, i, 137-139; ii, 722.

5. JOHANN WILHELM, doctor and professor of theology, was born at Rentweinsdorf, in Franconia, March 9, 1745. In 1770 he was repetent at Gittingen; in 1773, rector at Peine, in Hanover; in 1775 he was made rector and professor of theology at Dortmund, and in 1779 ordinary professor of theology at Erlangen, where he died, July 1, 1807. He wrote, Nonnulla ad Quamstion. ans Ortio Montana Apostolor. Initiandor. Cautsa dicta sit (Erlangen, 1802-3): — Untersuchun en die wahre Ansicht der Bergpredigt betreffend (ibid. 1805): — Freimuithige Untersuchungen uber die Typologie (ibid. 1784): — De Jo. Bapt. in rem Christ. Studiis (ibid. 1785-  86): — Materinlien zu Kanzelvortragen (ibid. 1797-1806). See Furst, Bibliotheca Judaicu, 3:134; Winer, Handbuch derl theologischen Literatur, i, 246, 247, 390, 556, 557, 559; ii, 122, 722. (B. P.)

## Rau, Sebaldus[[@Headword:Rau, Sebaldus]]

             a Dutch Orientalist, who died in 1810 at Utrecht, professor, was the author of, Exercitationes Philologicae ad Hubigantii Prolegomena (Leyden, 1785): — Diatribe de Epulo Fuinebri Gentibus Dando, Ies. 25:6-8 (Utrecht, 1747). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:134; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:94, 218, 227. (B.P.)

## Rauch, Frederick Augustus[[@Headword:Rauch, Frederick Augustus]]

             Ph.D., D.D., first president of Marshall College, Mercersburg, lPa., was born at Kirchbracht, in Hesse-Darmstadt, Germany, July 27, 1806. At the age of eighteen he entered the University of Marburg, and took his diploma in 1827. He then became a teacher in Frankfirt, and afterwards spent a year at the University of Heidelberg. In his twenty-fourth year he became extraordinary professor in the University of Giessein. After one year he was called as ordinary professor to Heidelberg, but this appointment he never realized. Having uttered his mind too freely on the subject of government in some public exercises at Giessen, he arrayed the civil powers against himself, and was compelled to provide for his safety in voluntary self-expatriation. He arrived in this country in the fall of 1831. He spent one year at Easton, as professor of German, in Lafayette College,  and in the study of the English language. In June, 1832, he was appointed to take charge of the classical school connected with the seminary of the German Rleformed Church at York, Pa. The same year he was ordained to the holy ministry. In 1835 he removed to Mercersburg, and became the first president of Marshall College, which position he ably filled till his death, March 2,1841. Shortly before his death he published his Psychology, which has passed through a number of editions, and is used as a text-book in its department of philosophy in several of our colleges. The Inner Life is a posthumous work, being a see tion of sermons by Dr. Rauch, edited by the Rev. Dr. Gerhart. Thoroughly learned, deeply pious, ardent, generous, and noble, Dr. Rauch's brief life has left behind it a lasting influence. In March, 1859, his remains were removed to Lancaster, Pa., under the auspices of the alumni of Marshall College and the board of trustees of Franklin and Marshall College, on which occasion a eulogy on his life and character was delivered by his distinguished colleague, Prof. J. W. Nevin, D.D.

## Raucourt, Louis Marie[[@Headword:Raucourt, Louis Marie]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1743. He entered the Benedictine Order, and studied theology in many of its monasteries. In 1768 he was made procurer of the abbey of Clairvaux, in 1773 prior, and in 1783 abbot. He did much in embellishing this abbey, and greatly increased the library. Being expelled during the revolution, he fled to Juvancourt, where he lived in retirement till 1804, when he settled in Bar-sur-Aube, where he died in 1824.

## Rauhe Haus[[@Headword:Rauhe Haus]]

             (Germ. for Rough House), THE, a great juvenile reform institution at the little hamlet of Horn, three miles from the German port of Hamburg, owes its origin to John Henry Wichern, the founder also of the German Home Mission Work. SEE INNER MISSION. The peculiar name which it bears (Rough House) is not due to any peculiar feature of the institution, as one might suppose, but rather to an awkward translation of the Germnan patois into the classical language. The house in which the institution was first located was built some hundred and fifty years ago by a certain Mr. Ruge, a gentleman of wealth and culture, and in every sense quite contrary in character to the name given him in classical German. People of Hamburg's suburbs always knew the place by the name of the “Ruge House,” and so  the institution was called Rauhe Haus when it was first opened on Nov. 1, 1833, by Wichern, with the assistance of his mother, he being then but a young man of twenty-five, and as yet not even in social relations with the opposite sex. For years previous to this event Wichern had conceived a plan for the amelioration of the condition of the lower classes. While at the university his mystical tendencies were noted. He frequently gave himself up to practices of great personal self-denial, and he formed an association of young men for self-improvement and religious edification. There was a constant longing for entire and unconditional consecration to God's service in this band, who all recognised the great fact that Christianity is only a truth to those who experience it. An acquaintance with Dr. Julius, then well known as a philanthropist, who had visited England and America in the interests of prison reform, only quickened Wichern in his purposes, and when, on his return from the university to Hamburg, he was placed in charge of a Sabbath-school in the religiously neglected suburbs of St. George, Wichern conceived a plan that shoull enable him to begin the task for which he felt himself called of God. Though poor himself, his father having died while he was yet scarcely out of the years of infancy, and his mother having depended upon him for years, he yet set about to realize his purpose.

All the difficulties that arose in his way only acted as fresh incentives to exertion. His enthusiasm knew no restraints nor barriers. Finally he succeeded in interesting the syndic Seiveking, a man of warm heart and full pocketbook. A house upon his estate which was occupied by a gardener was vacated for Wichern as a place in which to try his schemes by actual experiment. It was a small space for so vast an undertaking, but Wichern was quite content to let his enterprise have a small beginning. Full of faith, and encouraged by what was already gained, he made immediate arrangements for the occupancy of the Rauhe Haus (see illustration), small and poor as it was, and however uninviting its little windows, and thatched roof and low ceilings appeared. With the help of a few interested friends, such repairs as were absolutely necessary were made, he entering the premises himself as an inmate. The day of opening mwas marked by the admission of three boys; in a short time the number increased to twelve, and thus humbly began beneath that roof of straw, on the Seiveking estate, a movement for the neglected youth of Germany whose influence is seen and felt not only in that country, but all over the Continent and far beyond it, and whose results can never be estimated by mortal man. A careful examination shows that, so far as the children of the Rauhe Haus alone are concerned, a very moderate estimate gives eighty per cent. of them as  saved from what would inevitably have been a life of vice or crime. Describing this most Christian charity, Elihu Burritt says:

“These boys had bleen treated or regarded as a species of human vermin, baffling the power of the autholities to suppress. They had slept under carts, in doorways, herding with swine and cattle by night, when begging or thieving hours were past. Such were the boys that found themselves looking at each other in wonder and surprise the first evening they gathered around the hearth-stone of that cottage-home. There was no illusion about this sudden transformation in their experience. In their midst was that bland, benevolent man, with his kind eyes and voice, looking and speaking to them as a father to his children. And there was his mother, with the law of kindness on her lips, in her looks, in every act and word; and he called her mother, and they call her mother; and the first evening of their common life she became the mother of their love and veneration; and they, ragged, forsaken, hopeless castaways, conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity, became the children of her affection. This cottage, away from the city and its haunts, with its bright fire by night and the little beds under the roof — with its great Bible and little Psalm-books, was to be their home. The great chestnut-tree that threw out its arms over it, and all the little trees, and the ditches, hillocks, and bushes of that acre, were their own ... The feeling of home came warming into their hearts like the emotions of a new existence, as the father spoke to them of our house, our trees, our cabbages, turnips, potatoes, pigs, and geese and ducks, “which we will grow for our comfort.”

The boys at once set to work. At the end of the first week they had made a year's progress in this new life and its hopes and expectations. The faith that they could do something, be something, and own something grew daily within them. “So eager did they become,” says the first report of the institution, “to accomplish the undertaking that they frequently worked by lantern-light in the evening, rooting up bushes and trees, in spite of snow or rain.”

As the number of pupils increased, and there seemed danger that the size of the family would seriously affect its domestic character, Mr. Wichern divided the compaly into households, containing from twelve to fifteen each — the children themselves, as each new house was required,  performing a large part of the work. The first colony, “under the care,” as the report says, “of an earnest young disciple of the law of love, who had come from a distance to discipline his heart and life to the regime of kindness, and who had lived in their midst as an elder brother,” commenced their separate family life with affecting ceremonies. On a bright Sabbath morning, and in the presence of several hundred friends, the new cottage was dedicated “to the Good Shepherd, through whose love and help twenty-seven boys had already been gathered into a sheltering fold.” With numbers and resources increased, new cottages of the same unpretending character were built in a semicircle around the Rough House. Girls were admitted, and separate cottages were constructed for them; and a new building was erected which afforded a more commodious residence for the superintendent, a chapel, kitchen, and other apartments for the general use of the little community, which grew to be quite a village.

In 1851 Dr. Burritt found a considerable cottage-village, with workshops, dwelling-houses, a little chapel, a wash- and drying-house, a printing- office, bake-house, and other buildings. There were in all about seventy boys and twenty-five girls, constituting four families of boys and two of girls. Each family-house was under the charge of a superintendent (male or female), assisted by one or more brothers, as they are called — the superintendent being ordinarily a candidate for the ministry. The brothers are young men of the best character, who undergo a training of three or four years, after which they devote themselves to the care of similar institutions now rising all over Germany, quickened into life by this blessed experiment; or they become city missionaries, carrying the Gospel personally to the neglected and wretched. From thirty to forty brothers are inmates of this institution at one time, receiving no remuneration but their living, superintending the industry and aiding in conducting the moral discipline of the establishment. In its daily life this singular village is separated into three important divisions: domestic, educational, and industrial. Each family is to some extent an independent community. The members eat and sleep in their own dwelling, and the children belonging to each look up to their own particular father or mother as home-bred children to a parent. Each household has thus its individual character, its peculiar interest and history, and each bears some name of its own, such as the Beehive, the Dove's-nest, and the like. The bond of union is the loving father at the head of the whole institution; closely drawn by the morning and evening gatherings for prayer in the chapel or mother-house, and the celebration in common of the many festivals of the Church. The  superintendents of the several houses meet the chief weekly to render their reports, and to discuss all questions of discipline. In their turn, each separate family visits him once a week in his study; and the record of each member, whether good or bad, is fullly considered and passed upon-any child being admitted, at the close of the interview, to private conference with him, a privilege that is often improved.

The children were told at the beginning that labor is the price of living, and that they must earn their own bread if they would enjoy it. Mr. Wichern did not point them to ease and affluence, but to an honorable poverty, which they were taught was not in itself an evil. In illustration of this, the dress, food, and furniture of the cottages are of the simplest character. The secular education given is of the most rudimental description, reaching about the average of the German primary schoolsthree quarters of the weekly recitations being devoted to the study of the Bible Catechism, Church history, and to music. The principal labor, farming, is carefully taught in all its branches; in addition, instruction is given by the brothers in printing and other trades. The boys remain at the Rough House about four years, and the girls five. They are then apprenticed to service, chiefly in the city of Hamburg, whenever the work of redemption is sufficiently confirmed to admit of their exposure again to temptation. But it must not be inferred from the duration of their term of reform that the Rough House holds its inmates by force. As they come voluntarily, so they stay until dismissed by their own choice. The simple means relied upon for the accomplishment of this great reform work are prayer, the Bible, singing, affectionate conversation, severe punishment when unavoidable, and constant, steady employment in useful labor. “In a peculiar manner,” says Dr. Peirce, “Wichern relied upon the Word of God. He made the whole Bible the familiar companion and food of the pupil. The whole Scripture was made to open to their minds, in an impressive series of readings, like a mine of priceless metal — reaching a climax in the Evangel of the New Testament. The thought that, miserable, wicked, despised as they were, Christ, the Son of God, loved them-loved them enough to suffer and die for them, and still loved them-melted their hearts, and gave them both hope and a strong incentive to reformation.”

As the Rauhe Haus is now constituted, it is partly a refuge for morally neglected children, partly a boarding-school for the moral and intellectual education of those children of the higher classes whose vicious or unmanageable character makes them fit subjects for training by such competent hands as the Rauhe Haus superintendents; lastly, a training-  school for those who wish to become teachers or officials in houses of correction hospitals, etc., in promotion of the objects of the Home Mission. This is an especially important enterprise, Its trained men are employed in positions of trust, such as prison directors, stewards of estates, and superintendents of charitable houses. It was founded in 1845, and is a kind of conventual house. Entrance into this institution is limited to the age of twienty to thirty. Besides religious belief and good character, freedom from military duties, bodily and mental health, some scholastic acquirements, and a knowledge of some craft or of agriculture are required. The boarding-school was established in 1851, and at the same time a seminary was founded, in which twelve brethren of the Rauhe Haus are especially prepared for school-work. A printing-office, a bookbinder's shop, and bookselling, form part of the institution also. The last named has its principal depot at Hamburg, and from it trade with all Germany has been opened. The Rauhe Haus has brought out numerous publications, and all these enjoy a very large sale. A monthly periodical called Fliegende Blatter, devoted to the Inner Mission, is printed, edited, and circulated by the Rauhe Haus. It may be added also that during the recent German wars the inmates furnished the principal organizers of what was like our “Sanitary Commission” in the war with the South. Dr. Wichern is still living as we write (1878), but he has retired from all active connection with the Rauhe Haus. See Amer. Education. Monthly, Jan. 1868, art. i; (Luth.) Ev. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1874, p. 129; National Repository, Dec. 1878, art. iii; Hurst's Hagenbach, Church Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries (see Index).

## Raulin, Hippolyte[[@Headword:Raulin, Hippolyte]]

             a devoted Minim, was born about 1560, at Rethel. For many years he preached with great success, and was considered one of the most eloquent men of his day. In the capacity of a provincial of his order he governed the province of Lyons; afterwards that of Lorraine. He wrote, Panegyre Orthodoxe, Mysterieux, et Prophetique sur l'Antiquite. Dignite, Noblesse, et Splendleur des Fleurs de Lys (Paris, 1626). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Raulin, Jean[[@Headword:Raulin, Jean]]

             a French preacher, was born at Toul in 1443. After finishing his studies, he received the degree of D.D. Before this time he had composed a  commentary upon the Logic of Aristotle. In 1481 he was made president of the college at Navarre, and so acquitted himself that he was greatly esteemed. Desiring to live a more secluded life, he entered the Abbey of Clugny in 1497, and by his exemplary life led many others to follow his example. Under the direction of cardinal Amboise, he greatly aided in reforming the Order of St. Benedict. Raulin enjoyed the same reputation as Barlette, Millaid, and Menot. His sermons were plain, methodical, and replete with citations made from sacred writings and scholars. He wrote, Epistoloe (Paris, 1520): — Doctrinale de Triplici Morte, Naturali, Culpoe, et Gehennoe (ibid. 1520). His Sermons in Latin were published in Paris in 1642. He died Feb. 6, 1514. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Raulston, John[[@Headword:Raulston, John]]

             a Scotch prelate, was first rector of Cambuslang and sacrist of Glasgow, next provost of Bothwell, and then dean of Dunkeld. In 1444 he was preferred to be royal secretary, and in 1447 keeper of the privy seal. He was consecrated bishop of the see of Dunkeld, April 4, 1448. In 1449 he was constituted lord high-treasurer. In 1451 he was employed in an embassy to England. He died in 1452. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 88.

## Raumer, Frederic von[[@Headword:Raumer, Frederic von]]

             the accomplished German historian, was born at Worlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau, in 1781. In 1811 he was appointed professor of history at Breslau, and in 1819 he was called to Berlin. In 1859 he was released from the duty of lecturing, but he still continued till near his death, June 13, 1873. He was the Nestor of all German historians, and senior of all the living German professors. He is the author of the well-known History of the Hohenstaufen Dynasty (182327, and often, 6 vols.), a work deserving praise for its interesting narrative of the events of a romantic period. He also published Lectures on Ancient History (3d ed. 1861, 2 vols.): — History of Europe from the Close of the 15th Century (1832-50, 8 vols.), a work marked by the conciliatory style in which it describes the contentions of various religious and political parties. Besides, he wrote a number of other works, as Handbuch zur Gesch. d. Literatur (1864-66), etc., which we pass over. See Litercarischer Handwieiser, 1873, p. 300; Gostwick and Harrison, Outlines of German Literature, p. 551 sq. (B. P.)

## Raumer, Karl Georg von[[@Headword:Raumer, Karl Georg von]]

             doctor of philosophy and theology, brother of the well-known historian Frederic (q.v.), was born April 7, 1783, at Wurlitz, in Anhalt-Dessau. Having graduated at the Joachimsthal Gymnasium in Berlin, he went to Gottingen for the study of languages, history, and poetry. From Gottingen he went to Halle in 1803, where he attended the lectures of Wolf and Becker, and where he also made the acquaintance of Steffens, who introduced him in 1805 to the famous geologist Werner at Freiberg. In  1808 we see Raumer at Paris, in 1810 at Berlin; in 1811 he is professor and member of council for mining at Breslau. The Franco-Prussian war, in which he acted as adjutant to general Gneisenau, being over, he was called in 1819 as professor to Halle, where he remained till 1823, being obliged to leave the place in consequence of distrust aroused against him. He then acted as tutor in the Dittmar Educational Institution at Nirunberg, when, in 1827, he was called as professor to Erlangen, where he died, June 2,1865. Raumer took a very lively and active interest in all matters promoting the kingdom of God. He is best known as the author of Palumstina (Leipsic, 1835, and often since): — Der- Zug der Istraeliten atis Aegypten nutch Ctanaman (ibid. 1837): — Beitrate zur biblischet Geographie (ibid. 1843): -Geschichte desr aidatgopgik (3d ed. Stuttgart, 1857, n7 1861, 4 vols.) — and as the editor of Augustine's Confessiones, with notes (ibid. 1856, and often). See Fi rst, uibl. Juti icct, 3:134; Zucholtz, Bliblioth. Theolog. ii, 1033; Lifterarischer Handweiser, 1873, p. 300; Winer, Theolog. Handbuch, ii, 722; Thomasius, Rtede am Grobe rudes lerrn Kiarl v. / Partmer (Erlangen, 1865); Laumer, Lebeun von im selbst (Stuttgart, 1866); Hauck, Theolo. Jahresbericht, 1865, p. 734 sq.; 1866, ip. 361 sq. (B. P.)

## Raumer, Rudolph von[[@Headword:Raumer, Rudolph von]]

             professor of languages and son of Karl Georg von Raaumer, was born April 14, 1815, at Breslau. Hie prepared himself at thle gymnasia in Erlangen and Niirnberg, and in 1832 entered tihe University of Erlangen, continuing, hiowever, his studies at Gottingen and Munich. In 1840 he commenced lecturing at Erlangen, in 1852 was made professor in ordinary, and died there Aug. 30, 1876. He wrote Die E'itnci lsiing des Christenthums auf die althochdeutsche Sprache (Stattgart. 1845), which he concludes with the remarkable words that “the destiny of our (the German) people will always be connected with Christianity” — See Zuchold, Bibl. Theolog. ii, 1033; Literatrische-Handweiser, 1873, p. 300; 187;6, p, 352; Schneider, Theolog. Jahrbuch. 1878, p. 226 sq. (B. P.)

## Raus(s), Lucas[[@Headword:Raus(s), Lucas]]

             one of the earlier Lutheran ministers in this country, was born in 1723 in thie city of Hermanstadt, in Transylvania. He was the son of Lucas Laus, an eminent German divine, under whose careful training he enjoyed the best opportunities for mental and moral culture. Designed for the Christian  ministry, his studies were prosecuted at the universities of Leipsic and Jena. He immigrated to the United States in 1750, and at once identified himself with its interests. He commenced his labors in Philadelphia, and, as there were few organized Lutheran churches at the time and the members were scattered, his work was very much of an itinerant character. In 1754 he removed to York. Pa., where he continued to reside until his death, which occurred July 11, 1788. Mr. Raus enjoyed the reputation of being an accomplished scholar, particularly in the department of the Latin, Greek, and Oriental languages. He conversed with great fluency in several modern languages. His descendants are still numbered among the citizens of the place in which he so long labored. See Luth. Observer, April 19, 1878.

## Rausch, Emil Friedrich[[@Headword:Rausch, Emil Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, who died September 28, 1884, at Rengshausen, Hesse, was the author of, Zeugnisse von Christo dem Gekreuzigten (Cassel, 1837; 2d ed. 1852): — Christliche Predigten zun Vorlesen in der Kirche, und zur hauslichen Erbauung (1840): — Handbuch bei dem Katechismus Unterricht (1855): — Die Herrlichkeit des Herrn (1866): — Die ungeanderete augsburger Confession erlautert (Dresden, 1872). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:108; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rauscher, Joseph Othmar[[@Headword:Rauscher, Joseph Othmar]]

             one of the most prominent ecclesiastical princes of Austria and of the 19thli century, was born Oct. 6, 1797, at Vienna, being tihe son of an imperial officer. He first intended to study lawu, which he did for three years, but afterwards betook himself to the study of theology, and, almost twenty-six years of age, he was ordained priest Aug. 27, 1823. For two years he labored as vicar at Hutteldorf, not far from Vienna, but he was soon called to Salzburg as professor of canon law and Church history. Here he commenced the elaboration of a comprehensive Church history, of which the first two volumes, reaching down to Justinian (Sulzbach, 1824-29), promised so well for the young author that he undoubtedly would have become one of the brightest stars among the Roman Catholic historians were he left in his position; but in 1832 he was appointed director of the Oriental Academy at Vienna, and from that time on he was invested with different offices, to which also belonged the instruction of the present Austrian emperor and his brothers. In 1849 the metropolitan archbishop of Salzburg, prince Friedrich von Schuwarzenberg, his former pupil and now his friend, appointed Rauscher to the bishopric of Seckau. For four years he discharged his episcopal duties, amid great difficulties, in the most zealous and hlappy manner, when, in 1853, the emperor appointed Iiim to the archiepiscopal see. In his new position the emperor intrusted to him a mission nwhich forever connected his name with the Church history of Aunstria, viz. the negotiation of a concordat between Austria and the Apostolic See, which, unhappily for Austria, was signed Aug. 18, 1855. For this deed Rausclier was made cardinal, Dec. 17 of the same year. For twenty years Rauscher moulded the ecclesiastical as well as political affairs of Austria; for his position made him not only the intimate counsellor of the  emperor, but also a prominent member of the House of Peers. It would be too long to enumerate his numerous speeches and pastoral letters, whlich are all udistinguished bothl by the deplth of thought as well as by their rhetoric and noble language. He also took a prominent part in the last Vatican Council, and died Nov. 24,1875. See Litertischer Handweiser, 1875, p. 470; Kurtz, Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte (9th ed. Mitau, 1874), ii, 344, 363 sq. (B. P.)

## Rautenberg, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Rautenberg, Johann Wilhelm]]

             father of the Inner Mission at Hamburg, was born at Moorflath, near Hamburg, March 1, 1791. He studied at Kiel under Twesten, and at Berlin under Neander, who both influenced him, and brought him nearer to Him whom he afterwards proclaimed with such fervor and blessing. In 1820 he was appointed pastor of St. George, a suburb of Hamburg, where, amid many difficulties and obstacles he labored for forty-five years. He promoted every Christian enterprise which furthered the kingdom of God, and the many societies which he assisted with his word and counsel are his lasting monuments. He died March 1, 1865. Rautenberg is well known as a hymn-writer and preacher. After his death Sengelmann published Festliche Nachnige, a collection of 169 hymnological pieces (Hamburg, 1865); he also published Predigten (ibid. 1866). See Koch. Geschicile des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 7:292 sq.; Zuchold. Libioth, Theolog. ii, 1034; Lowe, Denkwirdifakeiten aus dem Leben u. Wirken Rautenbergs (Hamb. 1866); Hauclk. Theologischer Jahresbericht (1866), ii, 198 sq., 701 sq. (B. P.)

## Rautenstrauch, Franz Stephan[[@Headword:Rautenstrauch, Franz Stephan]]

             a German theologian of the Romish Church, was born at Platten, Bo hemia, in 1734, became a Benedictine monk at Braunanl, and was there teacher of philosophy, theology, and canon law. In 1773 he was made prelatus of the convent and director of the theological faculty at Prague, and in the following year was called to Vienna to assist in the Ministry of Education. He died at Erlau, Hungary, in 1785. He was a more than ordinary manl, and as a Romanist enjoyed the confidence of all liberalminded men. He was a favorite at the court of the scholarly emperor, and was the intimate friend of Hontheim (q.v.), whose liberal ideas he favored; but on these very accounts he had much to suffer from the enmity of the Jesuits. He prepared the scheme for the course of instruction for the theological faculty in the Austrian universities. and published several minor  works. On the occasion of the visit of pope Pius VI in Vienna, he wrote Patriot. Betrachtungen, etc.; but he is best known by his Synopsisis Juris Ecclesiastici (Vienna, 1776). See Sabrockh, Kirchengesch. seit der Reformation, 7:144 sq. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Ravana[[@Headword:Ravana]]

             (from the causal of the Sanscrit ru, cry, alarm; hence literally he who causes alarm) is the name of the Rakshasha (q.v.) who, at the time of Rama, ruled over Sri Lanka or Ceylon, and, having carried off Sita, the wife of Rama, to his residence, was ultimately conquered and slain by the latter. Ravana is described as having been a giant with ten faces, and, in consequence of austerities and devotion, as having obtained from Siva a promise which bestowed upon him unlimited power, even over the gods. As the promise of Siva could not be revoked, Vishnu evaded its efficacy in becoming incarnate as Rima, and hence killed the daemon-giant. — Chambers's Encyclop. s.v. SEE VISHNU.

## Ravanel, Pierre[[@Headword:Ravanel, Pierre]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born about 1680. He was a descendant of the celebrated Jean Mercier. He was pastor of a church at Souzet. His works are. Bibliotheca Sacra, sive Thesaurus Scripturae Canonicoe Amplissimus (Geneva, 1650, 1660, 2 vols.): — Additamenta Nova ad Bibliothecam Sacrau (ibid. 1685).

## Raven[[@Headword:Raven]]

             (עֹרֵב, ‘oseb'; Sept. and New Test. κρόαξ, Vulg. corvUS), the well- known bird of that name which is mentioned in various passages in the Bible. There is no doubt that the Heb. ‘oreb is correctly translated, the old versions agreeing on the point, and the etymology, from a root (עָרִב) signifying “to be black,” favoring this rendering. A raven was sent out by Noah from the ark to see whether the waters were abated (Gen 8:7). This bird was not allowed as food by the Mosaic law (Lev 11:15); the word ‘oreb is doubtless used in a generic sense, and includes other species of the genus Corvus, such as the crow (C. corone), and the hooded crow (C. cornix). Ravens were the means, under the divine command, of supporting the prophet Elijah at the brook Cherith (1  Kings 17:4, 6). They are expressly mentioned as instances of God's protecting love and goodness (Job 38:41; Luk 12:24; Psa 143:9). They are enumerated with the owl, the bittern, etc., as marking the desolation of Edom (Isa 34:11). “The locks of the beloved” are compared to the glossy blackness of the raven's plumage (Song of Solomon v, II). The raven's carnivorous habits, and especially his readiness to attack the eye, are alluded to in Pro 30:17. SEE OREB.

The Sept. and Vulg. differ materially from the Hebrew and our A.V. in (Gen 8:7; for whereas in the Hebrew we read “that the raven went forth to and fro [from the ark] until the waters were dried up,” in the two old versions named above, together with the Syriac, the raven is represented as “not returning until the water was dried from off the earth.” On this subject the reader may refer to Houbigant (Not. Crit 1, 12), Bochart (Hieroz. ii, 801), Rosenmuller (Schol. in V. T.), Kalisch (Genesis), and Patrick (Commentary), who shows the manifest incorrectness of the Sept. in representing the raven as keeping away from the ark while the waters lasted, but as returning to it when they were dried up. The expression “to and fro” clearly proves that the raven must have returned to the ark at intervals. The bird would doubtless have found food in the floating carcasses of the deluge, but would require a more solid resting- ground than they could afford. SEE DELUGE.

The subject of Elijah's sustenance at Cherith by means of ravens has given occasion to much fanciful speculation. It has been attempted to show that the ‘orebim (“ravens”) were the people of Orbo, a small town near Cherith; this theory has been well answered by Reland (Palest. ii, 913). Others have found in the ravens merely merchants; while Michaelis has attempted to show that Elijah merely plundered the ravens' nests of hares and other game! Keil (Comment. on 1 Kings 17) makes the following just observation: “The text knows nothing of bird-catching and nest-robbing, but acknowledges the Lord and Creator of the creatures, who commanded the ravens to provide his servant with bread and flesh.” It has also been well replied that an animal unfit for food or sacrifice did not necessarily defile what it touched. “An ass was as unclean as a raven; yet no one was polluted by riding on an ass, or by eating that which an ass had carried.” An objection more to the point would be that the flesh which ravens would bring would leave the prophet no opportunity of being satisfied that it was such as he could legally receive; either that it was the flesh of a clean beast, or, if so, that it had not died with the blood undrained. But to this, too, the answer is obvious: if Jehovah could so restrain and overrule the instincts of these  voracious birds as to make them minister to his servant, he could also take care that they should select nothing but what was fit, and he could give Elijah confidence that it was so. Some, however, understand Arabs to be there meant. SEE ELIJAH.

The raven belongs to the order Insessores, family Corvidoe. The raven is so generally confounded with the carrion crow that even in the works of naturalists the figure of the latter has sometimes been substituted for that of the former, and the manners of both have been mixed up together. They are, it is true, very similar, belonging to the same Linnaean genus, Corvus, nand having the same intensely black color; but the raven is the larger, weighing about three pounds; has proportionally a smaller head, and a bill fuller and stouter at the point. Its black color is more iridescent (hence the comparison to the bridegroom's locks, Song of Solomon v, 11), with gleams of purple passing into green, while that of the crow is more steel- blue; the raven is also gifted with greater sagacity; may be taught to articulate words; is naturally observant and solitary; lives in pairs; has a most acute scent; and flies to a great height. Unlilke the crow, which is gregarious in its habits, the raven will not even suffer its young, from the moment they can shift for themselves, to remain within its haunt; and, therefore, though a bird found in nearly all countries, it is nowhere abundant (Bochart, Hieroz. ii, 796 sq.; Kimchi on Psa 14:7). Whether the raven of Palestine is the common species, or the Corvus montanus of Temminck, is not quite determinedl; for there is of the ravens, or greater form of crows, a smaller group including two or three others, all similar in manners, and unlike the carrion crows (Corvus corrone, Linn.), which are gregarious, and seemingly identical in both hemispheres. Sometimes a pair of ravens will descend without fear among a flight of crows, take possession of the carrion that may have attracted them, and keep the crows at a distance till they themselves are gorged. (Comp. Horace, Ep. i, 16, 48; Aristoph. Thesmoph. 942). The habits of the whole genus typified by the name ‘oreb render it unclean in the Hebrew law; and the malignant, ominous expression of the raven, together with the color of its plumage, powers of voice, and solitary habits, are the causes of that universal and often superstitious attention with which mankind have ever regarded it.

In the mythological history of the Gentiles, we find the appellation of Ravens bestowed upon an oracular order of priesthood. In Egypt, it seems, the temples of Ammon were served by such — perhaps those priests that  occur in the catacombs playing on harps, and clothed in black. More than one temple in Greece had similar raven priests. It was the usual symbol of slaughter among the Scandinavians; and a raven banner belonged to the Danes. and also to the Saxons; one occurs amomng the ensigns of the Normans in the Bayeux tapestry; and it was formerly a custom in the Benedictine abbeys on the Continent to maintain in a very large cage a couple of ravens, where several are recorded to have lived above fifty years. The Raven of the Sea, that ominous bird in Northern mythology, is properly the cormorant — the morvran of the Celts. Jewish and Arabian writers tell strange stories of this bird and its cruelty to its young; hence, say some, the Lord's express care for the young ravens after they had been driven out of the nests by the parent birds; but this belief in the raven's want of affection to its young is entirely without foundation. To the fact of the raven being a common bird in Palestine, and to its habit of flying restlessly about in constant search for food to satisfy its voracious appetite, may, perhaps, be traced the reason for its being selected by our Lord and the inspired writers as the especial object of God's providing care.

There is something weird and shrewd in the expression of the raven's countenance; a union of cunning and malignity, which may have contributed to give it among widely severed nations, and in remote ages, a character for preternatural knowledge. Its black hue — the hue of night and of mourning — its recluse, solitary suspicion, and its harsh croak have no doubt increased its uncanny reputation. Certain it is that the “infausta cornix” has long been feared and hated as the messenger of evil and the prognosticator of death, while the Romans dedicated it to Apollo as the god of divination. An anonymous writer familiar with the habits of the bird has ingeniously suggested an explanation of its divining power. “The smell of death is so grateful to them that they utter a loud croak of satisfaction instantly on perceiving it. In passing over sheep, if a tainted smell is perceptible, they cry vehemently. From this propensity in the raven to announce his satisfaction in the smell of death has probably arisen the common notion that he is aware of its approach among the human race, and foretells it by his croakings. I have no doubt the idea is fosunded in truth, although I think the coming event is not communicated to the raven by any immediate or supernatural impulse, but that in passing over a human habitation from which a sickly or cadaverous smell may escape, it is perfectly natural for him to announce his percepltion of it by his cries” (Zoologist, p. 217). The shepherd has a better reason for calling the raven a bird of ill omen. A more vigilant or more cruel enemy to the flock can hardly exist, and it  frequently makes its ferocious assaults on the yet living victim. See Wood, Bible Animals, p. 439 sq.; Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 198 sq.

## Ravenna[[@Headword:Ravenna]]

             an important city of Central Italy, fortythree miles east-southeast from Bologna, and four and a half miles from the Adriatic, with a population of nearly 60,000 people, was once the capital of the empire (from A.D. 401), and is not only a very ancient city, whose history is of great interest to Christianity on account of its early relation to the Church, but more particularly on account of the different ecclesiastical councils which have been held there, and the disputes which the metropolitanate of Ravenna maintained in early medieval days with the bishopric of Rome, especially in the 7th century, under Constans (666), in the 8th against pope Hadrian, and in the 9th, when in 861 the strife was finally put at rest at a synod in Rome. Aside from the council of bishops in 419, called by Honorius to decide upon the choice of popes between Boniface and Eulalius, the following councils of Ravenna (Concilia Ravennata) are noteworthy:

(I.) Held July 22, 877, by pope John VIII, at the head of forty-nine bishops (Holstenius and Labbe say the number of bishops was 130). The object of this council was to remedy the disorders of the Church. Nineteen chapters remain to us, relating to the discipline and privileges of the Church; also a letter confirming the possession of a monastery to the bishop of Autun.

Chap.

1. Enjoins the metropolitan to send to Rome for the pallium within three months after his consecration, and forbids him to exercise any of the functions of his office until that be done.

2. Enjoins that all bishops elect shall be consecrated by their metropolitans within three months after election, under pain of excommunication.

3. Forbids metropolitans to make use of the pallium except on great festivals and during mass.

5, 6,7, and 8. Excommunicate and anathematize those who rob the Church, injure ecclesiastics, and commit various other crimes.

9. Declares those persons to be themselves excommunicated who voluntarily communicate with the excommuinicated.

12. Excommunicates those who absent themselves from their pariish church on three Sundays successively.  19. Forbids judges and royal commissioners to hold courts and to lodge in churches. — Labbe, Concil. 9:299.

(II.) Held in 898 (or 904, according to Labbe) by John IX, in the matter of Formosus and Stephen; the emperor Lambert being present and seventy- four bishops. Ten regulations were approved.

1. Enacts the observation of the canons of the fathers, and all that is contained in the capitularies of Charlemagne, Louis le Debonaire, Lothaire, and Louis II.

3. Confirms the privileges granted to the Church of Rome by the emperors.

4. Approves all that had been done in the Council of Rome, A.D. 898, in the matter of Formosus.

5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. Relate to the political circumstances of the Roman see. — Labbe, Concil. 9:507.

(III.) Held in April, 967. In this council the emperor, Otho I, yielded to the pope, John XIII, the city and territory of Ravenna. Heroldus, archbishop of Salzburg, was deposed and excommunicated; the act of deposition being subscribed on April 25 by the emperor and fifty-seven bishops, including the pope. Lastly, Magdeburg was erected into an archbishopric: this, however, was not completed until the following year. — Labbe, Concil. 9:674.

(IV.) Held May 1, 997, by Gerbert, archbishop of Ravenna, and eight suffragans. Three canons remain, of which

1. Condemns an infamous custom which existed in the cathedral of Ravenna of selling the holy eucharist and chrism. — Labbe, Concil. 9:766.

(V.) Held April 30, 1014, by the new archbishop, Arnold, to remedy the abuses caused by the long vacancy of eleven years, and the intrusion of Adalbert, who had unlawfully conferred holy orders and dedicated certain churches. It was determined that those upon whom orders had been thus conferred should remain suspended until the matter could be minutely considered; and that the consecrations of churches andul oratories made by Adalbert were null and void. — Labbe, Concil. 9:833.

(VI.) Held by Peter, cardinal of St. Anastasia, in 1128. Here the patriarchs of Aquileia and Venice, or Grade, were deposed, having been convicted of favoring schismatics. — Pagi; Labbe, Concil. 10:936.

(VII.) Held in 1286, July 8, by Bonifacius the archbishop, who presided, assisted by eight bishops, his suffragins. Nine canons were published.

2. Exhorts the clergy to almsgiving, and grants indulgences to those who feed and clothe the the poor.

3. Relates to the dress of the clergy; and forbids them to carry arms without the bishop's permission.

5. Orders that the usual daily distributions shall be made only to those canons who attend the holy office. — Labbe, Concil. 11. 1238.

(VIII.) Held in 1310 by Rainaldus the archbishop, in the matter of the Templars. Present, eight bishops of the province, three inquisitors, two preaching friars, and one Minorite: seven Templars were brought before them, who constantly affirmed their innocence. On the following day it was determined that they who had confessed from a fear of torture only should be considered innocent; nevertheless, there were five who went through the canonical ordeal. — Labbe, Concil. 11:1533.

(IX.) Held in 1311 by Rainaldus the archbishop, five bishops and six proctors attending. Thirty-two canons were published.

2. Orders mass to be said daily for a month by the other bishops in behalf of a bishop deceased.

3. Orders that yearly, on July 20, a solemn service shall be said for the deceased bishops; and that on that day twelve poor persons shall be fed.

4. Enjoins the same thing on behalf of patrons and benefactors of churches.

6. Orders that the sacraments be administered fasting.

10. Enjoins curates to warn the people every Sunday, after the gospel and offertory, of the festivals and fastdays in the coming week.

11. Orders that the form of baptism shall be publicly said in church three times a year.

15. Orders that the canon “omunnis utrinsque sexus” shall be published at Advent and Lent. That medical men shall not visit a patient a second time if he have not called in the priest.

16. Forbids to give a benefice to any one who cannot read or chant.

18. Orders annual synods.

23. Orders that Jews shall wear a distinguishing badge.

26. Reviews the canonical penalties for striking, maltreating, and driving the clergy from their churches. — Labbe, Concil. 11:1569.

(X.) Held in 1314 by the same archbishop, assisted by six bishops and four deputies. Twenty canons were published.

2. Forbids to ordain to the priesthood persons under twenty-five years of age; also to ordain a deacon under twenty, and a sub-deacon under sixteen years.

6. Orders that the church bells shall be rung when a bishop passes, that the people may come out to receive his blessing upon their knees; also regulates the form to be observed by the chapter of a cathedral upon the bishop's visit.

8. Declares, unuer pain of excommunication, that no monks, or other persons, can claim exemption from episcopal visitation upon plea of prescriptive right, or any other plea.

10. Enacts that the clergy shall be soberly dressed; that they shall not carry arms, nor dress in colored clothes; that they shall wear a close cassock, observe the tonsure, and keep their hair cut short, etc.

11. Forbids men to enter the monastic houses of females.

14. Orders curates to teach their people the form of baptism at least once a year.

16. Orders fasting and almsgiving on the three days before the meeting of provincial councils.

29. Revokes the permission given to monks to preach indilgences.  — Labbe, Concil. 11:1603. Sec also Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity; Hefele, Conciliengesch.vol. v, et al.; Landon, Manual of Councils, s.v. For the Council of Ravenna held in 1317, SEE BOLOGNA.

## Ravenscroft, John Stark[[@Headword:Ravenscroft, John Stark]]

             D.D., an Episcopal minister in America, afterwards bishop of North Carolina, was born near Blandford, Prince George County, Va.. in 1772. I- e entered William and Mary College in 1789, but with little profit, and, on his return front Scotland soon after, settled in Lunenburg County. In 1810 his mind changed, and he joined the “Republican Methodists,” and became a lay elder in their Church. He was subsequently ordained in the Protestant Episcopai Church, became assistant minister at Richmond, and mwas elected bishop the same year. In 1828 he retired to Williamsburgh from ill- health, and, on his return to North Carolina, died March 5, 1830. He published several Sermons and Charges: — also, The Doctrine of the Church Vindicated, etc.: — Revealed Religiion Defended against the No- Comment Principle. Sixty-one Sermons and a Memoir (2 vols. 8vo) were also published after his death. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, v, 617.

## Ravenscroft, Stephens[[@Headword:Ravenscroft, Stephens]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born of pious and respectable parentage in Staffordshire, England, March 6, 1803, was converted very young, and licensed to preach in his eighteenth year by the Wesleyans. In 1838 he emigrated to the United States. He was a great admirer of republican institutions, and as loyal a citizen as ever breathed the free air of America. In 1839 he was admitted into the Indiana Conference, and appointed to Booneville. His subsequent appointments were Mount Vernon, New Lebanon, Carlisle, Spencer, Bloomfield, and Bowling Green. While on the last-named charge his health failed, and he was located at his own request. He moved with his family to Point Commerce, and supplied Linton and New Albany circuits. He afterwards travelled as a Bible agent in Clark and Floyd counties until his health became so poor that he had to give up the work entirely. He then moved to Rockport, Ind., where, as a supply, he ended his nine years' service as a local preacher. In 1859 he was readmitted into conlference and placed on the superannuated list, which relation he sustained until his death In 1869 he moved to Worthington, Ind., and in 1870 to Petersburgh, Ind., where he  was appointed postmaster, and where he died, Oct. 20, 1871. See Minutes of Conf. 1872, p. 79.

## Ravenscroft, Thomas[[@Headword:Ravenscroft, Thomas]]

             an eminent English musical composer, deserves a place here for his devotion to sacred subjects. He was born in 1592, received his musical education in St. Paul's choir, and had the degree of bachelor of music conferred on him when only fifteen years of age. In 1611 appeared his Melismatta, Musical Phansies, a collection of twenty-three partysongs, some of them of great beauty; and three years later he brought out another collection of part-songs under the title of Brief Discourses, with an essay on the old musical modes. Turning his attention to psalmody, he published in 1621 a collection ot psalm-tunes for four voices, entitled The Whole Book of Psalms, composed into Four Parts by Sundry Authors to such Tunes as have been and are usually sung in England, Scotland, Wales, Germany, Italy, France, and the Netherlands. This was the first publication of its kind, and all similar works of later date have been largely indebted to it. Among the contributors to this collection were Tallis Morley, Dowland, and all the great masters of the day, the name of John Milton, the father of the poet, appears as the composer of York and Norwich tunes; while St. David's, Canterbury, Bangor, and many others which have since become popular, are by Ravenscroft himself. Each of the 150 Psalms has a distinct melody assigned to it. Two collections of secular songs similar to the Melismata, and entitled Pammelia and Deuteromelia, have been assigned to Ravenscroft; but it is probable that only a few of these songs were composed by him, while he may have revised and edited the whole. A selection from the Melismata, Brief Discourses, Pammelia, and Deuteromelia was printed by the Roxburghe Club in 1823. He died about 1640. — Chambers. See also Engl. Ch. Register, vol. i; Amer. Quar. Ch. Rev. Jan. 1871, p. 526.

## Ravesteyn, Josse[[@Headword:Ravesteyn, Josse]]

             (in Latin Tiletanus), a Belgian theologian, was born about 1506 at Tielt, Flanders. He was educated at Louvain, and taught theology there. He was sent by Charles V to the Council of Trent (1551), then to the Colloquy of Worms (1557), and distinguished himself at these ecclesiastical councils by his knowledge and moderation. In 1559 he replaced Ruard Tapper in the charge of the nuns who had the care of the hospital of Louvain. He had  twice been elected rector of the university of that city, and held divers benefices of imperial munificence. “He was,” said Paquot, “a wise doctor, quick at controversy, a zealous defender of the Church, and much opposed to the errors of Baius, whom he regarded as his most ardent adversary.” He died at Louvain Feb. 7, 1571. His principal writings are, Confessionis editoe a Ministris Antwerpiensibus Confutatio (Louvain, 1567, 8vo); the Confession of the pastors had already been refuted by William of Linda: — Apologia Catholicoe Confutationis, etc. (ibid. 1568, 8vo); directed against the Centuries de Magdeborg, of which Matthew Flach Francowitz was the principal author: — Apologice Decretorum Concilii Tridentini de Sacramentis (ibid. 1568-70, 2 vols. 12mo). He left several works in manuscript. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Ravignan, Gustavus Francis Xavier Delacroix De[[@Headword:Ravignan, Gustavus Francis Xavier Delacroix De]]

             one of the most celebrated of Roman Catholic preachers of our times, and also a distinguished member of the Jesuit Order, was born at Bayonne Dec. 2, 1795. IIe studied in the Lyce Bonaparte at Paris, and was by his parents intended for the legal profession, which hle also entered by obtaining his degree and being named auditor of the Cour Royale at Paris. In 1821 he received an appointment in the Tribunal of the Seine. The prospect thus opened for him, however, lost its attraction after a change of views in religion had made him serious about the future, and in 1822 he formed the resolution of relinquishing his career at the bar, and entering the Church. Having spent some time in the College of St. Sulpice, he soon passed into the novitiate of the Jesuits at Mlontrouge, and thence to Dole and St. Acheul for his theological studies, at the termination of which he was himself appointed a professor. The religious fervor of his soul found expression in many of the material forms which prevail so generally among the Romanists of his order. Thus, for example, he wore for a long time, as a mark of penance, a leather girdle stuck full of needles, around his waist, on the bare bodya. On the expulsion of the Jesuits from France in 1830, father Ravignan withdrew to Freiburg, in Switzerland, where he continued to teach in the schools of his own order; but after some time, when he was supposed to have gained sufficient notoriety by the afflictive discipline of his body, he was transferred to the more congenial duty of preaching, first in several of the Swiss towns, and afterwards in Savoy, at Chambery, at St. Maurice, and other places.

At length, in 1835, he appeared in the pulpit of the cathedral of Amiens. In the following year he was chosen to preach the Lenten sermons at the church of St. Thomas d'Aquin in Paris; and finally,  in 1837, was selected to replace Lacordaire (q.v.) at Notre Dame in the duty of conducting the special “conferences” for men which had been opened in that church. For ten years father Ravignan occupied this pulpit with a success which has rarely been equalled, and his Conferences are regarded as models of ecclesiastical eloquence. In 1842 he undertook, in addition, to preach each evening during the entire Lent; and it is to the excessive fatigue thus induced, as well as to the many trials imposed, that the premature break-down of his strength is ascribed. To the labors of the pulpit he added those also of the press. He published an Apology of his order in 1844; and in 1854 a more extended work with the same view. Clement XIII et Clement XIV (2 vols. 8vo), whicih was intended as a reply to tlhe Life of Clement XIV by the Oratorian father Theiner. These, with some occasional Sermons and Conferences, constitute the sum of the publications issued during his life. In 1855 he was invited by the emperor Napoleon I11 to preach the Lent at the Tuileries. He died Feb. 26, 1858, in the convent of his order at Paris. None of the Jesuit preachers of our times have so zealously labored among the Protestants as father Ravignan, but, alas! too frequently he employed measures in no way adding honor to the already overcast name of the Jesuitical order. His Memoirs have been published by his brethren, and a collected edition of his works and remains has been for some time in progress. The Memoir has been translated into English, under the title of The Life of Father Ravignan, by father De Ponlevoy (Dublin, 1869; N. Y. 1869).

## Ravle[[@Headword:Ravle]]

             is, in ecclesiastical language, the name of a cloak worn by women mourners. SEE MOURNING.

## Rawlett, John[[@Headword:Rawlett, John]]

             an English theologian, was born about 1642, and was a lecturer in divinity at Newcastle-upon-Tyne at the time of his death, in 1686. He published, Explication of the Creed, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer (Lond. 1672, 8vo; 1769, 8vo):Dialogue between Two Protestants (1686, 8vo): — Christian Monitor, in Welsh (Oxon. 1689. 8vo): — Treatise of Sacramental Covenanting (5th ed. Lond. 1692, 8vo).

## Rawley, William[[@Headword:Rawley, William]]

             an Anglican divine of some note, was born about 1588, and was educated at Bene't College, Cambridge, of which he was made fellow in 1609. He finally took holy orders, and in 1612 became rector of Bowvthorpe, Norfolk; in 1616, vicar of Landbeach, Cambridge. He was chaplain and amanuensis to lord Bacon, and subsequently chaplain to Charles I and Charles II. He wrote prefaces and dedications to some of Bacon's works, and translated several of them into Latin. In 1638, after Bacon's death, he published them in folio form — and in 1657 he published, under the title of Resuscitatio, several other of Bacon's tracts, with a memoir of the author prefixed. In 1661 he republished the Resuscitatio, with additions. He died in 1667.

## Rawlin, Richard[[@Headword:Rawlin, Richard]]

             an English Independent divine, was born in 1687, and flourished as pastor of an Independent congregation in Fetter Lane, London. He died in 1757. He published, Christ the Righteousness of his People, seven Discourses on Justification by Faith in Him (1741, 8vo; 1722, 1797, 12mo).

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

             a Wesleyan preacher of some note, was born May 24, 1813, at Cheltenham. He was destined for mercantile life, but finally, brought under the influence of the Wesleyans, he was converted and taken into the Church. In 1836 he entered the ministry, and for twenty-nine years filled some of the best circuits in the connection. He last held the appointment of superintendent of the Swansea (English) Circuit. He died July 14, 1865. See Cambria Daily Leader (of that date).

## Rawlinson, George[[@Headword:Rawlinson, George]]

             an English divine, noted also as a scientist, was born in 1828, and was educated at King's College and Emmanuel College, Cambridge. In 1854 he was made curate of St. Mary's, Vincent Square, London. In 1856 he was appointed professor of applied sciences at Elphinstone College, Bombay, mwhere he remained until his death in September following. He published in 1857, at Bombay, a work on dynamics. His Elementary Statics, edited by Edw. Sturgis, was published at Cambridge and London (1861, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rawlinson, John[[@Headword:Rawlinson, John]]

             D.D., an English divine, noted also as an educator, flourished in the first half of the 17th century. He was at one time principal of St. Edmund's Hall. He published, Three Sermons (Lond. 1609-11; Oxon. 1612, 4to): — Sermon on 1Sa 10:24 (ibid. 1616, 4to): — Sermons on Luk 22:48 (Lond. 1616, 4to): — Four Lent Sermons (1625, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Atuthors, s.v.

## Rawson, Grindal[[@Headword:Rawson, Grindal]]

             an early American preacher, was born in 1658, and was educated at H- arvard College, where he graduated in 1678. He entered the ministry, and was pastor of a Presbyterian congregation at Mendonm, Mass., from 1680 until his death, in 1715. He published Election Sermons (Bost. 1709, 16mo). See Mather, Deaths of Good Men.

## Rawson, Joseph[[@Headword:Rawson, Joseph]]

             D.D., an English divine, flourished near the opening of last century as canon of Lichfield. He published nine single Sermons (1703-16), and a Narrative of his case (Lond. 1737, 8vo). See Watt, Bib. Brit. s.v.

## Ray, Benjamin[[@Headword:Ray, Benjamin]]

             an English clergyman, flourished in the first half of the last century. He was perpetual curate of Surfleet and curate of Cowbitt, and died in 1760. He contributed to the Trans. of the Spaldinq Society, to the Gentleman's Magazine, 1744 (on an ancient coin, etc.), and to the Philosophical Transactions, 1751 (on a water-spout), and left some works in manuscript. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ray, John[[@Headword:Ray, John]]

             a celebrated English naturalist, of humble origin, but indomitable perseverance, was the author of two works showing the relation of science to religion (The Wisdom of God in the Works of Creation [Lond. 1691, and often since]; and Three Physico-Theological Discourses [ibid. 1693, and later]). He was born in 1628 at Black Notley, in Essex; was educated at Braintree School, and at Catharine Hall and Trinity College, Cambridge; lost his fellowship in the latter college by refusing to comply with the Act of Uniformity; travelled on the Continent for three years with Mr.  Willoughby and other friends; became a fellow of the Royal Society, and died in 1705. His works are numerous and valuable, chiefly on scientific and literary subjects. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ray, Thomas[[@Headword:Ray, Thomas]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Pennsylvania, Oct. 18, 1794, became a Christian in early life, and, after preaching for several years, in 1833 joined the Indiana Conference, within whose limits he travelled until his death, Jan. 31, 1871, at Inwood, Ind. — Minutes of Amer. Conf. 1871, p. 184.

## Raybold, George A[[@Headword:Raybold, George A]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Philadelphia, Pa., Oct. 18, 1802. He was converted in April, 1822, and began to preach in 1825. In April, 1829, he withdrew from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and joined the Methodist Protestant Church, but reunited with the Methodist Episcopal Church in September, 1831. In 1833 he was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, ordained deacon in 1835, and elder in 1837. When the New Jersey Conference was formed, he was set off with it, and continued to fill the several appointments to which he was assigned until 1847, when he was granted a supernumerary relation. For over thirty years he was a great sufferer from disease, and yet maintained a devout, patient spirit until his death, at Haddonfield, N. J., Dec. 4, 1876. — Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M. E. Church, 1877, p. 159.

## Rayland, John, D.D[[@Headword:Rayland, John, D.D]]

             a learned minister of the Baptist denomination in England, was born at Warwick Jan. 29,1753. In his childhood he developed remarkable talents as a scholar. Having been thoroughly trained under the tuition of his father. he became his assistant in the school under his charge, and his successor when he retired from his official duties. He began to preach in 1771 at Northampton and its vicinity. In 1781 he became colleague with his father in the pastorate of the Northampton church, and sole pastor on the removal of his father to Enfield. He occupied this position for ten years, and then became pastor of the Broadmead Chapel in Bristol, and at the same time president of the Baptist Institute in that place. Here he continued until his death, May 25, 1825. Brown University conferred the degree of D.D. on Dr. Rayland in 1772. His Sermons, etc., were collected after his death, and  published in two octavo volumes. The funeral sermon of Dr. Rayland by Robert Hall presents a most charming portraiture of this excellent man. (J. C. S.)

## Raymond Of Magnelonne[[@Headword:Raymond Of Magnelonne]]

             a French medieval prelate, flourished near the opening of the 12th century. It is supposed that he was of the family of the nobles of Montpellier. He was bishop from 1129, but not without opposition. Bernard, count of Substantion, finding the choice of Raymond contrary to his views, for revenge, tried to destroy the church of Magnelonne; but the constancy of Raymond triumphed over this opposition, and forced the same Bernard to make public confession of his fault. The name of this bishop is cited in  many of the acts mentioned or published by the Gallia Christianna and L'Histoire de Languedoc of M. Vaissette. He died in November, 1159. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Raymond Of Penafort[[@Headword:Raymond Of Penafort]]

             (Saint), a Spanish Dominican, was born in 1175 at the chateau of Penafort. in Catalonia, and belonged to one of the noble families of Spain allied to the royal house of Aragon. He was educated at Barcelona, and made such progress that at the age of twenty he taught the liberal arts at that place. He went to perfect himself at the University of Bologna, where he received the title of doctor in civil and canonical law. Attracted by his reputation, which was still rising, Beranger, bishop of Barcelona, on his returning to his church from Rome, went to see him at Bologna, and succeeded in persuading him to return with him to Spain. He did not, however, content himself with the mere discharge of the duties of his canonicate and his archdeaconry in the Barcelona cathedral, but was very much occupied with all manner of good works. He finally felt persuaded to take the Dominican habit, April 1, 1222. His example was followed by several persons distinguished for their knowledge and birth. Pope Gregory IX called him to Rome, and employed him in 1228 in the collection of the Decretals: he wished even to raise him to the metropolitan see of Tarragona, but Raymond preferred the solitude of Barcelona to all the advantages which his friends had hopedl for him. Nominated general of his order in 1238, he gave up his charge two years later, and contributed much by his zeal and counsel to the establishment of the Order of Mercy. Peter Nolascus was one of his converts, and so were many other distinguished characters of that period. Indeed, his influence is said to have been so great that the expulsion of the Moors from Spain is principally attributed to him. Raymond wmas also made the spiritual director of the king of Aragon, and he persuaded his royal master James to favor the establishment of the Inquisition in his kingdom and in Languedoc, and the popes permitted him to provide for the offices of this tribunal. Pope Clement VIII canonized him in 1601. We have of his works a collection of Decretals, which forms the fifth volume of the canon law. This collection is in five books, and the author has joined several decrees of the councils to the constitutions of the popes: — a Summa on penitence and marriage, which he had printed many times: — an abridgment of this work, and divers other works which have not been printed, and which do not merit it. Raymond de Penafort died at Barcelona Jan. 6, 1275. He is commemorated Jan. 23. — Hoefer, Nouv.  Biog. Generale, s.v. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, i, 200 sq.; Mrs. Jameson, Legendary and Mythological Art (see Index).

## Raymond Of Sabunde (Or Sebunde)[[@Headword:Raymond Of Sabunde (Or Sebunde)]]

             a French ecclesiastic, who was a native of Spain, but flourished in the first half of the 15th century at Toulouse, is noted as a philosopher and theologian. About 1436 he taught medicine at Toulouse, and perhaps also theology. He is especially noteworthy as the author of Liber Naturloe s. Creaturam, etc., which has had several emendations and translations. Raymond sought in a rational, yet in some respects rather mystical, manner to demonstrate the harmony between the book of nature and the Bible. He asserts that man has received from the Almighty two books, wherein he may discover the important facts which concern his relation to his Creator, viz. the book of Revelation and that of Nature; affirming the latter to be the most universal in its contents, and the most perspicuous. He endeavored by specious rather than solid arguments to deduce the theology of his age, even in its more peculiar doctrines, from the contemplation of nature and of man. “Setting out with the consideration of the four stages designated as mere being, life, sensation, and reason, Raymond (who agrees with the Nominalists in regarding self-knowledge as the most certain kind of knowledge) proves by ontological, physico-teleological, and moral arguments (the latter based on the principle of retribution) the existence and trinity of God, and the duty of grateful love to God, who first loved us. His work culminates in the mvstical conception of a kind of love to God by which the lover is enabled to grow into the essence of the loved” (Ueberweg). This attempt of Raymond of Sabunde to prove the doctrines of Christianity from the revelation of God in nature has no imitators. It certainly deserved, from its just observations on many subjects, especially on morals, greater success than it met with. Montaigne directed to it the attention of his contemporaries by a translation he made of it. (See Montaigne's observations in his Essays, lib. 2, ch. xii.) The best Latin editions of the Liber Naturoe are those of Frankfort, 1635, and Amsterdam, 1761. See Matzke, Die naturl. Theol. des R. v. Sab. (Breslau, 1846); Nitzsch, Qucest. Raimundance, in Zeitsch. fur hist. Theol. 1859. No. 3; Zockler, Theol. Natur. (Frankf. 1860), vol. i; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Ritter, Christl. Philos. ii, 747-754; Ueberweg, Hist. of Philos. i, 465467. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Raymond, John Howard, LL.D[[@Headword:Raymond, John Howard, LL.D]]

             an eminent Baptist educator, was born in New York city, March 7, 1814. He entered Columbia College when he was but fourteen years of age, where he remained until nearly the close of the junior year, when he was "suspended," and, as he always admitted, justly. Subsequently he went to Union College, Schenectady, where, in 1832, he graduated with high honors. On leaving college he studied law for two years in New York and New Haven. When he became a Christian, he pursued his theological studies at the Hamilton Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1838, and was licensed to preach. For ten years (1840-50) he was professor of rhetoric and English literature in Madison University, and filled the same chair in Rochester University from 1851 to 1855, when he was elected president of the Polytechnic Institute of Brooklyn, N.Y. and held that position until his election, in 1864, to the presidency of Vassar College. He died at Poughkeepsie, August 14, 1878. See Dr. Edward Lathrop, in The Baptist Weekly, August 22, 1878. (J.C.S.)

## Raymond, Lully[[@Headword:Raymond, Lully]]

             SEE LULLY.

## Raymond, Martin[[@Headword:Raymond, Martin]]

             a Spanish Dominican who flourished in the 13th century, near its middle, was in 1250 presiding officer of the eight colleges which the kings of Castile and Aragon had erected in the Dominican convents for the study of the Oriental tongues. The principal object of these schools was to fit out missionaries, and to aid the work of missions in all possible ways. Our Raymond was one of the greatest promoters of that work in his time, and his name deserves to be commemorated in the annals of Christian missions. He died after 1286. He is especially known by his Pugio Fidei contra Mauros et Judeos, ed. by De Voisin (Paris, 1651), and by Carpzov (Leipsic, 1687). See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, i, 383; ii, 17.

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

             (Spanish, San Ramon), a Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in Spain in the first half of the 13th century, is frequently called by his surname Nonnattus, which he owes to the fact that he was taken out of the body of his mother after her death by the Cesarean operation. He was thus born at Portel, in Catalonia, in 1204, and was of a gentleman's family of small fortune. His early life was spent in the mountain fastnesses of his native country; but when he had attained to the years of a maturer youth, he set out for the court, and there attracted attention. The dissipation of his royal associates disgusted him, and he sought the retirement of the cloister. He joined the Order of Mercy, which aimed at the redemption of captives from the Moors, and was admitted by the founder himself, St. Peter Nolasco (q.v.). While in Algiers he was taken up by the authorities, and punished with excruciating tortures of the body; but he bore all meekly, and even continued his work after his release. The story goes that the governor, when informed of the incurability of Raymond's zeal of propagandism, had him seized anew, and his lips were bored through with a red-hot iron and fastened with a padlock. He was released after eight months' imprisonment, and taken back to Spain by friends of his, and under direction of the pope of Rome, who shortly after made him a cardinal. He was also made the general of his order, and as such was invited to visit Rome. On his wav thither he fell sick at Cardona, only six miles from Barcelona, and died Aug. 31,1240. Both pope Gregory IX and king James of Aragon assisted at his funeral. Pope Alexander VII inserted Raymond's name in the Martyrology in 1657. See Butler, Lives of the Saints, 8:567 sq.

## Raynald, Oderich[[@Headword:Raynald, Oderich]]

             SEE RINALD.

## Raynaud, (Rainaldi), Theophilus[[@Headword:Raynaud, (Rainaldi), Theophilus]]

             a celebrated Italian Jesuit, was born Nov. 15, 1583, at Sospello, near Nice. He studied at Avignon, and became quite accomplished as a student of philosophy. In 1602 he entered the Society of Jesus, and was made one of their teachers at Lyons. At first he taught elementary branches, but soon found advancement. and was finally given a professorship of philosophy and theology. In 1631 he was chosen confessor to prince Maurice of Savoy, and repaired to Paris. Here he wsas made uncomfortable by unpleasant relations to Richelieu, who, having been attacked by a Spanish theologian for the alliance of the French government with the German Protestants, had asked Raynaud for a reply and been refused. Raynaud was, at his request to the order, transferred to Chambery, and this bishopric soon becoming vacant, he was solicited to fill it. But he was far from being pleased, and even prepared to return to Lyons.

He did not again revisit Savoy until 1639, and then only to his unhappiness. He had, during his sojourn at Chambery, contracted a close friendship with father Pierre Monod, his companion; and when he heard of his detention in the fortress of Montmelian, he tried in every way to have it brought to an end. Richelieu took offence at this ardent affection, which was natural between friends, and, not being willing to permit relations between Raynaud and a prisoner of the state, he solicited and obtained from the court of Savoy the arrest of the unfortunate Jesuit. At the end of three months he was released, and songht refuge at Carpentras, which then belonged to the  Papal States. But the aversion of his enemies would not leave him long undisturbed. By order of the cardinal-legate Antonio Barberini, he was conducted to Avignon, and locked in a chamber of the pontifical palace. With difficulty released, he left for Rome, with the manuscript of Heteroclita Spiritualia, of which the impression had been sutspended, submitted it for examination to father Alegambe, and obtained the authority to publish. In 1645 he returned to Rome in company with cardidal Federigo Sforza, and was presented to the pope and the Sacred College as one of the most ardent champions of the papal rights. He afterwards made two journeys to the Eternal City, the first time in 1647, and there occupied for some time a theological chair; the second time in 1651, when he assisted at the general assembly of his order. He afterwards obtained permission to establish himself at Lyons, and there passed the rest of his life in teaching and composing his works. He died Oct. 31, 1663.

Father Raynaud had all the qualities of a good friar: he was sober, pious, and very charitable; but by his pen he did not spare his adversaries, and showed himself severe and irascible. He wrote a great many works, which, though extravagant in style, tedious, and trivial, were nearly all received with favor. Tiraboschi was unable to forbear comparing them “to one of those vast magazines full of merchandise of all kinds, good and bad, ancient and modern, useful and useless, in which every one could find, with taste and patience, everything which suited him.”

The writings of pere Raynaud worth mentioning here are, Theologia Naturalis (Lyons, 1622, 1637, 4to): — Splendor Veritatis Moralis (ibid. 1627, 8vo; under the name of Stephanus Emonecus): — Moralis Disciplina (ibid. 1629, fol.): — Indiculus Sanctorunt Lugdunensium (ibid. 1629, 12mo): Culcinismus, Vestiareum Religio (Paris, 1630, 12mo; under the name of Riviere): — De Communione pro Alortuzis (Lyons, 1630, 8vo); he pretends that the sacraments have no virtue except for those who receive them uncensured by the Church of Rome: — De Martyrio per Postem (ibid. 1630, 8vo); in the index of this book he tried to show that those who exposed themselves voluntarily to the plague in assisting those who had it were the real martyrs: — ‘Nova Libertatis Explicatio (Paris, 1632, 4to); against father Gibieuf, an Orator: — Metamorphosis Latronis in Apostolum Apostolique in Latronen, (Lyons, 1634, 2 vols. 8vo); followed by several other treatises: — De Ortu Infantiun contra Naturam, per Sectionem Caesaream (ibid. 1637, 8vo); a singular and curious bohok: — Hipiparchus de Religioso Neyotiattore (Francopolis [Chambery], 1642, 8vo); a satirical work, translated into French (Chambery, 1645, 8vo) by  Tripier, teacher of the natural children of the duke of Savoy; and Amsterdam (1761, 12mo): — Dypticha Mariana (Grenoble, 1643, 4to): — Malal Bonorum Ecclesiasticorum (Lyons, 1644, 4to): — De Incorruptione Cadaverum (Avignon, 1645, Svo); a dissertation written upon the dead body of a woman which was found in 1642 at Carpentras wvithout any signs of decomposition, although it had been buried for a long time; Raynaund pretended that the incorruption of the body was not due to natural causes, nor to the artifices of the devil, but to God himself; but, adds he, as this last supposition is far from being demonstrateid, it will be well to find what God himself has decreed on this subject: — Heteroclita Spiritualia (Grenoble, 1646, 8vo; Lyons, 1654, 4to); a collection of the extraordinary practices which superstition and ignorance have introduced into religion: — Vitae ac Mortis Humanae Terminalia (Orange, 1646, 8vo); he had not then reason to doubt, following the author, that God has fixed the term of life for the good and the wicked; but ordinarily the length of the life of men and their death depend upon natural causes: — Trinitas Patrilarcharum (Lyons, 1647, 8vo); notices upon Simeon Stylites, Francis de Paulo, and Ignatius de Loyola: — Erotemata de Malis ac Bonis Libris, ceque Justa natt justa eornmodem Confixione (ibid. 1650, 4to); this work, fulll of research, is an answer to an attack on his De Martyrio per Pestem: - Theologia Patrum (Antwerp, 1652, fol.): — De Sobria Alterius Sexuts Frenuentatione per Sacros et Religiosos Homines (Lyons, 1653, 8vo): — Scapulare il Marianum (Paris, 1653, 8vo): — De Pileo Exteriusque Ceapitis Tegminiibus, tam Sacris quam Profanis (Lyons, 1655, 4to): — Eunuchi, Nati, Facti, AIystici, ex Sacra et Humlana Literatura Illustrati; Puerorum Enmasculatores ob Musicam quo Loco Habendi (Dijon, 1655, 4to); under the name of Jean Heribert. he treated in a very diffuse manner, the subject of eunuchs; but he had forgotten the most essential point, whether they were able to marry; this question was very fully treated in his work Traite des Eunuques (1707,4to): — Hercules Commodiclus (Aix, 1565, 8vo); under the name Honorat Leotard; it is a virulent satire against Jean de Launoi: — Trias Fortium David (Lyons, 1657, 4to); remarks upon Robert d'Arbrissel, St. Bernard, and Cesar of Bus: — Missi Evangelici cad Siwas. Japionam et Oras Confines (Antw. [Lyons] 1659, 8vo); under the name of Leger Quintin: — 0 Parascevasticum (Lyons, 1661, 4tc): — Iagiologiun Luydunennse (ibid. 1662, 8vo): — De Immunnitate Autorum Cyriacorum a Censura (ibid. 1662, 8vo). See Dupin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Ecclus.; Niceron, Memoires, vol. 26. His Life, written by himself, is preserved in  the Jesuit Library at Lyons. See also Sotwei, Script. Soc. Jesu. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Razis[[@Headword:Razis]]

             ( ῾Ραζείς, Vulg. Razias), “one of the elders of Jerusalem,” who killed himself under peculiarly terrible circumstances, that he might not fall “into the hands of the wicked” (2Ma 14:37-46). In dying he is reported to have expressed his faith in a resurrection (2Ma 14:46) — a belief elsewhere characteristic of the Maccabean conflict. This act of suicide, which was wholly alien to the spirit of the Jewish law and people (Joh 8:22; comp. EIwald, Alterth. p. 198; Grotius, De Jure Belli, II, 19:5), has been the subject of considerable discussion. It was quoted by the Donatists as the single fact in Scripture which supported their fanatical contempt of life (Augustine, Ep. 104, 6). Augustine denies the fitness of the model, and condemns the deed as that of a man “non cligende mortis sapiens, sed ferendae humilitatis impatiens” (Augustine, l.c.; comp. c. Gaud. i, 36-39). At a later time the favor with which the writer of 2 Maccabees views the conduct of Razis — a fact which Augustine vainly denies — was urged rightly by Protestant writers as an argument against the inspiration of the book. Indeed the whole narrative breathes the spirit of pagan heroism, or of the later zealots (comp. Josephus, War, 3:7; 4:1, 10), and the deaths of Samson and Saul offer no satisfactory parallel (comp. Grimm, ad loc.

## Razor[[@Headword:Razor]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of the following words:

1. מוֹרָה, morahle (Sept. σίδηρος, ξύρον; Vulg. novacula, ferrum: from מָרָה, “scrape,” or “sweep.” Gesenius connects it with the root יָרֵא, “to fear” [ Thesatur. p. 819j). This word occurs in Jdg 13:5; Jdg 16:17; 1Sa 1:11.

2. תִּעִר, ta'ar (Sept. ῥομφαία; Vulg. gladius: from עָרָה, to lay bare), a more general term (Num 6:5; Psa 52:2; Isa 7:20; Eze 5:1) for a sharp knife (as rendered in Jer 26:23) or sword (“ sheath,” 1Sa 17:51, etc.; although- many regard this as a different word of the same form). The barber is designated by גִּלָּב, gallab' (Sept. κουρεύς'; Vulg. tonsor, 2Sa 20:8). “Besides other usages, the practice of shaving the head after the completion of a vow must  have created among the Jews a necessity for the special trade of a barber (Num 6:9; Num 6:18; Num 8:7; Lev 14:8; Jdg 13:5; Isa 7:20; Eze 5:1; Act 18:18). The instruments of his work were probably, as in modern times, the razor, the basin, the mirror, and perhaps, also, the scissors, such as are described by Lucian (Adv. Indoct. ii, 395, ed. Amst.; see 2Sa 14:26). The process of Oriental shaving, and especially of the head, is minutely described by Chardin (Voy. 4:144). It may be remarked that, like the Levites, the Egyptian priests were accustomed to shave their whole bodies (Herod. ii, 36, 37).” The Psalmist compares the tongue of Doeg to a sharp razor (Psa 52:2) starting aside from what should be its true operation to a cruel purpose and effect. In the denunciation of the woes that were to be brought upon Judah in the time of Ahaz by the instrumentality of the Assyrians, we have the remarkable expression, “In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is hired, namely, by them beyond the river, by the king of Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet; and it shall also consume the beard” (Isa 7:20). It seems likely that there is here an implication of contempt as well as suffering, as the office of a barber ambulant has seldom been esteemed of any dignity either in the East or West. To shave with the hired razor the head, the feet, and the beard is an expression highly parabolical, to denote the utter devastation of the country from one end to the other, and the plundering of the people from the highest to the lowest bv the Assyrians, whom God employed as his instrument to punish the rebellious Jews. SEE BARBER.

## Rea, John, D.D[[@Headword:Rea, John, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in the village of Tully, Ireland, in 1772. He emigrated to the United States in 1799, and, after remaining at Philadelphia a short time, “I left on foot,” he says, “travelled mostly alone through the wilderness, sad, gloomy, and dispirited, until, after many days, I arrived west of the Alleghany Mountains, stopping at the house of Mr. Porter, a Presbyterian minister.” He now labored and struggled amid many adverse circumstances to secure a literary course of education, teaching school and studying alternately, until he graduated with honor at Jefferson College, when it was only a small school kept in a log-cabin near Canonsburg, Pa. He studied theology under the direction of Dr. John M'Millan, was licensed by the Ohio Presbytery in June, 1803, and, after itinerating awhile in the wilderness of Eastern Ohio among some Indian camps, he was appointed to supply the newly organized churches of Beechsprings and  Crabapple, over which he was ordained and installed pastor in 1805. The country was settled rapidly, and his charges grew as fast, so that it soon became necessary to have the relation between these two churches dissolved, that he might labor all his time at the Beechsprings. “So untiring and devoted was this servant of Christ that, besides constantly ministering to his own large congregation, he found time to be instrumental in raising up some six or seven separate societies that went out as colonies from the mother Church. and are now self-sustaining and prominent congregations.” He died, after a ministry of fifty-two years, Feb. 12. 1855. Dr. Rea was pastor of the Church at Beechsprings forty-five years, and the history of the Presbyterian Church in Eastern Ohio is closely connected with his biography. He was a close, persevering student, clear in the arrangement of his subject. original in his thinking, and independent in thought and expression. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 193. (J. L. S.)

## Read, Francis H[[@Headword:Read, Francis H]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harrison County, Va., Nov. 25, 1812, was converted in his youth, joined the Church promptly in 1829, and in 1834, feeling called of God to the holy ministry, entered the travelling connection within the bounds of the Pittsburgh Conference, Pa. When the West Virginia Conference was formed, he became united with it, and there labored until 1855, when he was located. He removed to Illinois, and shortly after entered the ocke River Conference, and was appointed to the Newark Circuit. After two years he again tookl a location, and removed to Iowa. In 1858 he was admitted into the Iowa Conference, and afterwards, by the formation and division of territory, he fell first into the Western Iowa, and then into the Des Moines Conference. His appointments in these conferences were Hopeville Circuit, Osceola, Chariton, Ottawa Circuit, Corning, and the Atlantic District. In this field truly “he died at his post.” His death occurred July 13, 1871, at Panora, Guthrie County, Iowa. See Minutes of the Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 218, 219.

## Read, Henry Clay[[@Headword:Read, Henry Clay]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Stanford, Lincoln County, Ky., Jan. 30, 1826. He graduated at Centre College, Danville, Ky., in 1849, and at the theological seminary at Princeton, N. J., in 1850; was licensed by Transylvania Presbytery June 27, 1850, and began his labors at Westport,  Lagrange, and Ballardsville. Ky. In 1851 he moved to Glasgow, Ky., and was ordained over that Church April 9, 1852. In 1858 he moved to Columbia, Ky., and engaged as joint principal of the high-school in that place, during which period he preached half of his time to the Church there, and the churches of Edmonton and Munfordsville. In 1859 he took full charge of the Church and school, but discontinued the school in 1862. He was a commissioner to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church which met in Peoria, Ill., in 1863. He died Oct. 23, 1863. Mr. Read was a most exemplary Christian, aman of soundjudgment, and a good preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 191. (J. L. S.)

## Read, Thomas Buchanan[[@Headword:Read, Thomas Buchanan]]

             an American artist of some renown, deserves a place here for his distinction in works on sacred subjects. He was born in Chester County, Pa., March 12, 1822. When but seventeen years old he entered the studio of a sculptor in Cincinnati, intending to devote himself to sculpture for life; but painting soon proved the more attractive to him, and he practiced sculpture only as an amateur. In 1841 he went to New York, then to Boston, and settled in Philadelphia in 1846. He visited Europe first in 1850, since which time he has lived in Fiorence and Rome, passing some interval in Cincinnati. His pictures and his poems have the same characteristics, as might be expected. They are full of aerial grace and delicacy; anl exquisite refinement anan ideal charm mingle in all he did. And yet he sometimes wrote with the spirit we find in Sheridan's Ride, and painted with such force as is seen in Sheridan and his Horse. Among his most charming pictures is his Star of Bethlehem. He died in Europe, where he had resided for over five years, while on his way home, May 11, 1872.

## Read, Thomas, D.D[[@Headword:Read, Thomas, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Maryland in March 1746. He was educated at the old Academy of Philadelphia; in 1768 received license to preach, and began his ministry at Drawyer's Creek, Delaware; in 1772 he was installed as the pastor; and in 1798 accepted a call from the Second Presbyterian Church of Wilmington. He resigned this pastoral charge in 1817, and died July 14, 1823. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3:301.

## Reader[[@Headword:Reader]]

             one of the five inferior orders of the Church of Rome. The office of reader is of great antiquity in the Church, dating as far back as the 3d century. It is, however, abundantly evident that it was not a distinct order, the reader (in the Latin Church at least) never having been admitted to his office by imposition of hands. According to the Council of Carthage, the Bible was put into the hands of the appointee, in presence of the people, with these words: “‘Take this book, and be thou a reader of the Word of God, which office thou shalt faithfully and profitably perform. Thou shalt have part with those who minister in the Word of God.” At the time of the  Reformation, readers wnere admitted in churches and chapels for which no clergyman could be procured, to the end that divine service in such places might not be altogether neglected. The office, or rather the name, is still continued in the Church of England. The following is the pledge to which, at the time of the Reformation, the readers were obliged to subscribe:

“Imprimis, I shall not preach or interpret, but only read that which is appointed by public authority. I shall not minister the sacraments or other public rites of the Church, but bury the dead, and purify women after their childbirth. I shall keep the register-book according to the injunctions. I shall use sobriety in apparel, and especially in the church at common prayer. I shiall move men to quiet and concord, and not give them cause of offence. I shall bring in to my ordinary testimony of my behavior from the honest nof the pamish where I dwell, within one half year next following. I shall give place, upon convenient warning, so thought by the ordinary, if any learned minister shall be placed there at the suit of the patron of the parish. I shall claim no more of the fruits sequestered of such cure where I shall serve but as it shall be thought meet to the wisdom of the ordinary. I shall daily, at the least, read one chapter of the Old Testament, and one other of the oew, with good advisement, to the increase of my knowledge. I shall not appoint in my room, by reason of my absence or sickness, any other man, but shall leave it to the suit of the parish to the ordinary for assigning some other able man. I shall not read but in poorer parishes, destitute of incumbents, except in the time of sickness, or for other good considerations to be allowed by the ordinary. I shall not openly intermeddle with any artificer's occupations, as covetously to seek a gain theieby, having in ecclesiastical living the sum of twenty nobles, or above, by the year.”

In Scotland also, at the Reformation, readers were appointed to read the Scriptures and the common pravers — that is, the forms of the Church of Geneva. They were not allowed to preach or administer the sacraments. The readers were tempted now and then to overstep these limits, and were as often forbidden by the General Assembly, till, in 1581, the office was formally abolislied. The First Book of Discipline says:

“To the churches where no ministers cain be had presentlie must be appointed the most apt men that distinctlie can read the common  praiers and the Scriptures, to exercise both themselves and the Church, till they grow to greater perfection: and in process of time he that is but a reader may attain to a farther degree, and, by consent of the Church and discreet ministers, may be peimitted to minister the sacraments; but not before that he be able somewhat to perswade by wholesome doctrine, beside his reading, and be admitted to the ministerie, as before is said... Nothing have we spoken of the stipend of readers, because, if they can do nothing hut reade, they neither can be called nor judged true ministers, and yet regard must be had to their labors; but so that they may be spurred forward to vertue, and not by any stipend appointed for their reading to be retained in that estate. To a reader, therefore, that is newly entered, fourty merkes, or more or lesse, as parishioners and readers can agree, is sufficient: provided that he teach the children of the parish, which he must doe, besides the reading of the common prayers, and bookes of the Old and New Testament. If from reading he begin to exhort and explain the Scriptures, then ought his stipend to be augmented, till finally he come to the honour of a minister. But if he be found unable after two yeares, then must he be removed from that office, and discharged of all stipend, that another may be proved as long; for this alwaies is to be avoided, that none who is judged unable to come at aiiy time to some reasonable knowledge, whereby he may edifie the Kirk, shall be perpetually susteined upon the charge of tihe Kirk. Farther, it must be avoided that no child, nor person within age-that is, within twentie-one yeares of age — be admitted to the office of a reader.”

The name occurs, however, in Church records long after that period, for in many places the office was tacitly permitted. The precentor sometimes bore it; and exhorters — persons who read the Scriptures and added a few words of remark — were found in various towns. SEE PRENTOR.

## Reading OF The Bible[[@Headword:Reading OF The Bible]]

             The regular and constant perusal of the Holy Scriptures is so delightful a privilege of Christians that it is spontaneously adopted by the converted heart, and the book has such a charm both for the young and the old, the scholar and the unlearned, as to be a perpetual theme of study for every intelligent mind. It is also enjoined as a religious duty, as well in the volume itself (Deu 6:7; Joh 5:39), as in the prescriptive rules of most ecclesiastical bodies. The public use of the Bible was practiced by the Jews and by the early Christians, and has been continued among all Protestant bodies. SEE LESSONS. Especial officers were detailed in the early Church for the more general diffusion of this work. SEE READER. In the Roman Catholic Church, however, and to some extent in the Greek, the promiscuous perusal of the Scriptures, in the vernacular, has been prohibited. SEE BIBLE, USE OF BY THE LAITY. Much of the modern so- called “Bible-reading" is rather a mode of sermonizing, or a casual stringing together of disconnected texts on some fanciful principle.

## Reading, Councils Of[[@Headword:Reading, Councils Of]]

             (Concilia Redingesia). The first of these was held in July, 1279, by archbishop Peckham of Canterbury, assisted by his suffragans. The twelve following constitutions were published:

1. Renews the twenty-ninth constitution of Othobon against pluralities, and directs bishops to cause a register to be kept of all incumbents in their dioceses, with all particulars relating to them and their livings.

2. Relates to commendairies, and declares such as are held otherwise than the constitution of Gregory, made in the Council of Lyons, 1273, permits, to be vacant.

3. Orders all priests, on the Sunday after every rural chapter, to explain to the people the sentences of excommunication decreed by the Council of Oxford in 1222; and to publish four times in each year the constitutions of Othobon concerning baptism at Easter and Pentecost, and that concerning concubinaries at the four principal rural chapters, the laity being first dismissed.

4. Orders that children born within eight days of Pentecost and Easter shall be reserved to be baptized at these times; but that children born at other times shall be baptized at once, for fear of sudden death.

5. Orders the eighth constitution of Othobon (1268) against concubinary priests to be read openly in the four principal rural chapters, and declares that such readings shall be taken as a monition. If the dean or his deputy neglect this, he is directed to fast every Friday on bread and water until the next chapter.

6. Relates to the chrism orders that what remains of the old chrism shall be burned when the new is consecrated; directs that priests shall be bound to fetch the chrism for their churches every year from their bishops before Easter; forbids to use any other than the new chrism, under the heaviest penalties.

7. Orders that the consecrated host be kept in a fair pyx, within a tabernacle; that a fresh host be consecrated every Lord's day; that it be carried to the sick by a priest in surplice and stole, a lantern being carried before and a bell sounded, that the people may “make humble adoration wheresoever the King of Glory is carried under the cover of bread.”

8. Declares the custom of praying for the dead to be “holy and wholesome;” and ordains that upon the death of any bishop of the province of Canterbury his surviving brethren shall perform a solemn office for the dead, both singly in their chapels, and together, when called to assemble in council or otherwise, after the death of the said bishop; orders, farther, every priest to say one mass for the soul of his deceased diocesan, and entreats all exempt religious priests and seculars to do likewise.

9. Relates to the preaching of indulgences, and orders caution in so doing, “lest the keys of the Church be despised.”

10. Forbids to set free, or admit to purgation, on slight grounds, clerks who, having been put in prison for their crimes, are delivered to the Church as convicts.

11. Enjoins that care be taken to preserve the chastity of friars and nuns; forbids them to sojourn long in the houses of their parents and friends.

12. Forbids parishioners to dispose of the grass, trees, or roots growing in consecrated ground; leaves such produce at the disposal of the rectors; forbids the latter, without sufficient cause, to spoil or grub up such trees as are an ornament to the churchyards and places thereabouts.

Then follows (in some copies) an injunction that the clergy of each diocese should send at least two deputies to the next congregation, to treat with the bishops for the common interests of the Church of England. This injunction, however, is by some persons said to be not genuine. In this same council a deed protecting the liberties of the scholars at Oxford was drawn up, in which the archbishop declared that, “moved by their devout prayers, he received under his protection their persons and property, and  confirmed to them and their successors the liberties and immunities granted to them by bishops, kings, and others of the faithful;” it is also provided that sentences of suspension and excommunication passed by the chancellor, or his deputies, etc., upon men on account of offences committed by them in the university shall be put into execution throughout the province of Canterbury; further, it is ordered that the benefices of clerks found in arms by day or night, to the disturbance of the peace of the university, shall be sequestered for three years; and if the clerks so offending be unbeneficed, they shall be incapable of holding any benefice for five years, unless they shall make competent satisfaction in the interim.

Thirteen prelates attended this council, viz. the archbishop, and the bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury, Winchester, Exeter, Chichester, Worcester, Bath, Llandaff, Hereford, Norwich, Bangor, and Rochester. — Johnson, Eccle. Canons; Labbd, Concil. 11:1062; Wilkins, Concil. ii, 33.

## Reading, John[[@Headword:Reading, John]]

             an English theologian, was born in 1588, in the county of Buckingham. He was curate at Dover, and afterwards chaplain of Charles I, but he manifested so much zeal in defending the cause of the king that in 1642 he was cast into prison, where he remained seventeen months. Archbishop Laud having conferred upon him, during his detention at the Tower, the parish of Chatham and a prebend at Canterbury, the king would not allow him to take possession of either of these benefices; and he even had a new imprisonment to undergo. When in 1660 Charles II landed at Dover, it was Ieading who was first congratulated, upon his return, on the renown of the city. We have several religious works written by Reading, among others, A Guide to the Holy City (Oxford, 1651, 4to): — An Antidote to Anabaptism (1654, 4to); also several sermons. Reading died Oct. 26, 1667, at Chatham, Kent. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Reading, Oriental Mode Of[[@Headword:Reading, Oriental Mode Of]]

             (Heb. קָרָא, to call aloud; ἀναγινώσκω). Mr. Jowett remarks, in his Christian Researches in Syria, etc., that “when persons are reading privately in a book, they usually go on reading aloud with a kind of singing voice, moving their heads and bodies in time, and making a monotonous cadence at regular intervals, thus giving emphasis, although not such an  emphasis as would please an English ear. Very often they seem to read without perceiving the sense, and to be pleased with themselves merely because they can go through the mechanical art of reading in any way.” This practice may enable us to “understand how it was that Philip should hear at what passage in Isaiah the Ethiopian eunuch was reading before he was invited to come up and sit with him in the chariot (Act 8:30-31). The eunuch, though probably reading to himself, and not particularly designing to be heard by his attendants, would read loud enough to be understood by a person at some distance.” SEE BOOK.

## Reading, William[[@Headword:Reading, William]]

             an Anglican divine, flourished in the early opening of last century as keeper of the Library of Sion College, London. He prepared an edition of the early ecclesiastical historians (Eusebius, etc.) in Greek and Latin, with notes (Cantab. 1720, 3 vols.). He also wrote, Sermons (1714, 8vo): —Hist. of Jesus Christ (Lond. 1716, 12mo; 1851, 32mo; 1852, 32mo): — Sermons — Mortfication, Holiness, etc. (1724, 8vo): — Bibliothecoe Cleri Londinensis in Collegio Sionesi Catalogus Duplici Formas concinnatus (1724, fol.): — Sermons Preached out of the First Lessons of Every Sunday in the Year, with an Appendix of Six Sermons (4 vols. 8vo-i, ii, 1728; 3:4:1730; 1755, 4 vols. 8vo); very rare; commended by D'Oyle and Maret in their Commentary on the Bible: — Sermons (1731, 8vo): — Tracts on Government (1739, 8vo).

## Reading-desk[[@Headword:Reading-desk]]

             the desk or pew from which the minister reads the morning and evening prayer. In the early part of the reign of Edward VI it was the custom of the minister to perform divine service at the upper end of the choir, near the communion-table; towards which, whether standing or kneeling, he always turned his face in the prayers. This being objected to, a new rubric was introduced (in the fifth year of king Edward), directing the minister to turn so that the people might best hear. In some churches, however, the too great distance of the chancel from the body of the church hindered the minister from being distinctly heard by the people; therefore the bishops, at the solicitation of the clergy, allowed them in several places to supersede their former practice, and to have desks or reading-pews in the body of the church; which dispensation, begun at first by some few ordinaries, grew by degrees to be more general, till at last it came to be a universal practice; insomuch that the Convocation, in the beginning of the reign of James I, ordered that in every church there should be a “convenient seat made for the minister to read service in.” It is remarkable that the reading-desk is only once recognised in the Prayer-book, viz. in the rubric prefixed to the Commination; and also that the rubric prefixed to the Communion office supposes the continuance of the old practice of reading the service in the choir or chancel. SEE AMBO; SEE LECTERN.

## Reading-in[[@Headword:Reading-in]]

             a form required of each incumbent on taking possession of his cure in the Church of England. The minute of the procedure is as follows:

“ Memoroandum, That on Sunday, the — day of in the year of our Lord, the reverend A B, clerk, rector, or vicar of —, in the county of — and diocese of —, did read in this church of — aforesaid the articles of religion commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, agreed upon in Convocation in the year of our Lord 1562, and did declare his unfeigned assent and consent thereto; also, that he did publicly and openly, on the day and year aforesaid, in the tine of divine seil vice, read a declaration in the following mwords, viz. ‘I, A B, declare that I will conform to the liturgy of the United Church of England and Ireland as it is now by law established.' Together with a certificate nnder the right hand of the reverend —, by divine permission lord bishop of —, of his having made and subscribed the same before him; and also that the said A B did read in his parish church aforesaid, publicly and solemnly, the morning and evening prayer, according to the form prescribed in and by the book intituled the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the Use of the Church of England; together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons; and that immediately after reading the evening service, the said A B did openly and publicly, before the congregation there assembled, declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all things therein contained and prescribed, in these words, viz. ‘I, A B, do declare my unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained and prescribed in and by the book intitled the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church; according to the Use of the Church of England, together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, printed as they are to be sung or said in Churches, and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating Bishops, Priests, and Deacons.' And these things we promise to testify upon our corporal oaths, if at any time we should be duly called upon so to do. In witness whereof we have hereunto set our hands, the day and year first above written.”

## Readings, Various[[@Headword:Readings, Various]]

             SEE VARIOUS READINGS.

## Reaia[[@Headword:Reaia]]

             (1Ch 5:5). SEE REAIAH.

## Reaiah[[@Headword:Reaiah]]

             (Heb. Reayah', רְאָיָה, seen of Jehovah), the name of three Hebrews.

1. (Sept. ῾Ράδα v. r. ῾Ρεϊά) A “son” of Shobal son of Judah (1Ch 4:2). B.C. post 1658. He is apparently designated by the epithet Haroeh (הָרֹאֶה, ha-Roeh, the seer; Sept. Α᾿ραά, Vulg. qui videbat; evidently a mere corruption of Reaiah). SEE SHOBAL.

2. (Sept. ῾Ρηχά) The son of Micah and father of Baal, apparently phylarchs of the tribe of Reulben not long before the invasion of Tiglath-Pileser (1Ch 5:5, A.V. “Reaia”). B.C. ante 720.

3. (Sept.' ῾Ραϊά v. r. ῾Ρααϊά, etc.) One of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:47; Neh 7:50). B.C. ante 536.

## Real Presence[[@Headword:Real Presence]]

             in the eucharist, is a doctrine forming an article in the belief of the Roman, the Greek, and other Eastern churches, and of some bodies or individuals in other Christian communions. Those who espouse the real presence in the eucharist hold that, under the appearance of the eucharistic bread and wine, after consecration by the minister, Christ himself is really and substantially present, body and blood, soul and divinity. The word really is used in opposition to “figuratively;” and the decree of the Council of Trent, which is the authoritative expositor of the Roman Catholic belief, conjoins with that word the terms “truly” and “substantially,” the former being used in order to exclude the notion of a barely typical representation, such as is recognisable in the Paschal Lamb and the other Messianic types of the old law; and the latter for the purpose of meeting the view ascribed to Calvin, that Christ, as apprehended by the faith of the believer, was, for such believer, rendered virtually present in the eucharist, and that his body and blood were received in virtue and efficacy, although not in corporal substance. SEE LORDS SUPPER.

In the Protestant churches of the Reformation, this question became a matter of serious conflict between Lutherans and Zwinglians. The belief of the Roman and Eastern churches as to the reality of the presence was shared by Luther, who, however, differed from Catholics as to the mode. One school of divines in the Anglican Church, whose doctrine became very  prominent in the time of Laud, and has been revived in the late Tractarian movement, also hold to transubstantiation in such a forbidding form to the Protestants as to stand entirely alone within the fold of Protestantism. Yet it must be remarked that between Roman Catholics and all other theological schools, of whatever class, one marked difference exists. According to the former, the presence of Christ in the consecrated eucharist is permanent; so that he is believed to be present not alone for the communicant who receives the eucharist during the time of his communion, but also remains present in the consecrated hosts reserved after communion. On the contrary, all the Lutherans, and almost all Anglicans, confine their belief of the presence to the time of communion, and all, with hardly an exception, repudiate the worship of the reserved elements, as it is practiced by Catholics. SEE CONSUBSTANTIATION; SEE LUTHERANISM.

In the Protestant Episcopal Church, while the “real presence” is undoubtedly held, yet it is considered as of a spiritual and heavenly character. The homily on the sacrament expressly asserts, “Thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but the communion of the body and blood of the Lord in a marvellous incorporation, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful,” etc. In the Office of the Communion, the elements are repeatedly designated as the body and blood of Christ; and after their reception we give thanks that God “doth vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, withl the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of [his] Son our Saviour Jesus Christ.” The Catechism, in agreement with this, defines the “inward part” of this sacrament to be “the body and blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's supper.” The 28th Article asserts, respecting the eucharist, that “to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the body of Christ; and, likewise, the cup of blessing is a partaking of the blood of Christ.” “By maintaining this view,” says Stoughton, “the Church supports the dignity of this holy sacrament without involving the dogma of transubstantiation, which she everywhere repudiates, asserting that it cannot be proved by Holy Writ, but it is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament. and hath given occasion to many superstitions.” Instead of this-i.e. a corporal presence by the  change of the elements into tie natural body and blood of Christ-she goes on to assert that “the body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the supper only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten inll the supper is faith” (Article XXVIII). See Waterland, Works, vol. vi; Willet, Syn. Pap.; Wheatley, Commone Prayer; Hooker, Ch. Polity; North Brit. Rev. Jan. 1870, p. 272. SEE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

## Realino, Bernardino[[@Headword:Realino, Bernardino]]

             an Italian Jesuit scholar, was born Dec. 1, 1530, at Carpi. Son of a gentleman in the service of Luigi di Gonzaga, he received an excellent education at Modena, and graduated at Bologna. He studied jurisprudence, and made himself known by a commentary upon the Nuptials of Thetis and Peleus of Catullus (Bologna, 1551, 4to), wlien one of his parents began an unjust lawsuit to take away part of his fortune. The affair lasted a long time, and was finally left to the verdict of an arbitrator, who hastened to decide against Realino without even hearing him. About the time of the encounter at Carpi, this arbitrator addressed him in very strong terms, and, in great wrath, Realino gave him a sword-cut in the face. Condemned for this bold action, the young man fled to Bologna. Made doctor of law in 1556, he obtained in the same year the office of magistrate of Felizzano, a borough of Milan; after this he became attorney of Alessandria; then the marquis of Peschiera gave him control of the vast domains which he possessed in the kingdom of Naples. At the age of thirty-four he grew weary of the world, arranged his affairs, and entered, at Naples, the Society of Jesus (1564). He there distinguished himself by a zeal, a patience, and a charity for the poor in which he was always consistent. Having received, in 1574, the order to lay the foundation of a college at Lecce, he did it just before his death. An inquiry was started to establish his rights to canonization, but the court of Rome refused the application. Realino composed quite a number of small books, mentioned by Sotwel; his notes upon ancient authors have been inserted in vol. ii of the Thesaurus Criticus of Gruter. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Realism[[@Headword:Realism]]

             is a distinct and readily apprehended doctrine in the higher ranges of metaphysics, characterizing the whole scheme of speculation with which it may be associated. A Realist is one who maintains this doctrine. Realism  asserts that General Terms, or Ideas, as they are called by Plato, such as Man, Horse, Plant, have a substantive, or real, existence independent of their actual and individual manifestations. This dogma early encountered opposition, which became so violent in the 12th and ensuing centuries as to distract philosophy, and to excite controversies that disturbed creeds and kingdoms, and that still survive, though in disguised forms and with greatly diminished virulence. The war of words frequently proceeded to blows and slaughter. Excommunication often attended the less popular side. Tracts, pamphlets, and formidable volumes were sustained or resisted with carnal and sanguinary weapons. Communities were divided by the bitter logomachy into hostile factions. The Church swarmed with discords. Universities were arrayed against each other, or were torn by intestine dissensions. Cities were opposed to cities; states to states; one religious order to another; and the conflict between the temporal and spiritual sovereignty was exacerbated and widened by the metaphysical strife. Brucker, and multitudes less cognizant than he of the influence of metaphysical conclusions on the condition and conduct of governments and societies, have superciliously sneered at these envenomed and long- enduring contentions, as merely the blind sophistries of men bewildered by vain abstractions or futile fantasies. But a philosophical problem which has remained unsolved for thousands of years, which engrossed and embattled the most acute intellects for centuries, and which has not yet ceased to produce perplexity and division; which enlisted the zeal alike of the scholar and the people, the priest and the prince, can be regarded as frivolous only by those who fail to discern the intellectual forces and associations by which the progress of the world is moulded. Sir William Hamilton, indeed, doubts the continued existence of any Realist doctrine, and regards it “as curious only in a historical point of view;” but this opinion apparently results from inattention to the transformations which speculative tenets undergo, and to the vitality of old doctrines through the instrumentality of new disguises. There is a true metempsychosis of metaphysical questions:

“Nec manet nt fuerat, nec formas seivat easdem,

Sed tamen ipsa eaden est: aaniam sic sc emper candem

Esse, sed in varias dooceo misaree figuras.”

Sir William Hamilton's scant notices of Realism and Nominalism are ingenious, subtle, delicate, but they want compass, completeness, and depth.  Twin-born with Realism was Nominalism (q.v.), its direct opposite, which strenuously denies the reality of General Terms, and maintains that they are names only, logical entities, convenient artifices of expression (nomidna mera, voces nudce, flatus vocis, articulated air, “vox et praeterea nihil”). Springing, as these antagonist views do, from the weakness of the human mind, which is unable to comprehend the primordial origin of being, and which is inevitably inclined to consider its imperfect knowledge complete and conclusive, the opposition began with the beginning of systematic speculation, accompanied its development, and acquired predominance in the ages characterized by dialectical earnestness and verbal precision. The contradictory tenets were upheld by rival sects of Hindui philosophers; they produced a wide severance of opinion in the brightest aera of Greek philosophy; they remained irreconcilable, though at times indistinct, in the schools of Alexandria: they burst out into clamorous fury in the Middle Ages, when the loftiest intellects were employed in laying the foundations of systematic theology and of orthodox expression.

Between the extreme and contradictory schemes of Realism and Nominalism was interposed, chiefly by the keen perspicacity of Abelard, but in accordance with the probable views of Aristotle. a doctrine of compromise which has been designated Conceptualism. The Conceptualist theory holds that General Notions, or Universals, have a real existence in individuals, but no real or substantial being without them. It recognises their positive existence in the mind, which derives them by abstraction and generalization from particulars, and employs them as the signs or names of the classes of concrete realities to which they are applicable. The Realist doctrine is that, before Socrates, Plato, and Phedo, or any other individual men existed, Man, as an abstract idea, had an essential and immutable reality, and that Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo were men solely in consequence of possessing this ideal manhood — κατά μέθεξιν. The Nominalist, on the other hand, alleged that humanitv existed only in Socrates, Plato, Phaedo, and other individuals; that the term was only an intellectual device for indicating the common properties characteristic of Socrates, Plato, and Phaedo by giving them the general name Man, and thus embracing them in one class. The Conceptualist agreed with the Nominalist in refusing anl absolute existence to the general term Man, and in assigning to it a real existence only in conjunction with Socrates, Plato, Phnedo, etc., but he endeavored to satisfy the demands of the Realist by admitting that the conception Man, attained by abstraction and  generalization from individuals, had an actual existence, and was an intelligible reality in the mind apprehending it. Thus Abelard was antagonist at once to William of Champeaux and to Roscellinus. Employing the quaint but precise language of the schoolmen, the idealists held universalia esse ante rem; the Nominalists, universalia esse post rem; the Conceptualists of various types, universalia esse in rem. To the last should be added et etiam in intellectu. These distinctions may appear shadowy and impalpable, but metaphysics dwells amid such “airy shapes,” and these have had a marked influence and serious consequences in politics, law, morals, philosophy, and religion: “inclusas animas, superumque ad lumen ituras.”

Nominalism has already met with due consideration. SEE NOMINALISM. The present notice will consequentlv be confined to Realism, except so far as Nominalism and Conceptualism may be inextricably entwined with it.

I. Origin of Realism. — It would be misplaced industry, and inconsistent with the brevity required here, to investigate the Realist doctrines which were entertained and developed in the philosophy of the Hindus. But the mediaeval dogma is so intimately connected with the tenor of Greek speculation that a reference to its remote source in the schools of Athens cannot be avoided. The controversy between Realism and Nominalism did not become predominant in speculation till the close of the 11th century, but the antagonism was distinctly declared from the times of Plato and Aristotle. The wide differences which separated the schemes of the great teacher and his greater pupil in their explanation of the intelligible universe (mundus intelligibilis) were plainly manifest to the successors of those great heresiarchs. The doctrine of Plato and the earnest opposition of Aristotle may be best appreciated by the careful consideration of the multitudinous passages in the text of Aristotle referred to in the index of Bonlitz (Aristotelis Opera [ed. Acad. Berolin.], vol. iv) under the head of “Plato, 2.” Evidences not merely of the continued antagonism of the Academic and Peripatetic schools, but also of the recognition of the gravity and the consequences of this antagonism, are abundant in the subsequent ages. It may suffice to refer to Plotinus (Emnnead. III, 9:1; V, v, 1; IX, 3:10), to a passage in Porphyry, which will soon require to be cited, and to Hesychius Milesius (Fr. 7, ii, 53, Fragm. Histor. Grasc. 4:173), who has stated clearly and precisely the Platonic thesis (῎Εστυ δὲ τῶν εἰδῶν ž ν ἕκαστον αϊvδιόν τε καὶ νόημα καὶ πρὸς τούτοις ἀπαθές. Διὸ καί φησιν ἐν τῇ φύσει τὰς ἰδεάς ἐστάναι καθάπερ παραδείγματα, τὰ δ᾿ ἄλλἀ ταύταις ἐοικέναι, τούτων ὁμοιώματα καθεστῶτα). But the  divergence of the schools in regard to Universals, or genera generalissima, and to abstract notions generally, remained an indeterminate disputation in the Hellenic world, and was not raised to supreme importance till it passed, in the mediaeval period, from transcendental ontology to dialectics and theology. The germ of the grand debate is found in one of the associates of the Neo-Platonic schools, but it scarcely vegetated till the scholastic period. Porphyry had said, in his introduction to the Categories of Aristotle (Schol. Aristot. ap. Aristot. Opera [ed. Acad. Berlin.], 3:1), that he would abstain from the more recondite inquiries, and aim only at a concise presentation of the simpler topics. “For,” he proceeds, “I will decline to speak of the essential character of genera and species, or to inquire whether they are substantially corporeal or incorporeal, and whether they are separable or existent only in perception, since this is a most profound investigation, and requires other and deeper examination.”

The Greek of Porphyry was almost entirely unknown to mediseval speculators, but the Latin paraphrase of Boethius was familiar to them, and constituted, as it were, a text-book of elementary logic. Thus the question of the nature of Universals was distinctly raised, and the opposite views which were entertained on the subject divided reasoners into hostile camps, and led to those passionate controversies which have been already alluded to. It was only gradually, however, that the opposition became clear and well marked, and connected itself closely with the gravest interests that have occupied the minds of men. In the first half of the 9th century, Rabanus Mnaurus, commenting on the text of Porphyry just quoted, but using the version of Boethius, recognises the conflict of opinion (Cousin, Introd. aux OEuvres Inedits d'Abelard, p. 77), and is supposed to have inclined to the Nominalistic side (Caraman, Hist. des Rev. de lac Philosophie, i, 249). It would probably be more correct to conclude that he sought a ground of conciliation between the two extremes. The difficult problem was, however, brought forward into distinct contemplation. If there was any tendency in Rabanus Maurus to what was atterwards known as Nominalism, the reaction showed itself promptly. In the next generation, the philosophy of Johannes Scotus Erigena, which was founded on an imperfect acquaintance with the Neo- Platonic teachings, ran into decided Pantheism, in accordance with the results of those teachings, as developed by Plotinus. Regarding God as the source whence all things proceed, by which all things are sustained, and to which all things return — representing creation as the self-evolution of the Creator, and destruction as the self-reabsorption, he rendered God all  things and all things God. The basis of his whole scheme was involved in the Platonic theory of ideas, SEE PLATONIC PHILOSOPHY, and in the Realist tenet universallia ante rem. Not merely were the body and spirit of Scotus's philosophy heterodox, but it contained several particular conclusions which were deemed heretical, and which provoked the ecclesiastical censure which thev received.

The Pantheistic doctrines of Scotus Erigena naturally excited opposition when the results to which they led became apparent. If God wrere all things, then necessarily all things would be essentially God — being the external and phenomenal manifestations of the divine activity, and constituting, at the same time, the divine essence, inasmuch as their whole support was a real existence in the divine substance. It is the inevitable tendency of a metaphysical dogma to be unfolded by its acolytes into its ultimate logical consequences, which reveal the extravagances and the hazards of the position. It is the inevitable tendency of such revelation to arouse antagonism, and to suggest security in the opposite extreme. By such oscillation between contradictory tenets, the humnan intellect is kept from stagnation, and research and meditation are constantly stimulated. The Pantheism of Scotus Erigena annihilated independent individual existence and individual responsibility; and it obliterated the distinction between the Creator and the creation. The refutation of his errors was sought in the cxamination and denial of his premises, as well as in the repudiation of his conclusions. His views had been founded on the supposititious writings of Dionysius the Areopagite, which wrere steeped in Neo-Platonism (q.v.). Their antidote was expected from the school of Aristotle, whose logical opinions were gradually disseminated throughout Western Europe, through, Saracenic and Jewish channels, and which had been partially known throutgh Boethius during nearly all mediaeval times.

But the latter part of the 9th, the whole of the 10th, and most of the 11th century were eminently unfavorable to diligent study and tranquil speculation. It was the period of Arab ravage and encroachment in the Eastern Empire; the period of the ruthless descents of Danes and Northmen in the Western; the period when the reigning dynasties of France and England were changed; when Italy was distracted by invasions and by wars between contending emperors; and when the fierce strife between the secular and spiritual authority became peculiarly acrimonious. As the result of these wide-spread disturbances. discord and anarchy, lawlessness and rapine, general wretchedness and insecurity prevailed. Two centuries thus  elapsed before the great question of Universals distinctly emerged out of the earlier discordances of opinion. Towards their conclusion, a purely theological question had arisen, which recalled eager inquiry into the nature of Universals. This was the denial of transubstantiation by Berengarius on grounds which implied Nominalism.

About the same time, the doctrine of Nominalism was explicitly asserted by Roscellinus, a canon of Compiegne. He has been usually regarded as the founder of the sect, but may have been preceded by his master, Johannes Surdus (John the Deaf), of whom very little is known. Roscellinus held that ‘“geenerat and species are not realities, but only words denoting, abstractions;” that, consequently, “there are no such things as universals, but only individuals.” Realism is thus directly contradicted. These speculations pointed towards dalngerous heresies in theology. Roscellinus, denying all but individual existences, assailed the unity of persons in the Trinity, and thus maintained Tritheism. The Church was at once aroused. Numerous confutations were propounded, the most celebrated of which was the tractate of Anselm, archbishop of Canterbury, De Fide Trinitatis. Anselm holds the Realist doctrine of Universals, and is occasionally betrayed into extravagance. His polemics is, however, theological rather than dialectical or metaphysical. He attacks perilous errors in religious beliet; and assails speculative opinions only incidentally. Remusat, while considering him a decided Realist, deems that his prominence in the controversy between Realism and Nominalism has been exaggerated (Remusat, St. Anselme, pt. ii, ch. 3:p. 494). Efforts were made to reconcile the conflict between the discordant doctrines. but they only rendered the issue and the antagonism more pronounced. William de Champeaux (De Campbellis) held that “the Universal or genus is something real; the individuals composing the genus have no diversity of essence, but only of accidental elements.” This is the first precise asseveration of Realism in medineval philosophy. With William de Champeaux the essence of things is ascribed to the genera, the individual is reduced to a simple accident. With Roscellinus, the individuals alone exist, and they constitute the essence of things. With Champeaux, the essence of things is in the genera to which they belong, for so far as they are individuals they are only accidents” (Caraman, Hist. des Rev. de la Philippians vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 48).

Thenceforward the great controversy proceeds with increasing ardor, and furnishes the battle-field for the rival schools and rival schoolmen of the Middle Ages. The further consideration of these dissensions belongs,  however, more appropriately to the discussion of the development of scholasticism. SEE SCHOLASTICISM.

II. Nature of Realism. — The general character of Realism has been exhibited sufficiently to render its origin and evolution intelligible. A fuller explanation is needed to enable us to understand the importance which it assumed in medineval speculation. Cicero has said that “there is nothing so absurd as not to have been maintained by some of the philosophers.” It is easier to ridicule than to appreciate the reveries of philosophy. The aberrations of metaphysics and the paradoxes of dialectics are only the zealous and inadequate expression of far-reaching truths imperfectly apprehended. We certainly should not complain of either the excesses or the blindness of the schoolmen, in an age which is inclined to accept protoplasm as a sufficient explanation of all life, and evolution as a complete exposition of creation, or a substitute for it. Yet, even in these cases, much is charged upon the hierophants which they do not accept as part of their doctrines. Realism was the mediaeval and dialectical reproduction of the Platonic ideas. It asserted that general terms, such as Man, Horse, Tree, Flower, etc., were not merely logical devices, creatures of abstraction, ingenuities of language, but were realities, separable (χωριστά) from the being of individual men, horses, trees, flowers, etc. In Plato and the Platonic school these ideas were supposed to have a real, primordial, changeless, and eternal existence in the Divine Mind, as the archetypes of all things that are made. It demands no extraordinary range of intellect to point out the presumption of attempting to determine the contents of the Divine Mind and the modes of its procedure in ordering the creation.

It needs no great intellectual effort to dilate upon the practical incongruities of representing Socrates as a transitory accident; having no real existence except so far as he partakes of the one, universal, ideal Man, who is immortal, incorporeal, immaterial, and unchangeable; communicated and communicable to all men, past, present, and fuiture; completely contained in each, yet abundant for all, and independent of each and of all. These objections blink or evade the subtleties of the problem. These sneers do not reach the difficulty with which the greatest philosophers have struggled, and struggled in vain. No doubt our knowledge of generatls and specials is attained (so far as the human mind is capable of ascertaining the process of attaining knowledge) by abstraction from individual things observed, and by recombination of their accordant characteristics. No doubt the abstract terms, so arrived at, are  the instruments of linguistic and logical classification, which we employ unsuspiciously in reasoning and conversation. But is this all? Is this a complete solution of the enigma? Is it not a mere screen which conceals the real enigma from us? There is a general, not an individual, resemblance between all men — homo simillimus honzini — nihil similius hominii quam homo. They are alike in consequence of their participation in a common humanity.

Our knowledge of this humanity may be — must be — derived by generalization from the common characteristics of all men. But, again, it should be asked, Is this all? Does our knowledge precede or follow this possession of a common humanity? Does it do anything more than recognise its presence? How does the common humanity come into existence? How does it continue in existence? How is it to be interpreted? Is there no plan or order in creation? No eternal design in the purposes of the Creator? Is everything spasmodical, momentary creation, with observance of antecedent forms? Whence, then, such observance, and the maintenance of uniformity, and all the characteristics of preordination? How does it occur that the earth proceeds ever to “bring forth the living creature after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind,” if the several kinds and genera and species are mere abstractions, pure figments of the generalizing faculty? Did this unvarying observance of the type arise, without any reality of the type, by the accidental collision of atoms in all the infinite variety of their hypothetical contacts, and by survival of the fittest, through self-adaptation to their shifting surroundings? No permanent forms, transmitted from generation to generation, from age to age, could thus be maintained. The unmitigated repudiation of Realism leads straight to the acceptance of the creed of Lucretius and Darwin and Herbert Spencer.

Nam certe neque consilio Primordia rerum Ordini se quaeque, atque sagaci menite locarnnt: Nec quos qneque darent motus pelpise e ilrofecto; Sed qnia mnulltimnodis, mnultis, mutatal, per Omne Ex infillito vexantur percita plagis, Omne genus motus, et coetus experinmlo, Tandem devenient in taleis dispositnras, Qualibus hec rebus consistit summa cieata; Et multos etiam magnos servata per mannos, Ut semel in motus conjecta ‘st convenieuteis.”  The answer of the Epicurean herd will not solve the riddles proposed. Realism offered a very different solution, which, however inadequate and unsatisfactory it may be deemed, did not affect to treat the questions as shallow or unimportant. But may there not be some genuine truth, obscured, disguised, mutilated, lame, yet, nevertheless, struggling into meaning, in the theory of Realism? Is there not a plan, a divine order, throughout all creation? Are there not types — intelligible, potential, not actual types — to be accounted for? Has a conception of the reason — never varying, but persisting as long as the reason and the objects of reason endure — has such a conception a less real existence than the concrete and material, or individual forms which correspond to the conception, but which are changing at all times during their existence, and are born to perish? The existence is of very different character, but is it less truly existence? The ambiguity and vagueness of their terms may not hiave been recognised by the mediaeval Idealists and Idealists. Are they always clearly apprehended by their critics? Have the censors of Realism filly appreciated the incomprehensibility and variability of the Realist doctrine without loss of its distinctive character and without sacrifice of its essential tenet? Doubtless the theory of Realism was indistinct, not rigorously determined, and scarcely palpable. Doubtless the modes of its statement were obnoxious to grave exceptions, and led to misapprehensions and misconceptions on the part even of its advocates. The subjects with which the theory dealt may very well lie beyond any determinate grasp of the human faculties. But an earnest effort was made to interpret the great mysteries of existence — the permanence of type, with the variability and fragility of all embodiments of the type. This world may be “all a fleeting show, for man's illusion given;” but is there nothing unseen behind it which is true, and which furnishes its unalterable patterns? There is some justification, or at least some elucidation, of the thesis of the Realists to be deduced from the conclusions of comparative anatomy. Aristotle taught that the skeletons of the beast, the bird, and the fish revealed a common type, with characteristic deviations (De Part. Animal.). Six centuries later, Lactantius, or the Pseudo-Lactantius, reproduced the same tenet in a remarkable passage: “Una dispositio, et unus habitus, innumerabiles imaginis proeferat varietates” (De Opific. Dei, c. vii). In our own day, the distinguished comparative anatomist Owen has demonstrated the validity of the conjecture of Aristotle by his work On the Achetypal Skeleton of Vertebrate Animals; and Dr. M'Cosh has given, perhaps without full recognition of its import, a most instructive application of the principle in  his Typical Forms and Special Ends in Creation. Is there no truth, no validity, no reality in the types?

Is Realism, then, to be regarded as true? By no means. It only contains an element, an unsegregated element, of truth. It is a very important element, but it is dimly entertained and extravagantly expressed. Is its opposite, Nominalism, true? Again the answer must be, By no means. It contemplates only one side of the truth; runs into equal extravagance, and excludes utterly the indispensable particle of truth contained in the adverse doctrine. Is the truth attained by combining the antagonistic views? Not so. The two schemes cannot be united. and can scarcelv be reconciled, except by regarding them as imperfect expositions from opposite points of view. Moreover, two partial and fragmentary truths can never make the whole truth. Truth is a consistent. harmonious, organic whole. It can never be attained by dovetailing patches of truth, or by forming a mosaic.

Philosophy, in its development, is a series of erroneous and conflicting positions. One extreme provokes another extreme; but the conception of first principles. and the range of deductions from them, become enlarged and cleared with the progress and succession of errors, although the full and precise truth may never be reached.

The truth which seems to be involved in Realism is this: Universals, genera, species, represent the permanent forms of the intelligible creation. They attest a settled and regular order in the sensible universe. They reveal a preordained, or predetermined, plan in the several classes of existence; an enduring truth; an abiding uniformity in the midst of individual deviations and transitory manifestations; a design habitually fulfilled; types which subsist, though actualities vanish. A part, at least, of the error of Realism — for neither its whole truth nor its whole error can be distinctly grasped and perspicuously expressed — consisted in presenting these important conclusions in an exaggerated form, so that they contradicted the partial truth equally involved in Nominalism: that individuals have a real as well as an actual existence, and that the generic and specific terms which are habitually employed, and are indispensable in language, are modes of classifying our perceptions and conceptions, and are used altogether independently of any ulterior suggestions which may be implicated in them.

The Nominalist denied a metaphysical truth because it was not embraced within the sphere of his logical requiremnents. The Realist assailed the  logical truth because it failed to embrace an ontological explanation, and appeared to be at variance with it.

Bitter contradictions and acrimonious hostilities necessarily resulted from the antagonism, in consequence of the inevitable association of the conflicting doctrines with adverse parties and interests in theology, in Church and in State.

III. Literature. — The historians of philosophy, who embrace the philosophy of the Middle Ages, necessarily pay much attention to Realism and Nominalism. More special sources of information are, Caraman, Hist. des Revolutions de la Philosophie en Fransce; Baumgarten Crusius, De Vero Scholast. Retal. et Nominal. Discrimine (Jena, 1821); Cousin, Fragments Philosophiques (Paris, 1840); id. Introd. aux ouvres inedits d'Abelaurd; Exner, Nominatlismus und Reallismus (Prague, 1842); Kohler, Realismus and Nominualismuits in ihrem ifuss auf die dogmat. Syst. des Mittelalt. (Gotha, 1857); Hautreau, Philosophie Scolastique (Paris, 1858); Cupely, Espirit de la Philosophie Scolastique (ibid. 1868). Much valuable suggestion may also be obtained from Rdmusat, Abelard (ibid. 1845, 2 vols.); id. St. Anselme (ibid. 1853). To these may be added, Emerson, Realism and Nominalism. (G. F. H.)

## Reanointers[[@Headword:Reanointers]]

             is the name of a Russian sect, which dates from about the year 1770. They do not rebaptize those who join them from the Greek Church, but they insist upon their having the chrism again administered to them. They are said to be especially numerous in Moscow. SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.

## Reaping[[@Headword:Reaping]]

             ( קָצִרkts, ts, to cult if; θερίζω). Reaping in Palestine was usually done by the sickle, to which reference is occasionally made in Scripture. SEE SICKLE. But there can be little doubt that the modern practice of pulling up by the roots, instead of cutting the corn, also prevailed to a considerable extent in ancient times. The corn seldom yields so much straw as in this country, and pulling is resorted to in order to obtain a larger supply of fodder. Maundrell thus describes the practice as he noticed it in 1697: “All that occurred to us new in these days' travel was a particular way used by  the country people in gathering their corn, it being now harvest-time. They plucked it up by handfuls from the roots, leaving the most fruitful fields as naked as if nothing had ever grown on them. This was their practice in all the places of the East that I have seen; and the reason is that they may lose none of their straw, which is generally very short, and necessary for the sustenance of their cattle, no hay being here made. I mention this,” he adds, “because it seems to give light to that expression of the Psa 129:6 ‘which withereth before it be plucked up,' where there seems to be a manifest allusion to the custom.” This undoubtedly is the correct mealning of the expression; and the real allusion is lost sight of by the rendering in the A.V., ‘before it groweth up.” It grows, but withers before the plucking- time comes — an emblem of the premature decay and fruitlessness of the wicked. SEE AGRICULTURE.

## Reason[[@Headword:Reason]]

             denotes that function of our intelligence which has reference to the attainment of a particular class of truths. We know a great many things by immediate or actual experience. Our senses tell us that we are thirsty, that we hear a sound, that we are affected by light. These facts are truths of sense or of immediate knowedge, and do not involve the reason. Reason comes into play when we know a thing not immediately, but by some indirect process; as when, from seeing a river unusually swollen, we believe that there have been heavy rains at its sources. Here the mere sense tells us only that the river is high. It is by certain transitions of thought, or by the employment of our thinlking powers, that we come to know the other circumstance — that in a remote part of the country there have been heavy rains.

In ascertaining these truths of reason or of inference, as they are called. there are various steps or operations, described ulnder (different names. Thus we have (1) Deduction, or Syllogism; (2) Induction; and( (3) Generalization of notions, of which Abstraction and Definition are various phases. These are well represented by their several designations. The nature of the function or faculty denominated Reason, or the Reasoning Faculty, can be explained by showing how it results from the fundamental powers of the intelligence.

There is anoter anand peculiar simgniication attached to the word reason, growing out of the philosophy of Kant (q.v.), which maintains a distinction between reason and understanding, the latter being that faculty called by  the Greeks νοῦς, and by Hamilton called the “Regulative Faculty.” See Fleming and Krauth, Vocab. of Philosophy, s.v.

## Reason, Use Of, In Religion[[@Headword:Reason, Use Of, In Religion]]

             The sublime, incomprehensible nature of some of the Christian doctrines has so completely subdued the understanding of many pious men as to make them think it presumptuous to apply reason in any way to the revelations of God; and the many instances in which the simplicity of truth has been corrupted by an alliance with philosophy confirm them in the belief that it is safer, as well as more respectable, to resign their minds to devout impressions than to exercise their understandings in any speculations upon sacred subjects. Enthusiasts and fanatics of all different names and sects agree in decrying the use of reason, because it is the very essence ot lanaticism to substitute, in place of the sober deductions of reason, the extravsaant fancies of a disordered imagination, and to consider these fancies as the immediate illumination of the Spirit of God. Insidious writers in the deistical controversy have pretended to adopt those sentiments of humility and reverence which are inseparable from true Christians, and even.that total subjection of reason to faith which characterizes enthusiasts. A pamphlet was published about the middle of the last century that made a noise in its day, although it is now forgotten, entitled Christianity not Founded on Argument, which, while to a careless reader it may seem to magnify the Gospel, does in reality tend to undermine our faith by separating it from a rational assent; and Mr. Hume, in the spirit of this pamphlet, concludes his Essay on Miracles with calling those dangerous friends or disguised enemies to the Christian religion who have undertaken to defend it by the principles of human real son. “Our most holy religion,” he says, with a disingenuity very unbecoming his respectable talents, ‘“founded on faith, not on reason;” and “mere reason is insufficient to convince us of its veracity.” The Church of Rome, in order to subject the minds of her votaries to her authority, has reprobated the use of reason in matters of religion. She has revived an ancient position, that things may be true in theology which are false in philosophy; and she has, in some instances, made the merit of faith to consist in the absurdity of that which was believed.

The extravagance of these positions has produced, since the teformation, an opposite extreme. While those who deny the truth of revelation consider reason as in all respects a sufficient guide, the Socinians, who admit that a  revelation has been made, employ reason as the supreme judge of its doctrines, and boldly strike out of their creed every article that is not altogether conformable to those notions whlich may be derived from the exercise of reason. These controversies concerning the use of reason in matters of religion are disputes. not about words, but about the essence of Christianity. But a few plain observations are sufficient to ascertain where the truth lies in this subject.

The first use of reason in matters of religion is to examine the evidences of revelation; for, the more entire the submission which we consider as due to everything that is revealed, we have the more need to be satisfied that any system which professes to be a divine revelation does really come from God. SEE FAITH AND REASON.

After the exercise of reason has established in our minds a firm belief that Christianity is of divine origin, the second use of reason is to learn what are the truths revealed. As these truths are not in our days communicated to any by immediate inspiration, the knowledge of them is to be acquired only from books transmitted to us with satisfying evidence that they were written above seventeen hundred years ago, in a remote country and foreign language, under the direction of the Spirit of God. In order to attain the meaning of these books, we must study the language in which they were written; and we must study, also, the manners of the times and the state of the countries in which the writers lived because these are circumstances to which an original author is often alluding, and by which his phraseology is generally affected; we must lay together different passages in which the same word or phrase occurs, because without this labor we cannot obtain its precise signification; and we must mark the difference of style and manner which characterizes different writers, because a right apprehension of their meaning often depends upon attention to this difference. All this supposes the application of grammar, history, geography, chronology, and criticism in matters of religionthat is, it supposes that the reason of man had been previously exercised in pursuing these different branches of knowleldge, and that our success in attaining the true sense of Scripture depends upon the diligence mwith which wne avail ourselves of the progress that has been made in them. It is obvious that every Christian is not capable of making this application. But this is no argument against the use of reason, of which we are now speaking; for they who use translations and commentaries rely only upon the reason of others instead of exercising their own. The several branches  of knowledge have been applied in every age by some persons for the benefit of others; and the progress in sacred criticism which distinguishes the present times is nothing else than the continued application, in elucidating the Scripture, of reason enlightened by every kind of subsidiary knowledge, and very much improved in this kind of exercise by the employment which the ancient classics have given it since the revival of letters.

After the two uses of reason that have been illustrated, a third comes to be mentioned, which may be considered as compounded of both. Reason is of eminent use in repelling the attacks of the adversaries of Christianity. When men of erudition, of philosophical acuteness, and of accomplished taste, direct their talents against our religion, the cause is very much hurt by an unslilful defender. He cannot unravel their sophistry; he does not see the amount and the effect of the concessions which he makes to them; he is bewildered by their quotations; and he is often led, by their artifice, upon dangerous ground. In all ages of the Church there have been weak defenders of Christianity; and tlhe only triumphs of the enemies of our religion have arisen from their being able to expose the defects of those methods of defending the truth which some of its advocates had unwarily chosen. A mind trained to accurate and philosophical views of the nature and the amount of evilence, enriched with historical knowledge, accustomed to throw out of a subject all that is minute and irrelative, to collect what is of importance within a short compass, and to form the comprehension of a whole, is the mind qualified to contend with the learning, the wit, and the sophistry of infidelity. Many such minds have appeared in this honorable controversy during the course of this and the last century; and the success has corresponded to the completeness of the furniture with which they engaged in the combat. The Christian doctrine has been vindicated bv their masterly exposition from various misrepresentations; the arguments for its divine original have been placed in their true light; and the attempts to confound the miracles and prophecies upon which Christianity rests its claim with the delusions of imposture have been effectually repelled. Christianity has in this way received the most important advantages from the attacks of its enemies; and it is not improbable that its doctrines would never have been so thoroughly cleared from all the corruptions and subtleties which had attached to them in the progress of ages, nor the evidences of its truths have been so accurately understood, nor its peculiar character been so  perfectly discriminated, had not the zeal and abilities which have been employed against it called forth in its defence some of the most distinguished masters of reason. They brought into the service of Christianity the same weapons which had been drawn for her destruction, and, wielding them with confidence and skill in a good cause, became the successful champions of the truth. SEE RATIONALISM.

The fourth use of reason consists in judging of the truths of religion. Everything which is revealed by God comes to his creatures from so hi'gh an authority that it may be rested in with perfect assurance as true. Nothing can be received by us as true which is contrary to the dictates of reason, because it is impossible ftor us to receive at the same time the truth and the falsehood of a proposition. But many things are true which we do not fully comprehend; and many propositions, which appear incredible when they are first enunciated, are found, upon examination, such as our understandings can readily admit. These principles embrace the whole of the subject, and they mark out the steps by which reason is to proceed in juidging of the truths of religion. We first examine the evidences of revelation. If these satisfy our understandings, we are certain that there can be no contradiction between the doctrines of this true religion and the dictates of right reason. If any such contradiction appear, there must be some mistake. By not makiung a proper use of our reason in the interpretation of the Gospel, we suppose that it contains doctrines which it does not teach; or we give the name of right reason to some narrow prejudices which deeper reflection and more enlarged knowledge will dissipate; or we consider a proposition as implying a contradiction, when, in truth, it is only imperfectly understood. Here, as in every other case, mistakes are to be corrected by measuring back our steps. We must examine closely and impartially the meaning of those passages which appear to contain the doctrine; we must compare them with one another; we must endeavor to derive light from the general phraseology of Scripture and the analogy of faith; and we shall generally be able, in this way, to separate the doctrine from all those adventitious circunmstances which give it the appearance of absurdity. If a doctrine which, upon the closest examination, appears unquestionably to be taught in Scripture, still does not approve itself to our understanding, we must consider carefully what it is that prevents us from receiving it. There may be preconceived notions hastily taken up which that doctrine opposes; there may be pride of ulnderstanding that does not readily submit to the views which it  communicates; or reason may need to be remindted that we must expect to find in religion many things which we are not able to comprehend. One of the most important offices of reason is to recognise her own limits. She never can be moved, by any authority, to receive as true what she perceives to be absurd. But if she has formed a just estimate of human knowledge, she will not shelter her presumption in rejecting the truths of revelation under the pretence of contradictions that do not really exist; she will readily admit that there may be in a subject some points Vwichi she knows, and others of which she is ignorant; she will not allow her ignorance of the latter to shake the evidence of the former, but will vield a firm assent to that which she does understand without presuming to deny what is beyond her comprehension. Thus, availing herself of all the light which she now has, she will wait in humble hope for the time when a larger measure shall be imparted.

## Reay, Stephen[[@Headword:Reay, Stephen]]

             an Anglican divine, was born at Montrose, New Brunswick, in 1782, was educated at St. Alban's Hall, Oxford, and was Laudlian professor of Arabic from 1840 till his death. He published, Observations on the Defence of the Church Missionary Society against the Objections of the Archdeacon of Balth, by Pileus Quadratus (1818, 8vo): — Naratio de. Josepho e Sacro Codice (1822): — Textus Hebraicus (Lond. 1822, 1840, 12mo).

## Reay, William[[@Headword:Reay, William]]

             an English divine of the Establishment, flourished near the middle of the 18th century. He was curate and lecturer of Wordsworth in 1755. He died in 1756. He published Sermons, with Preface by T. Church, D.D., prebend of St. Paul's (Lond. 1755, 8voj.

## Reba[[@Headword:Reba]]

             (Heb. id. רַבִעfour; Sept. ῾Ροβόκ in Numbers, ῾ροβέ in Josh.; Vulg. Iebe), one of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the children of Israel in their avenging expedition when Balaam fell (Num 31:8; Jos 13:21). B.C. 1858.

## Rebaptism[[@Headword:Rebaptism]]

             The ancient Church, if it did not openly declare against the repetition of baptism, certainly refused to rebaptize, and supported its position by  assigning, not one, but many reasons. It especially maintained that there is no example of rebaptization in Scripture; and as baptism succeeds to circumcision, which was the entrance and seal of the old covenant, and could not be repeated, so baptism, being the sign and seal of admission to the new covenant, the breaches of this covenant are not to be repaired by repeated baptisms. There were in the early Church some heretics who rebaptized, such as the Marcionites; but the Catholic Church disapproved of the practice. In one of Cyprian's epistles there is a question referred to Stephen, bishop of Rome, whether it was necessary to rebaptize heretics who sought admission to the Catholic Church; or whether it should be deemed sufficient, proceeding upon the acknowledged validity of their baptism, to receive them with the simple ceremony of imposition of hands and ecclesiastical benediction.

The Roman bishop acceded to the latter opinion. The African bishops, on the other hand, declared the baptism of heretics to be null and void, and would not recognise their confirmation at the hands of a Catholic bishop as sufficient for their reception into the Church. They demanded another baptism, to be followed by the usual confirmation, notwithstanding the Church of Rome persevered in maintaining that the baptism of heretics, provided only that it had been administered in due form, was valid and sufficient and ought not to be repeated. Farrar, Theol. Dict. s.v. In the modern Church rebaptism is practiced by the Romanists and the Anglicans. The latter deny the validity of other Protestant bodies if such oppose the divine right of apostolical succession. The Baptists, of course, recognise as valid only immersion, and not infrequently repeat this ordinance if it has been performed by persons known as Paedobaptists (q.v.). See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 364 sq.; Hofling, Lehre von der Talufe (Erlang. 1846). SEE ALSO ANABAPTISTS; SEE BAPTISM.

## Rebecca[[@Headword:Rebecca]]

             ( ῾Ρεβέκκα), the Graecized form (Rom 9:10) of the name REBEKAH (q.v.).

## Rebekah[[@Headword:Rebekah]]

             (Heb. Ribkah', רַבְקָה, a noose, i.e. ensnarer; Sept., New Test., and Josephus, ῾Ρεβέκκα), the daughter of Bethuel (Gen 22:23) and sister of Laban, married to Isaac, who stood in the relation of a first cousin to her father and to Lot. She is first presented to us in the account of the  mission of Eliezer to Padanaram (ch. 24), in which his interview with Rebekah, her consent and marriage, are related. B.C. 2023. The elder branch of the family remained at Haran when Abraham removed to the land of Canaan, and it is there that we first meet with Laban, as taking the leading part in the betrothal of his sister Rebekah to her cousin Isaac (24:10, 29-60; 27:43; 29:4). Bethuel, his father, plays so insignificant a part in the whole transaction, being in fact only mentioned once, and that after his son (24:50), that various conjectures have been formed to explain it. Josephus asserts that Bethuel was (lead, and that Laban was the head of the house and his sister's natural guardian (Ant. i, 16, 2), in which case “Bethuel” must have crept into the text inadvertently, or be supposed, with some (Adam Clarke, ad loc.), to be the name of another brother of Rebekah. Le Clerc (in Pent.) mentions the conjecture that Bethuel was absent at first, but returned in time to give his consent to the marriage. The mode adopted by Prof. Blunt (Undesigned Coincidences, p. 35) to explain what he terms “the consistent insignificance of Bethutel,” viz. that he was incapacitated from taking the management of his family by age or imbecility, is most ingenious; but the prominence of Laban may be sufficiently explained by the custom of the country, which then, as now (see Niebuhr, quoted by Rosenmuller, ad loc.), gave the brothers the main share in the arrangement of their sister's marriage and the defence of her honor (comp. Gen 34:13; Jdg 21:22 2Sa 13:20-29). SEE BETHUEL.

The whole chapter has been pointed out as uniting most of the circumstances of a pattern marriage — the sanction of parents, the guidance of God, the domestic occupation of Rebekah, her beauty, courteous kindness, willing consent and modesty, and success in retaining her husband's love. For nineteen years she was childless; then, after the prayers of Isaac and her journey to inquire of the Lord, Esau and Jacob were born; and, while the younger was more particularly the companion and favorite of his mother (Gen 25:19-28), the elder became a grief of mind to her (26:35). When Isaac was driven by a famine into the lawless country of the Philistines, Rebekah's beauty became, as was apprehended, a source of danger to her husband. But Abimelech was restrained by a sense of justice such as the conduct of his predecessor (ch. 20) in the case of Sarah would not lead Isaac to expect. It was probably a considerable time afterwards when Rebekah suggested the deceit that was practiced by Jacob on his blind father. She directed and aided him in carrying it out, foresaw the probable consequence of Esau's anger, and prevented it by moving Isaac to send Jacob away to Padan-aram (ch. 27) to her own  kindred (Gen 29:12). B.C. 1927. The Targum Pseudo-Jon. states (Gen 35:8) that the news of her death was brought to Jacob at Allon-bachuth. It has been conjectured that she died during his sojourn in Padan-aram; for her nurse appears to have left Isaac's dwelling and gone back to Padan-aram before that period (comp. Gen 24:59; Gen 25:8), and Rebekah is not mentioned when Jacob returns to his father, nor do we hear of her burial till it is incidentally mentioned by Jacob on his death-bed (Gen 49:31). Paul (Rom 9:10) refers to her as being made acquainted with the purpose of God regarding her children before thev were born. For comments on the whole history of Rebekah, see Origen, Hom. in Genesis 10, 12; Chrysostom, Hom. in Genesis, p. 48- 54. Rebekah's inquiry of God, and the answer given to her, are discussed by Deyling, Obser. Sac. i, 12, p. 53 sq., and in an essay by J. A. Schmid in Nov. Thes. Theol. -philolog. i, 188; also by Ebersbach (Helmst. 1712). The agreement of the description of Rebekah in Genesis 22 with modern Eastern customs and scenes is well noticed by Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 403. SEE ISAAC; SEE JACOB.

## Reber, Joel L[[@Headword:Reber, Joel L]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church. was born in Berks County, Pa., Nov. 8, 1816. He spent his youth on a farm, and afterwards learned the printing business. He pursued his studies in the college and seminarv at Mercersburg, Pa., from 1837 to 1842, and was ordained in May, 1843. He was pastor successively in Brush Valley, Centre County, Pa.; Jonestown, Lebanon County, Pa.; Millersville, Lancaster County, Pa.; Codorus, York County, Pa. He died Aug. 15, 1856. In 1850 Mr. Reber published a small work in German entitled An Earnest Word on the Sect-Spirit and Sect- Work, which passed through two editions. He also wrote much for the periodicals of the day in German and English, in both of which languages he was able to write with equal vigor and correctness. He was possessed of a strong, original mind. was an earnest and powerful preacher, and manifested a laborious, self-sacrificing spirit.

## Recanati, Menahem Di[[@Headword:Recanati, Menahem Di]]

             a Jewish writer, was born in Recanati (the ancient Recinetum) about 1290, and is the author of a commentary on the Pentateuch (על התורה פרוש), which is little else than a commentary on the Sohar. This commentary, which was first published by Jacob ben-Chajim in Bomberg's celebrated  printing establishment (Venice, 1523; then again ibid. 1545; and in Lublin, 1595), has been translated into Latin by the famous Pico della Mirandola. He also wrote ס הדינים, a treatise forensic, moral, and ceremonial (Bononia, 1538): — — טעמי המצות, an exposition of the precepts of the law (Constantinople, 1544). Besides these works, he wrote a number of others, which are still unpublished. See Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:135 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico (Germ. transl.), p. 275; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodlei. col. 1733-37.; Etheridge, Introd. to Hebr. Literature, p. 286; Ginsburg, Kabbalah, p. 118 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3:77. (B. P.)

## Reccard, Gotthelf Christian[[@Headword:Reccard, Gotthelf Christian]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Wernigerode, March 13, 1735, and died at Konigsberg, October 3, 1798, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Neomenia Judaeorums Paschali: — De Fugae Infantis Jesu in AEgyptum. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:155; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Recchi, Immanuel Hayimi[[@Headword:Recchi, Immanuel Hayimi]]

             a Jewish author of Ferrara, who died at Leghorn in 1743, is the author of מעשה חושב, a treatise on the structure of the tabernacle, the holy vessels, etc. (Venice, 1716): — חזה ציון, a cabalistic commentary on the Psalms (Leghorn, 1742): הון עשיר, a commentary on the Mishna (Amsterdam, 1731), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Receipt Of Custom[[@Headword:Receipt Of Custom]]

             SEE CUSTOM.

## Recensions Of The New Testament[[@Headword:Recensions Of The New Testament]]

             After the critical materials at the basis of the New-Test. text had accumulated in the hands of Mill and Bentley, they began to be examined with care. Important readings in different documents were seen to possess resemblances more or less striking. Passages were found to present the same form, though the MSS. from which they were derived belonged to various times and countries. The thoulght suggested itself to Bengel that the mass of materials might be definitely classified in conformity with such peculiarities. The same idea afterwards occurred to Semler. Bengel classified all the documents from which various readings are collected into two nations or families — the Asiatic and the African. To the former belonged the Codex Alexandrinus as the chief; to the latter the Graeco- Latin codices. At first that eminent critic does not seem to have had a very distinct apprehension of the subject; and therefore he speaks in general terms of it in his edition of the Greek Testament published in 1734; but in the posthumous edition of the Apparatus Criticus (1763, edited by Burlius) he is more explicit. Semler was the first that used the term recension of a particular class of MSS., in his Hiermeneutische Vorbereitun (1765). This critic, however, though acquainted with Wetstein's labors on the text of the New Test., had nothing more than a dim notion of the subject. He  followed Bengel without clearly understanding or enlarging his views. Griesbach was the first scholar who treated the topic with consummate learning and skill, elaborating it so highly that it became a prominent subject in the criticism of the New Test. But he had the benefit of Wetstein's abundant treasures. The term recension applied to MS. quotations by ancient writers, and versions of the Greek Testament bearing an affinity to one another in characteristic readings, became a classical word in his hands, and has continued so. The appellation is not happily chosen. Family, nation, class, or order would have been more appropriate; because recension suggests the idea of revision, which is inapplicable. If it be remembered, however, that the word denotes nothing more than a certain class of critical documents characterized by distinctive peculiarities in common, it matters little what designation be employed.

The sentiments of Griesbach, like those of Bengel, developed and enlarged with time. Hence we must not look for exactly the same theory in his different publications. In his Dissertatio Critica de Codicibus Quatuor Evangeliorum Origenianis (pars prima, published in 1771), he says that there are, perhaps, three or four recensions into which all the codices of the New Test. might be divided (Opuscula Acadenzica, edited by Gabler, i, 239). In the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1777), he states that at the beginning of the 3d century there were two recensions of the gospels, the Alexandrian and the Western. In the prolegomena to the first volume of his second edition of the Greek Testament, the matured sentiments of this able critic are best set forth. There he illustrates the Alexandrian recension, the Western, and the Constantinopolitan. The first two are the more ancient, belonging to the time in which the two collections of the New-Test. writings, the εὐαγγέλιον and ὁ ἀπόστολος, were made. The Alexandrian was an actual recension arising at the time when the two portions in question were put together; the Western was simply the accidental result of carelessness and arbitrary procedure on the part of transcribers and others in the MSS. current before the ἀπόστολος, or epistles, were collected. The Constantinopolitan arose from the intermingling of the other two, and, like the Western, is no proper recension, but was rather the result of a condition of the documents brought about by the negligence and caprice of copyists or meddling critics. The Alexandrian is presented by the MSS. C, L, 33, 102, 106, and by B in the last chapters of the four gospels; by the Memphitic, Ethiopic, Armenian, and Philoxenian versions; and the quotations of Clemens  Alexandrinus, Origen, Eusebius, Atbanasius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Isidore of Pelusium. The Western accords with the Graeco-Latin codices, with the Ante-Hieronymian Latin version, and with B in the gospel of Matthew; also with 1, 13, 69, 118, 124, 131, 157; with the Thebaic and JerusalemSyriac versions, and the quotations of Irenaeus in Latin Cyprian, Tertullian, Ambrose, and Augustine. The third or Constantinopolitan is shown in A, E, F, G, H, S, of the gospels, the Moscow codices of the Pauline epistles, the Gothic and Slavonic versions; and in the quotations of such fathers as lived during the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries in Greece, Asia Minor, and the neighborilng provinces. The text in Chrysostom is described by Griesbaclh as a mixed one; and of P, Q, and T he says that they accord sometimes with the Alexandrian, sometimes with the Western. The Alexandrian recension sought to avoid and change whatever might be offensive to Greek ears; but the Western preserved the harsher genuine readings when opposed to the genius of the Greek language; Hebraizing ones; readings involving solecism or unpleasant to the ear. The Alexandrian sought to illustrate words and phrases rather than the sense; the Western endeavored to render the sense clearer and less involved by means of explanations, circumlocutions, additions gathered from every side, as well as by transpositions of words and sentences. It also preferred the readings which are more full and verbose, as well as supplements taken from parallel passages, sometimes omitting what might render the sense obscure or seem repugnant to the context or parallel passages, in all which respects the Alexandrian is purer. The Alexandrian critic acted the part of a grammarian, the Western that of an interpreter. In all these points Criesbach asserts that the Constantinopolitanl commonly agrees with the Alexandrian; but with this difference, that it is still more studious of Greek propriety, admits more glosses into the text, and intermingles either Western readings, which differ from the Alexandrian, or else readings compounded of Alexandrian and Western. No recension is exhibited by any codex in its original purity (Prolegomena in Novum Testamentum [3d ed. by Schulz], vol. i, p. lxx sq.).

Michaelis thinks that there have existed four principal editions:

1. The Western, used in countries where the Latin language was spoken.

2. The Alexandrian or Egyptian, with which the quotations of Origen coincide and the Coptic version.

3. The Edessene edition, embracing the MSS. from which the old Syriac was made.

4. The Byzantine, in general use at Constantinople after that city became the capital of the Eastern empire. This last is subdivided into the ancient and the modern (Introduction to the New Test., translated by Marsh, ii, 175 sq., 2d ed.). Assuredly this classification is no improvement upon Griesbach's. Somewhat different from Griesbach's system is that of Hug, which was first proposed in his Einleitung in das neue Testament (1808).

1. The κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, i.e. the most ancient text, unrevised, which came into existence in the 2d century, found in D, 1,13, 69,124, of the gospels; in D, E, F, G, of Paul's epistles; in D, E, of the Acts; and in the old Latin and Thebaic versions. The Peshito also belongs to this class of text, though it differs in some respects from D.

2. About the middle of the 3d century, Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, made a recension of the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. To this belong B, C, L, of the gospels; A, B, C, 40, 30, 367, in the Acts; A, B, C, 40, 367, in the Catholic epistles; A, B, C, 46, 367, 17, of the Pauline epistles; and A, C, of the Apocalypse. It appears in the citations of Athanasius, Marcus and Macarius the monks, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cosmas Indicopleustes. This recension had ecclesiastical authority in Egypt and Alexandria.

3. About the same time, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, in Syria, revised the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις as it then existed in the Peshito, comparing different MSS. current in Syria. In this way he produced a text which did not wholly harmonize with the Hesychian because he was less studious of elegant Latinity. It appears in E, F, GI, S, V, of the gospels, and b, h, of the Moscow Evangelistaria collated by Matthai, with most of the cursive MSS.; in f, a,, b, d, c, m, k (Matthai), of the Acts; in g (Matthai), f, k, l, m, c, d, of the Pauline and Catholic epistles; in r, k, p, l, o, Moscow MSS.. of the Apocalypse; in the Gothic and Slavonic versions, and the quotations of Theophylact, though his text is no longer pure. 4. A fourth recension Hug attributes to Origen during his residence at Tyre. To it belong A, K, NI, 42, 106, 114, 116, and 10 of Matthai in the gospels, the Philoxenian Syriac, the quotations of Theodoret and Chrysostom. From this summary it appears that Hug's κοιᾷή ἔκδοδις agrees substantially with the Western  recension of Griesbach. It is more comprehensive, as including the Peshito, with the quotations of Clement and Origen. The Hesychian recension of Hug coincides with the Alexandrian of Griesbach.

Eichhorn's system is substantially that of Hug, with one important exception. He assumed an unrevised form of the text in Asia, and, with some differences, in Africa also. This unrevised text may be traced in its two forms as early as the 2d century. Lucian revised the first, Hesychius the second. Hence, from the close of the third century, there was a threefold phase of the text — the African or Alexandrian, the Asiatic or Constantinopolitan, and a mixture of both. Eichhorn denied that Origen made a new recension (Einleitun in das neue Testament, vol. 4:§ 35 sq.).

In 1815 Nolan published an Inquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, in which he propounded a peculiar theory of recensions. He divided all the documents into three classes — the Palestinian, equivalent to Griesbach's Alexandrian; the Egyptian, identical with Griesbach's Western; and the Byzantine. The three forms of the text are represented, as he assumed, by the Codex Vaticanus and Jerome's Vulgate, with the Codices Vercellensis and Brixianus of the Latin version. The last two contained a more ancient text than that represented by the version of Jerome. The Palestinian recension, which he attributes to Eusebius of Cesarea, is greatly censured as having been executed by this father with arbitrariness and dishonesty, since he tampered with passages because of their opposition to his Arian opinions. At the end of the 5th century this recension was introduced into Alexandria by Euthalius, and was circulated there.

Scholz made two classes or families — the Alexandrian or Occidental, and Constantinopolitan or Oriental. Griesbach's Western class is contained in the former. He referred to the Alexandrian several of the ancient MSS., and a few later ones — the Memphitic, Thebaic, Ethiopic, and Latin versions, and the ecclesiastical writers belonging to Western Europe, with those of Africa. To the Constantinopolitan he referred the MSS. belonging to Asia Minor, Palestine, Syria, Eastern Europe, especially Constantinople, with the Philoxenian, Syriac, Gothic, Georgian, and Slavonic versions, besides the fathers of these regions. To the latter he gave a decided preference, because of their alleged mutual agreement, and also because they were supposed to be written with great care after the most ancient exemplars; whereas the Alexandrian documents were arbitrarily altered by  officious grammarians. Indeed, he traces the Constantinopolitan to the autography of the original writers.

Rinck agrees with Scholz in classifying all documents under two heads — the Occidental and the Oriental; the former exhibited in A, B, C, D, E, F, G, in the epistles, the latter containing the cursive MSS. The former he subdivides into two families — the African (A, B, C) and the Latin codices (D, E, F, G). He finds in it the result of arbitrary correction, ignorance, and carelessness.

Tischendorf's view, given in the prolegomena to the seventh edition of his Greek Testament, is that there are two pairs of classes — the Alexandrian and Latin, the Asiatic and Byzantine. The oldest form of the text, and that which most bears an Alexandrian complexion, is presented in A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z, A, perhaps also R, in the gospels. A later form, bearing more of an Asiatic complexion, is in E, F, G, H, K, M, O, S, U, V, r, A. For the Acts and Catholic epistles the oldest text is given in A, B, C; for Acts probably D and I also. For the Pauline epistles the oldest text is represented by A, B, C, H, I, D, F, G, the first five being Alexandrian, the last two Latin; D standing between the two classes. A and C in the Apocalypse have a more ancient text than B.

Lachmann disregarded all systems of recensions, and proceeded to give a text from ancient documents of a certain definite time — the text which commonly prevailed in the 3d and 4th centuries, drawn from Oriental MSS. — with the aid of Occidental ones in cases where the former disagree among themselves. In his large edition he follows the united evidence of Eastern and Western MSS. His merits are very great in the department of New-Test. criticism; but this is not the place to show them. He does not, however, profess to give a text as near as possible to that which he judges to proceed from the sacred writers themselves, as Griesbach and Tischendorf have done. On the contrary, he has simply undertaken to present that form of the text which is found in documents belonging to a certain period as a basis contributing to the discovery of the authentic text itself. His text is an important aid to the work of finding out the original words; not the original itself, as he would have given it. For this reason his edition contains readings which, in his own opinion, could not have been original. His object was therefore somewhat different from that of most editors. But he set an example of rigid adherence to the task proposed, and of critical sagacity in eliminating the true text from ancient documents of  the time, evincing the talents and skill of a master. Since his time it has been the fashion among inferior critics and imitators to attach undue weight to antiquity. Uncial MSS. and their readings have been too implicitly followed by some.

Tischendorf more recently adopted the same views as those of Lachmann, holding that the most ancient text alone should be edited, though it may not always be what the sacred authors wrote. This principle being laid at the basis of his eighth edition, lately completed, made a considerable difference between it and the seventh. The internal goodness of readings, the context, and sound judgment are thus excluded, and this at the expense of something more valuable; for mere outward and ancient testimony can never elicit what ought to be an editor's chief object — the presentation of a text as near the original one as can be procured. The oldest text of the best MSS. and versions is valuable only so far as it assists in attaining that object. It is owing to the undue elevation of antiquity that such a reading as ὁ μονογενὴς θεός in Joh 1:18 has been given in the text of a recent edition. The same excessive veneration for antiquity has led to the separation of ὅ γέγονεν from οὐδὲ ž ν ‘‘v (Joh 1:3) in modern times. Lachmann is exceeded by smaller followers, not in his own exact line.

To Griesbach all must allow distinguished merit. He was a consummate critic, ingenious, acute, candid, tolerant, and learned. His system was elaborated with great ability. It exhibits the marks of a sagacious mind. But it was assailed by many writers, whose combined attacks weakened its basis. In Germany, Eichhorn, Bertholdt, Hug, Schulz, Gabler, and Schott made various objections to it. In consequence of Hug's acute remarks, the venerable scholar himself modified his views. He did not, however, give up the three recensions, but still maintained that the Alexandrian and Western were distinct. He admitted that the Syriac, which Hug had put with the κοινή, was nearer to that than to the Alexandrian class; but he hesitated to put it with the Western because it differed so much. He denied that Origen used the κοινή, maintaining that the Alexandrian, which existed before his time, was that which he employed. He conceded, however, that Origen had a Western copy of Mark besides an Alexandrian one; that in his commentary on Matthew, though the readings are chiefly Alexandrian, there is a great number of such as are Western, and which therefore appear in D, 13, 28, 69, 124, 131,157, the old Italic, Vulgate, and Syriac. Thus Origen had various copies at hand, as he himself repeatedly asserts. Griesbach also conceded that Clemens Alexandrinus had various copies,  differing in the forms of their texts. Hence his citations often agree with the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις and D. Thus Origen and Clement cease, in some measure, to be standard representatives of the Alexandrian recension. The concessions of Griesbach, resulting from many acute observations made by Hug and others, amounted to this, that the nearness of MSS. and recensions to one another was greater than he had before assumed; that his two ancient recensions had more points of contact with one another in existing documents than he had clearly perceived. The line between his Alexandrian and Western classes became less perceptible. This, indeed, was the weak point of the system, as no proper division can be drawn between the two. In the application of his system he professed to follow the consent of the Alexandrian and Western recensions, unless the internal marks of truth in a reading were so strong as to outweigh this argument. But he departed from his principle in severn inistances, as in 1Co 3:4; Galations 4:14; Php 3:3; 1Th 2:7; Heb 4:2.

In the year 1814 Dr. Laurence published objections to Griesbach's system, many of which are unfounded. Some of his observations are pertinent and fair; more are irrelevant. He does not show much appreciation of the comparative value of MSS. and texts, and reasons in a sort of mechanical method against Griesbach. It is evident that he was somewhat prejudiced against the Alexandrian recension. Observations like the following show an animus against the German critic: “Too much dazzled, perhaps, by the splendor of intricate and perplexing research, he overlooked what lay immediately before him. When he threw his critical bowl among the established theories of his predecessors, he too hastily attempted to set up his own without having first totally demolished theirs, forgetting that the very nerve of his criticism was a principle of hostility to every standard text” (Remarks upon the Systematic Classification of MSS. adopted by Griesbach, p. 57). The pamphlet of the Oxford scholar is now almost forgotten, yet it produced considerable effect at the time of its appearance, when the reprinting of Griesbach's Greek Testament in England was associated with the active dissemination of Unitarian tenets, and the accomplished German himself was unjustly charged with leaning to similar views.

In America, Mr. Norton subsequently animadverted upon the same system with considerable acuteness and plausibility. It is evident, however, that he did not fully understand all Griesbach's sentiments; he had not studied the  peculiar readings of MSS., the quotations of the fathers, and the characteristics of ancient versions, yet he has urged some objections forcibly and conclusively against the adoption of the system.

Hug's theory of recensions, so far as it differs from Griesbach's, is without foundation. It makes Origen use the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις, whereas his usual text agrees with the Alexandrian. The Hesychian recension was employed at least a hundred years previously by Clement of Alexandria, and that Hesychius was really the author of a recension is historically baseless; he may have corrected, in some places, a few copies which he used. The recension attributed to Lucian is also destitute of historical proof. The basis of this is supposed to have been the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις as it existed in Syria. Again, it is very improbable that Origen undertook to revise the κοινὴ ἔκδοσις. It is true that Jerome appeals to the exemplars of Origen, but this does not imply that the latter made a revision of existing copies. The Alexandrian father used copies of the New Test. selected with care, and probably corrected them in various places, but he did not undertake in his old age the laborious task of making a peculiar revision. The silence of ancient writers, especially of Eusebius, who is most copious in his praises of Origen, speaks strongly against the critical studies of the Alexandrian father in the New-Test. text. We believe, therefore, that the recension system of Hug is unsustained by historical data. Succeeding critics have refused to adopt it. Griesbach himself made several pertinent objections to it. It was also assailed by Schott, Rinck, Gabler, and others. Mr, Norton, too, opposed it.

Nolan's system is fundamentally wrong. There is no evidence that the Codex Brixianus contains the Latin version in its oldest form, and therefore the assumed connection of it with the Byzantine text fails to show that the latter is the most ancient and best representative of the original Greek. The Codex Brixianus, on the contrary, is itself a revision of the old Latin text. Nolan thinks that the Codex Vercellensis has a text corrected by Eusebius of Vercelli after that which he brought from Egypt on his return from exile. But this form of the text circulated in the West before Eusebius, and the Palestinian recension, which he supposes to have been introduced into Alexandria by Euthallus, was there before; thus the system so ingeniously elaborated by the critic is historically erroneous. It introduces arbitrary and baseless conjectures into the department of criticism, ignores facts, and deals in unjust accusations against ancient writers, such as Eusebius of Cmsarea, who were as honest as the zealous upholder himself of the  Byzantine text. All attempts to maintain the most recent in opposition to the most ancient text must necessarily fail. Thoroughly erroneous as Nolan's theory is, it was eagerly welcomed by some advocates of the received text in England. Mr. Horne could say of it, even in the ninth edition of his Introduction to thle Critical Study and Knowledge of the Scriptures, “The integrity of the Greek Vulgate he has confessedly established by a series of proofs and connected arguments the most decisive that can be reasonably desired or expected.”

With regard to Scholz's system, which is identical with Bengel's, it may be preferable to Griesbach's so far as it allows but two classes of documents; it is certainly simpler. His estimate, however, of the value of families is erroneous. He failed to prove that the particular form of the text current in Asia Minor and Greece during the first three centuries was the same as that presented by the Constantinopolitan MSS. of a much later date. He did not show that the Byzantine family was Iderived from the autographs of the original writers in a very pure state; and he was obliged to admit that the text which obtained at Constantinople in the reigns of Constantine and Constance was collated with the Alexandrian, a circumstance which would naturally give rise to a mingling of readings belonging to both. Eusebius states that he made out fifty copies of the New Test. for the use of the churches at Constantinople at the request of Constantine; and as we know that he gave a decided preference to Alexandrian copies, it cannot be doubted that he followed those sanctioned by Origen's authority. Constantinopolitan codices differ in their characteristic readings from the Alexandrian, but the preference belongs to the latter, not to the former. Why should junior be placed above older documents? Antiquity may be overbalanced by other considerations, and certainly the Alexandrian MSS. are neither faultless nor pure. But the Byzantine and later MSS. are more corrupt, Numbers must not be considered decisive of right readings in opposition to antiquity, yet numbers had an undue influence on Scholz's mind. Rinck has refuted his supposed proofs of the superiority of Constantinopolitan MSS., and Tischendorf has more elaborately done the same in the preface to his first edition of the Greek Testament (1841). In fact, Scholz's historical proofs are no better than fictions which true history rejects.

No definite system of recensions such as those of Griesbach, Hug, and Scholz can be made out, because lines of division cannot be drawn with accuracy. Our knowledge of the ways in which the early text was  deteriorated — of the influences to which it was exposed, the corrections it underwent in different places at different times, the methods in which it was copied, the principles, if such there were, on which transcribers proceeded — is too meagre to build up a secure structure. The subject must therefore remain in obscurity. Its nature is such as to give rise to endless speculation without affording much real knowledge; it is vague, indefinite, shadowy, awakening curiosity without satisfying it. Yet we are not disposed to reject the entire system of classification as visionary. It is highly useful to arrange the materials. The existence of certain characteristic readings may be clearly traced in various monuments of the text, however much we may speculate on their causes. It is true that in several cases it is very difficult to distinguish the family to which a particular reading belongs, because its characteristics may be divided between two classes, or they may be so mixed that it is almost impossible to detect the family with which it should be united; the evidences of its relationship may be so obscure as to render the determination of its appropriate recension a subtle problem. It is also unquestionable that no one MS. version or father exhibits a recension in a pure state, but that each form of the text appears more or less corrupted. The speculations of the critics to which we have referred have had one advantage, viz. that they have made the characteristic readings of MSS. better understood, and enabled us to group together certain documents presenting the same form of text. Thus in the gospels, א, A, B, C, D, I, L, P, Q, T, X, Z present an older form of the text than E, F, G, H, K, I, S, U, V, r. Among the former, א, B, Z have a text more ancient and correct than that of the others.

Matthai repudiated the whole system of recensions as useless and absurd. We question whether he was warranted by learning, penetration, or jmudgment to use the contemptuous language which he applied. His industry in collating MSS. and editing their text was praiseworthy, but he had not the genius to construct a good text out of the materials within his reach. He overestimated his Moscow codices, and looked on Griesbach's merits with envious eye; hence his diatribe on recensions shows more ardent zeal than discretion. What sentence can show the spirit of the man better than this? — “Griesbach has been hammering, filing, and polishing for thirty years at this masterpiece of uncriticism, unbelief, and irreligiousness in Semler's recension-manufactory” (Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen, welche der Terr Abt Begel, der Herr Doctor Senler, und der Herr Geheimz-Kirchenrath Griesbach, in deme  griechischen Texte des N.T. wollen entdeckt haben, p. 28). Prof. Lee employed language equally strong with Matthai's, but not so scurrilous, though of the same tendency: “Ingeniosae illa familiarum fabricae, nt mihi videtur, in unum tantumrnodo finem feliciter exstructms sunt; ut rem in seipsa baud valde obscuram, tenebris AEgyptiacis obscuriorem reddant; Editoresque eos qui se omnia rem acu tetigisse putent, supra mortalium labendi statum, nescio quantum, evehere” (Prolegomena ins Biblia Polygllotla Londinensia Minora, p. 69). Neither is sufficiently eminent to be justified in the employment of phraseology from which masters in criticism like Griesbacli would refrain. Hear the veteran scholar, in his last publication, speaking of Hug: “Dubitationis igitur causas exponere mihi liceat, sed paucis et modeste, nec eo animo, ut cumr viro doctissimo quem permagni me facere ingenue profiteor, decertem, sed ut turn alios viros harum rerum peritos, tum in primis ipsum excitem et humanissime invitem ad novum instituendum cause, quae in universa re critica Novi Testamenti maximi momenti est, examen, quo ea, si ullo o moo fieri id possit, ad liquidumn tandem perducatur” (Meletfemrata de Vetustis Textus Novi Testamenti Recensionibus, particula ii, p. 42). The preceding observations will help to account for the varying schemes of different critics. Some may look for greater exactness and nicety than others, hence they will make more families of documents; others, with less acuteness or ingenuity, will rest satisfied with classes more strongly marked by the number of materials they embrace or thce breadth of territory over which they were supposed to circulate. There is no possibility of arriving at precision. The commingling of readings has obliterated many peculiarities in the progress of time, though enough has been left to form the basis of a rough classification.

It is more difficult to classify the ancient versions, such as the Peshito- Syriac, because their texts have suffered frequent interpolations and changes. In the quotations of the fathers we must make allowance for memoriter citation, without expecting great care or attachment to the letter. Griesbach, however, denies that Origen quoted from memory — and none has investigated the citations of the Alexandrian father with equal labor — but the state of his commentaries is far from being what we could wish, and the original is often lost or corrupted.

The term recension is sometimes applied to the Old Test. as well as the New Test. There the materials hitherto collated all belong to one recension, viz. the Masoretic. Some, indeed, have divided them into Masoretic and  Ante-Masoretic, but the latter cannot be traced. At present we are acquainted with only one great family, though it is probable that particular revisions of parts of the Old Test. preceded the labors of the Masoretes. Whether the Karaite Hebrew MSS. — of which many have been recently brought to St. Petersburg — present a different form of the text from the Masoretic wmill be seen after they have been collated; it is certain that their vowel-system is different from the present one. We expect, therefore, that important readings may be furnished by these very ancient codices.

See Bengel, Introductio in Crisin N.T., prefixed to his edition of the Greek Testament (Tiibingen, 1734, 4to); Semler, Vo bereitungen zur Hermeneutik (Halle, 1760-69, 8vo); Michaelis, Introduction to the N.T., by Marsh, ii, 173 sq.; Griesbach, Optuscula (edited by Gabler, with the Preface of the latter [Jena, 1824-25, 2 vols. 8vo]); id. Commentarius Criticus in Textun Gracecum, particule i and ii (ibid. 1798, 1811, 8vo); id. Prolegomenae to the second edition of his Greek Testament (1796, 8vo); Eichhorne, Einleituing (Gott. 1827, 8vo), vol. iv; Bertholdt, Einleitung (Erlangen, 1812, 8vo), vol. i; Schulz, Prolegomena to the third edition of Griesbach (Berl. 1827, 8vo); Hug, inzleif. (4th ed. Stuttgart, 1847, 8vo), vol. i; De Wette, Binleit. in dus neue Testament (6th ed. Berl. 1860, 8vo); Schott, Isagoye Historicocritica (Jena, 1830, 8vo); Iatthdii, Ueber die sogenannten Recensionen, etc. (Leips. 1804, 8vo); Scholz, Biblischkritische Reise, etc. (ibid. 1823, 8vo); id. Prolegomena to the N.T. (1830), vol. i; Laurence, remarks on Griesbach's Systematic Classification of MSS. (Oxford, 1814, 8vo); Rinck, Luclubratio Critica in Actat Apost., Epp. Cathol. et Pulinz. etc. (Basil. 1830, 8vo); Tischendorf, Prolegomena to his edition of the Greek Testament (Leips. 1841,8vo), with the Prolegomena to his seventh edition (ibid. 1859), and his article Bibeltext in Herzog's Enzcyklopadie; Reuss, Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments (4th ed. Brunswick, 1864); Norton, Genuineness of the Gospels (Boston. 1837, 8vo), vol. i; Davidson, Treatise on Biblical Criticism (Edinburgh, 1852), vol. ii. SEE CRITICISM; SEE MANUSCRIPTS; SEE VARIOUS READINGS.

## Recensions Of The Old Testament[[@Headword:Recensions Of The Old Testament]]

             Under this head we present an outline of the history of the printed Hebrew text, not in the manner of Bartolocci, Wolf, and Le-Long-Mash, who give a long list of editions, but according to the different recensions which the Hebrew text underwent from time to time. The history of the unprinted text in its different periods has already been treated in the article OLD TESTAMENT SEE OLD TESTAMENT (q.v.). From the article MANUSCRIPTS SEE MANUSCRIPTS (q.v.) it will be seen that some of the most important MSS. are lost, and that they are only known to us from quotations. Yet a great many MSS. of the Old Test. existed in the different countries where Jews resided; and, as certain rules and regulations were laid down by the scribes according to which MSS. were to be written, it is but natural to infer that the MSS. of the different countries would. in the main, correspond with each other. After the invention of printing, many were desirous of publishing corrected editions of the Holy Scriptures, though they seldom gave an account of the materials they used. The history of the printed text is important as showing the manner in which our present copies of the Hebrew Bible mwere edited, and the sources available for obtaining the exact words of the original. In order to do this we must examine the different editions according to the text which they contain; we must know the different degrees of relationship in which the editions stand to each other; in a word, we must have the genealogy of the present editions.  Before entering upon the history of the printed text, we must mention, first, the editions of different parts of the Old Test. which formed the basis of later editions. The first part of the Hebrew Scriptures which was published is

(I.) תהלים, i.e. Psalteriumn Hebraicum cume Commentario Kimchii (237 [i.e. A.D. 1477], 4to, or sm. fol., sine loco). This very rare edition is printed on 149 folios, each page containing forty lines, but without division of verses, in majuscular and minuscular letters. Only the first four psalms have the vowel-points, and these but clumsily expressed. Each verse is accompanied by Kimchi's commentary. The pages and psalms are not numbered. The Soph Pasuk (i.e.:) is often omitted, especially when two verses stand by each other. For יהוה, often an empty space is left, sometimes omitted; in the space we often find an inverted he, ה, or an iuverted erted vav, ו, in the word יהוה; often the word is expressed by a sign of abbreviation, “, which generally occurs in the commentary. In Psa 119:1 we find יהיה, i.e. a yod for a vav. The letters כand ב, aִnd ד, רand ד, ןand ז, גand נ; עיand שcan hardly be distinguished from each other. The text is far from being correct, as a few examples will khow. Thus, inl

Psa 1:3 we read פריה, inn Van der Hooght, פריו

Psa 1:5 “ צריקם“צדיקים Psa 2:1 רֵיק“רַיק Psa 2:2 “ עבותימו“עבתימו Psa 4:1 מזמור לדוד מזמור שיר

It is divided into five books, as can be seen from superscriptions to Psalms 41, 42, 89, , 106. As to the commentary, it is very valuable, because it contains all the anti-Christian passages of Kinmich, which are not found in later editions. At the end two epigraphs are printed, one in rhyme, the other in prose. See on this edition, Eichhorn, Repertorium, 6:134 sq.; De Iossi, Annnales Hebraeo-typogrcaphica, p. 14; and De Hebl aicce Typographice Origine ac Primitiis, etc., p. 13; Kennicott, Diss. Genesis in V. T. p. 91.

(II.) בולונייא רמב חומש עם תרגום אונקלוס ופירוש רשו, i. Pentateuchus Hebraicus cum Punctis et cumn Paraphrasi Chaldaica et  Commentario Rabbi Salomonis Jarchi (Bonononie, 242 [i.e. A.D. 1482], fol.). This copy is printed on 21S parchment leaves. Above and below the Hebrew Rashi's commentary is given, while the Chaldee is plinted on the side of the Hebrew. The text is very correct, and when compared with Van der Hooght's, the latter seems to be a reprint of this Pentateuch. The harmony of this Pentateuch with that found in Van der Hooght's edition is of the utmost imtportance for the printed text. In the first place, it corrobnorates the fact that, prior to the year 1520, the beginning had already been made to print the Hebrew text according to recent MSS. and the Masorah; in the seconld place, we must admit that all variations which are found in the Pentateuch printed at Sonieino in 1488, and which is a reprint of our edition, are nothing but negligences of the printer and corrector, in so far as these variations are not supported by the Masorah, and hebnce cannot.be regarded as a testimony against the Masoretic text. In the third place, we see that all MSS. and editions which were prepared by Jews are of the utmost correctness, and that the variations are nothing but an oversight of either the copyist or printer. At the end is a very leungthy epigraph in Hiebrew, to give which in an English translation space forbids. See Eichhorn, Repertoriem. v, 92 sq., where the variations of this Pentateuch from Van der Hooght's text are given.

(III.) Ruth, Ecclesiastes, Canticum Canticorum, Threni cum Comm. Jarchi, et Esther cum Comm. Aben-Ezrae (sine anno et loco [but probably Bononiaie, 1482], fol.). See De Rossi, De Ignotis Nonnullis Anticuissimis Hebr. Textus Editionibus (Erlangen, 1782).

(IV.) Phrophetoe Priores ac Posteriores cum Comm. Kimchii (Soncino, 1485-86, 2 vols. fol.). On this, see Eichhorn, Repertorium, 8:51 sq.

(V.) Quinque Megilloth et Psalteriumn (Soncini et Casali, 1486).

(VI.) Quatuor Sacra Volumina, sen Riuth, Canticum, Threni et Ecclesiastes (ibid. 1486), with vowel-points, but with no accents.

(VII.) Hagiographa, with different commentaries (Neapoli, 1487).

(VIII.) Biblia Hebraica Integra cum Punctis et Accentibus (Soncilli, 248 [i.e. A.D. 148S], fol.). This is the first complete Hebrew Bible, with vowel- points and accents. It is very rare; only nine copties are known) to be extant, viz. one at Exeter College, Oxford; two at Rome, two at Florence, two at Parma, one at Vienna, and one in the Baden-Durlach Library.  According to Bruns (Dissertat. General. in V. Test. p. 442 sq.), the text is printed neither from ancient nor good MSS., but is full of blunders; and Kennicott asserts that it contains more than 12,000 variations (“qnue una editio ab exemplaribus hodiernis discrepat in locis plus quam 12,000”). How carelessly the printing was executed may be seen from the fact that Psalms 41, 42, 89, , 106:16 of Psa 74:16 was interpolated after Psa 74:12 of Psa 89:12.

(IX.) Pentateuchus Hebraicus absque Punctis, etc. (1490).

(X.) Pentateuchus cum Haphtaroth et Megilloth Hebraice (sine loco et anuo, 4to [1490-95?]). For a long time only two copies were known to be extant; one in the Library of St. Mark at Florence, and one in the library of the cardinal Zelada. De Rossi, however, procured some copies.

Between 1490 and 1494 twelve other editions of different books were published, which we will not enumerate for want of space. In 1494 the Biblia Hebraica cum Punctis (4to) was published at Brescia; remarkable as being the one from which Luther's Geiman translation was made. The Royal Library at Berlin preserves that copy in a case. This edition has many various readings. As it cannot historically be proved that in the edition of this Bible MSS. have been used — on the contrary, in its lectionibus singularibus it agrees with the edition of Soncino (1488) — it is very probable that it was reprinted from the Soncinian text. A full description of this Bible is given by Schunlze, Vollstandigere Kritik (Berlin, 1766). A collection of various readings is given by le-Long-Mash in the Bibliotheca Sacra. Between 1494 and 1497 four other editions of different parts of the Hebrew Old Test. were published, which would make the number either of entire editions of the Old Test. or of single parts thereof about twenty- eight, and which all belong to the 15th century.

I. The first main recension was the Complutensian text of 1514-17. The editions which were published in the following centuries are mainly taken from one of the three main sources: the Complutensian Bible, the Soncinian Text of 1488, and Bomberg's (1525); yet there is a fourth class, which contains a mixed text, composed of many old editions. The Complutensian text was entitled Biblia Sacra polyglotta, etc. (in Complutensi Universitate, 1514-17). SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES. This was followed by the Heidelberg or Bertram's Polyglot (Sacra Biblia Hebraice,  etc.) (ex officina Sanctandreana, 1586, 3 vols. fol.; republished in 1599, 3 vols. fol. ex officia Commeliniana, and in 1616, 3 vols. fol. ibid.).

II. The second main recension, or the Soncinian text of 1488, was the basis of:

1. Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana I, curavit F. Pratensis (Venice, 1517- 18S). SEE RABBINIC BIBLES.

2. Bomberg's Editions (4to): α. the first published in 1518; β. the second in 1521; γ. the third in 1525-28; δ. the fourth in 1533; ε. the fifth in 1544.

3. Munster's Editions of 1534, 1536, and 1546. The first contains the Hebrew text only, and was published by Froben at Basle. This edition is very rare and valuable on account of a collection of various readings, partly taken from MSS., which must have been collected by a Jewish editor. The other two editions have, besides the Hebrew, a Latin translation.

4. Robert Stephens's first edition (Paris, 1539-44, 4 vols.). This was not published as a whole, but in parts, each having a title. The first part that was published was ישעיה ספר, or Prophetia Isaice (ibid. 1539). Of variations, we subjoin the following: 1, 25,!סיגי; ve. 29, מאלים 3:16, ְָוּמְשִׁקְרוֹת6:5, נדמתי; 8:6, השלּח(dagesh in ל); ren. 13, מערצכם; 10:15, וָאתver. 16, כבודו; Psa 89:18, כמסום; Psa 89:33, ישפרו, etc. The second part contained the twelve minor prophets (1539); the third, the Psalms (1540); the fourth, the Proverbs (1540); in the same year also Jeremiah, Daniel, the five Megilloth; in 1541, Job, Ezra, Ezekiel; in 1543, Chronicles, the former prophets, and the Pentateuch. Richard Simon, in his Histoire Critique du V. T. p. 513, makes this remark on that edition: “Si l'on a egard a la beaute des caracteres, il n'y a gueres de Bibles qini approchent de celle de Robert Estienne in quarto; an moins d'une partie de cette Bible; mains elle iest pas fort correcte.” The same is confirmed by Carpzov, Critica Sacra, p. 421: “Plurimis autem scatere vitiis, non in punctis niodo vocalibus et accenturnm, sed etiam in literis, imo in integris nonnunqiuamn vocibus deprehenditur,” etc.; and Samuel Ockley, in his Introduct. ad Linguas Orient. cap. ii, p. 34, says: “Haec Roberti Stephani editio pulchris quidem characteribus est imnpressa... sed pluribus mendis scatet, qun libri pulcherrimi nitoarem turpiter foedarunt.”

III. The third main recension was the Bombergian text of 1525. A new recension of the text, which has had more influence than any on the text of later times, was Bomberg's second edition of the Rabbinic Bible, edited by Jacob ben-Chajim (Venice, 1525-26, 4 vols. fol.). SEE RABBINIC BIBLES. This edition was followed by —

1. R. Stephens's second edition, published in parts, like the first (Paris, 1544-46, 16mo).

2. Boumberg's third Rabbinical Bible (1547-49). SEE RABBINIC BIBLES.

3. M. A. Justinian's Editions, published at Venice in 1551, 1552, 1563, and 1573.

4. J. de Gara's Editions, published at Venice, viz.:

a. an edition in 4to, 1566;

b. an edition in 8vo, 1568;

c. a Rabbinic Bible (1568, 4 vols. fol.) SEE RABBINIC BIBLES;

d. an edition in 8vo, 1570;

e. an edition in 4to, 1582;

f. an edition with Rashi's commentary (1595, 4to);

g. the same edition, published in 1607.

5. Plantin's Manual Editions, published at Antwerp, viz.: a. an edition in 4to, Svo, and 16mo, in 1566; b. a 4to edition in 1580; c. an 8vo edition in 1590.

6. Crato's Editions, published at Wittenberg in 1586 and 1587.

7. Hartmann's Editions, published at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1595-98.

8. Bragadin's Editions, published at Venice, viz.:

a. an edition in 4to and 12mno (1614-15);

b. a Rabbionic Bible, SEE RABBINIC BIBLES (1617-18, 4 vols. fol.);

c. a 4to edition (1619);

d. a 4to edition (162S);

e. a 4to edition, with Italian notes (1678);

f. Biblia Hebraiea ad usum Judaeorum (1707, 4to);

g. Biblia Hebraica, with a Spanish commentary in Rabbinic letters, “con licenza de' superiori” (1730, 4to).

9. . de la Rouviere's, or Celphas Elon's Editions, published at Geneva in 1618, in 4to, 8vo, and 18mo, are but a reprint of No. 3.

IV. The fourth main recension, or mixed text, was formed from Nos. II and III above, and was the Antwerp Polyglot, or Biblia Sacra Hebraice (Antwerp, 1567) SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES, which was followed by

1. The Paris Polyglot. SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES.

2. The London, or Walton's Polyglot. SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES.

3. Plantin's Hebrew-Latin Editions (Antwerp, 1571, 1583). In the first edition, in Gen 3:15, where the Vulg. has “ipsa conteret caput,” with reference to the Virgin Mary, we read הות, instead of הוא, with a little circle above to indicate a different reading in the passage (היא). But this corruption was not made by Arias Montanus, the Latin translator.

4. The Burgos Edition, a very rare reprint of Plantin's first edition, published at Burgos, inn Spain, in 1581 (fol.).

5. The Geneva Editions, in Hebrew and Latin, published in 1609 and 1618 (fol.).

6. The Leyden Edition, published in 1613 (large 8vo).

7. The Vienna Edition, published in 1743 (large 8vo).

8. Reineccius's Polyglot and Manual Editions. See Reineccius.

V. Hutter's Text. Several older editions contributed to Hutter's Bibles:

a. Biblia Sacra, etc. (Hamburg, 1587, fol.). The outward appearance of this edition is splendid. In the margin the number of chapters is marked, and every fifth verse. From the preface we see that Hutter perused the editions of Bomberg, Munster, Stephens, etc. This edition was only printed once, but was published in 1588, 1596, and 1603 with new title-pages.

b. Biblia Sacra Polyglotta (incomplete; only the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth) (Nuremberg, 1599). Hutter's Hebrew Bible was reprinted in Nissel's edition (Lugduni Batavorum, 1662, large Svo), with the title Sacra Biblia Hebraea ex Optimis Editionibus, etc.

VI. Buxtorfs Editions. A text revised accurately after the Masorahb, and therefore deviating here and there frtom the earlier editions, is furnished by Buxtorf's editions, viz.:

a. The Manual Edition (Basle, 1611, 8vo), which was followed by

1. Janssun's Edition (Amst. 1639), or עשרים וארבעה.

2. Menasseh ben-Israel's Edition (ibid. 1635, 4to). It would have been well if the editor had stated which four editions he perused, and to which the mistakes, which are not a few in this edition, are to be ascribed. Each page has two colummns. The order of the books is rather incommon; the Hagiographa and five Megilloth come before the earlier amid her prophets. As to the edition itself, R. Simon, in his Histoire Critique, p. 514, remarks. “L'edition en quarto de Menassa ben-Israel, a Amsterdam en 1635, a cette commodite, qu'elle est non seulement co'recte, mais aussi a deux colonnes; au lieu que les editions de Robert Estiennie et de Plantin sont a longues ligues et par consequent incommodes pour la lecture.”

b. Buxtorf's Rabbinic Bible, SEE RABBINIC BIBLES, which was followed by 1. Frankfurter's Rabbinic Bible. SEE RABBINIC BIBLES

VII. Joseph Athias's Text. Neither the text of Hutter nor that of Buxtorf was without its permanent influence; but the Hebrew Bible which became the standard to subsequent generations was that of Josemph Athias, a learned rabbi and printer at Amsterdam. His text was based on a comparison of the pievious editios itions with to SS.; one bearing the date 1209, the other a Spanish MS., boasting an antiquity of 900 years. The first edition of this new text was published at Amsterdam (1661, 2 vols. Svo), with the title, Biblia Hebraica correcta et collata cum Antiqonissimis et Accuatissismis Exemplaribus Manuscriptis et hactenus impressis. This is the first edition in which each verse is numbered. A second edition, with a preface by Lensden, was published in 1667. These editions were much prized for their beauty and correctness, and a gold medal and chain were conferred on Athias in token of their appreciation by the States-General of Holland.

VIII. Clodius's Editions were based upon the text of Athias.

a. Biblia Testamenti Veteris, etc. Opeia et studio Clodii (Frankfort-on-the- Main, 1677).

b. Biblia Hebraica, etc.; recognita a J. H. Majo (ibid. 1692).

c. Biblia Hebraica, etc.; ed. G. Chr. Burcklin (ibid. 1716, 4to). In spite of all the care which Burcklin bestowed upon this edition, some mistakes were left, as: Isa 1:16, רחקו four רחצו; Isa 41:22, הרשנות for הָראשנית Jer 4:18, על for עד; Jer 23:21, עליהםfor אליהם: Eze 40:25, סביעfor סָביב Hos 7:16, לאגם for לעגם; Amo 7:10, בים for בָית Lam 5:22, כי for כי אם; Psa 75:1, אמ for אס, etc.

IX. Jablonski's Editions, or —

a. Biblia Hebraica cum Notis Hebraicis, etc. (Berolini, 1699, large 8vo or 4to). For this edition Jablonski collated all the cardinal editions, together with several MSS., and bestowed particular care on the vowel-points and accents, as he expresses himself more fully in his preface, § 6, 7.

b. Biblia Hebraica in Gratiam, etc.. (ibid. 1712, 12mo). This is the last of Jablonski's editions, but less correct; and the same may be said of the one published in 1711 (24mo) without the vowel-points.

X. H. Michaelis's Bible was based on Jablonski's first edition of 1699, and was entitled הקרש עשרים וארבע ספרי (Halle, 1720, 8vo and 4to). For this edition Michaelis compared five Erfurt MSS. and nineteen printed editions, which are all enumerated in the preface. This edition is much esteemed, partly for its correctness and partly for its notes, which, on account of the very small type, are a task to the eyes.

Michaelis's text is said to have been the basis of the so-called Mantuan Bible, edited, with a critical commentary, by Norzi (q.v.) (Mantua, 1742- 44).

XI. Van der Hooght's Text, or Biblia Hebraica, secundum ultimam Editionem Jos. Athia, etc. (Amst. 1705, 2 vols. Svo). This edition — of good reputation for its accuracy, but above all for the beauty and distinctness of its type — deserves special attention as constituting our present textus receptus. The text was chiefly formed on that of Athias; no MSS. were used for it, but it has a collection of various readings from printed editions at the end. The Masoretic readings are given in the margin. In spite of all the excellences which this edition has above others, there are  still a great nmany mistakes to be found therein, as Bruns has shown in Eichhorn's Repertorium, 12:225 sq. The following editions are either printed from or based on Van der Hooght's text:

1. Proop's Editions, published at Amsterdam (1724,1762).

2. The Leipsic Edition, with Seb. Schmid's Latin translation (1740, 4to).

3. Forstem's Biblia Hebraica sine Punctis (Oxford, 1750, 2 vols. 4to).

4. Simoni's Editions (Halle, 1752, 1767, 1822, 1828; the latter two with a preface by Rosenmuller).

5. Houbigant's (q.v.) Edition (Paris, 1753,4 vols. fol.).

6. Bayly's Old Testament, in Hebrew and English (Loud. 1774, large Svo).

7. Kennicott's (q.v.) Vetus Testamentum (Oxford, 1776-80, 2 vols. fol.).

8. Jahn's Biblia Hebraica, etc. (Vienna, 1806, 4 vols. 8vo), with readings from De Rossi, Kennicott, etc. With injudicious peculiarity, however, the books are arranged in a new order; the Chronicles are split up into fragments for the purpose of comparison with the parallel books.

9. Boothroyd's Biblia Hebraica, with various leadings (Pontefract, 1810- 16, 2 vols. 4to).

10. Frey's Biblia Hebraica (Lond. 1812, 2 vols. 8vo), which was entirely superseded by

11. D'Allemand's Biblia Hebraica (ibid. 1822, and often). Van der Hooght's text is fountd in all English editions of the Hebrew Bible published by Duncan or Bagster, and is also made the basis of

12. The Hexaglot Bible, SEE POLYGLOT BIBLES (Lond. 1876, 6 vols. royal 4to).

13. The Basle Edition of 1827.

14. Hahn's Editions, published at Leipsic in 1831, 1832, 1833, 1839, and 1867; the last is superior to the former, as can be seen from the preface. Hahn's text has also been relprinted in the polyglot of Stier and Theile (Elberfeld, 1847, and often). There is also a small edition of Hahn's Bible (in 12mo), with a preface by Rosenmuller, in small but clear type. The last of this edition was published in 1868.

15. Theile's Editions (ibid 1840; 4th ed. 1873). This edition may be regarded as one of the best Hebrew Bibles according to Van der Hooght's recension. Wright, in his The Book of Genesis in Hebrew (Lond. 1S59), has followed Theile's text.

XII. Opitz's Text, or Biblica Hebraica cum Optimus Impressis, etc. Studio et Opera D. H. Optii (Kiloni, 1709, 4to). Opitz compared for this edition three codices and fourteen plinted editions, which are enumerated in the preface. This text was reprinted in

1. Zullichow Biblia cum Praefatione Michaelis (1741, 4to).

2. Evangelische deutsche Original-Bibel, containing the Hebrew and Luther's German translation (Kiloni,1741).

XIII. Editions with a Revised Text. With Van der Hooght's edition a textus receptus was given, which was corrected and improved from time to time. But the more the Masorah and ancient Jewish grammarians were studied, the more it was found that the present text, while on the whole correct, did not come up to the requirements and rules laid down by ancient grammarians, for, as Delitzsch observes, in the edition of the Old Test., the minutest points must be observed, trifling and pettifoggish as they may appear to the superficial reader; “yet ιῶτα ἕν ἢ μία κεραία maximi apud nos ponderis esse debet.” Thus it came to pass that from time to time new editions of the Hebrew text were published על פי המסרה, i.e. in accordance with the Masorah. Of such editions we mention, passing over the editions of single parts of the Old Test.,

1. The edition publish ed at Carlsruhe (1836-37) and edited by Epstein, Rosenfeld, and others.

2. Philippsohn's Israelitische Bibel (Leipsic, 1844-54). But this edition, says Delitzsch, “quamquam textnm המסרה אל פי conformatum se exhibeie predicat, Masorethica diligentie vix ullum vestigiumn ostendit et vitiis plurimis scatet.”

3. Letteris's Edition, or נביאים וכתובים ספר הקדש והוא תורה (Vienna, 1852, 2 vols. Svo). This edition was reprinted by the British and Foreign Bible Society at Berlin, with the corrections of Theophilus Abramson (1866, and often; latest edition, 1874). With an English title- page, “The Hebrew Bible, revised and carefully examined by Myer Levi  Letteris,” the society's edition was published (?) by Wiley and Son (N. Y. 1875).

4. A new edition, which, as we hope, will become the standard text for the future, is that commenced by Baeur and Delitzsch. As early as 1861, S. Baer, in connection with Prof. Delitzsch, published the ספר תהלים, or LiberPsanlorumn Hebraicus. Textuan Masorethicum accuratimvs quam adhutc factuan est expressit. . .¥ otas criticas adjecit S. Baer. Pruefatus est F. Delitzsch (Lipsiae, 1861). Mr. Baer, who for about twenty years has made Masoretic lore his specialty, the results of which he partly gave to the public in his תורת אמת (Ridelheim, 1852), was best adapted for such a task, and his connection with Prof. Delitzsch, one of the greatest living Hebrew scholars, is the best guarantee that the work is in able hands. An improved edition of the Psalms was published in 1874, under the title ספר תהלות, Liber Psanlmorum Hebraicus atque Latinus ab Hieronymno ex Hebrceo conversus. Consociata opera ediderunt C. de Tischendorf, S. Baer, et Fr. Delitzsch. In the preface, which is prepared by Delitzsch, we get a great deal of instructive matter as to the sources used for this edition. The Hebrew and Latin text is followed by Appendices Criticoe et Masorethicoe of great value to the student. Both these editions are published in 12mo. Besides the Psalms, which in their present size are probably not intended for a complete edition of the Old Test., they published —

(1.) תורה ספר בראשית הוא ספר ראשון לחמשה חמשי, Liber Genesis, Texture Masorethicum accuratissime expressit, e Fontibus Masoroe varie illustravit, Notis Criticis confirmavit, S. Baer. Prefatus est edendi operis adjutor Fr. Delitzsch (Liptsie, 1869, gr. Svo). The title fully indicates the contents of the work, which, however, we will specify. The Hebrew text is followed by

a. Specimen Lectionuum in hac Editione Genesis receptarum.

b. Loci Genesis Vocalem non productam in Medio Extrea move Versu retinentes.

c. Scripturoe Genesis inter Scholas Orientales et Occidentales controversoe.

d. Loci Genesis a Ben-Asher et Ben-Naphtali diverse Punctis signati.

e. Loci Genesis Consimiles qui facile confunduntur.

f. Loci Genesis Lineola Pasek notati.

g. Sectiones Libri Genesis Masorethicoe.

h. Conspectus Notarumn Masoreticarumn: α. Varietas scriptionis et lectionis; β. Adnotationes Masoreticce; γ. Clausula libri.

(2.) Liber Jesaioe .. (Lipsiae, 1872), containing the same critical matter as Genesis.

(3.) Liber Jobi. . . (ibid. 1875). Opposite the title-page stands a facsimile of the Codex Tshufutkale No. 8 a, which gives a good specimen of the Babylonian system of punctuation.

(4.) Liber Duodecim Prophetarum . . (ibid. 1878). The prefaces which precede the Hebrew text, in all these volumes give an account of the various MSS , editions, etc., which have been perused for each book, and aie full of instruction to the student of the sacred text. When completed, this edition of the Old Test. will form not a recension, but the recension of the best Hebrew text with which the student can be furnished.

Literature. — For the different editions of the Old Test., see Le-Long- Mash, Wolf, Bartolocci, Rosenmuller, and introductions to the Old Test., together with Davidson, Biblical Criticism, i, 137 sq., and De Rossi, De e nebraicc Typogtruphiu- Origine, etc. (Parma, 1776); id. De Typograuphiua Hebraeo-Fue-irariensi, etc. (ibid. 1780); id. De Iginotis Nonnullis Antiquissinis Hebr. Textus Editt. etc. (Erlangen, 1782); id. Annales Hebrceo - typogragphici, etc. (Parma, 1795). For various readings, see the editions of Kennicott, Michaelis, Jahin, Reineccius- Meissner-Doderlein; the Varice Lecliones of De Rossi (ibid. 1784, 4 vols.); Davidson, The Hebrew Text of the Old Testament, etc. (Lond. 1855) — following, as Davidson does, De Rossi and Jahn, his work, besides being deficient, cannot always be relied upon; Pick, Horce Samaritance, or a Collection of various Readings of the Samiaritan Pentateuch compared with the Hebrew and other Ancient Versions, in Libl. Sacra (Andover, 1876-78); Strack, Katalog der hebr. Bibelhandschriften in St. Petersburg (St. Petersburg, 1875). For critical purposes, see, besides the articles QUOTATIONS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE TALMUD and SEE MASORAH in this Cyclopoedia, together with the literature given in those articles, Strack, Peroleuomena Critica in V. T. (Lipsiae, 1873); id. Zur  Textlritili des Jesaias, in Lutchrische Zeitschrift (Leipsic, 1877), p. 17 sq., and his preface to the edition of the Proaphetarnum Codex Buabylonicus Petropolitanus (Petrop. 1876); Meir-a-Levi Abulafia (q.v.), ספר מסורת סייג לתורה (Florence, 1750; Berlin, 1761), Lonzano, אור תורה (Venice, 1618; Berlin, 1745); Norzi (q.v.), מנחת שי (Vienna, 1813); also in the Warsaw Rabbinic Bible; Heidenheim, מאור עינים הומש (Rodelheim. 1818-21); Kimchi, Liber Radicum edd. Lebrecht et Biesenthal (Berlin, 1847); Frensdorff, Die Massora Miagna (Hanover and Leipsic, 1876); Geiger, Urschrift und Uebersetzumngen der Bibel (Breslau, 1857), p. 231 sq.; the critical notes appended by Baer and Delitzsch to the different books edited by them; the Masechet Soferim (q.v.), best ed. by J. Muller (Leipsic, 1878); the forthcoming work of Ginsburg on the Masorah, which will be published in 4 vols. - viz. vol. i, the Masorah Magna, lexically arranged; vol. ii, the Masorah Parva; vol. 3, an English translation, with explanatory notes; vol. 4, the original Hebrew text of the Bible according to the Masorah; and Delitzsch, Complutensische Varianten zu den Alttestamnentlichen Texte (ibid. 1878). (B. P.)

## Reception of the Holy Ghost[[@Headword:Reception of the Holy Ghost]]

             In the act of conferring the orders of the ministry simple, or of its higher functions, such as the eldership or bishopric, the solemn words are used, “Receive the Holy Ghost.” Having been originally used by Jesus when he commissioned his apostles, the expression has been retained by the Church  as the most proper and authoritative form in which the powers of the Christian priesthood can be conveyed. “That the Church is vindicated,” says Stoughton, “in employing them at the consecration of bishops is manifest from the fact that the ministerial powers of office are identically the same with those held by the apostles, and if given at all must proceed from the same source — i.e. the Holy Ghost.” In the ordination of priests the same principle will apply. “Those under the designation of presbyters or elders also received their authority from this divine source, notwithstanding that there might be one or more intermediate links in the chain of transmission.” “Take heed,” said Paul to the elders of Ephesus, “unto yourselves and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.” If, therefore, it be granted that the bishop has the power of ordaining, it follows that he stands as an agent between the heavenly source of authority and the candidate to whom that authority is to be given, and is qualified to pronounce, “Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a priest [or bishop] in the Church of God,' etc.

We have quoted Stoughton because he fully exhibits the High-Church notion of ordination (q.v.), but we do not wish to be understood as its endorsers. Even the Low-Church clergy of the Anglican communion and the Protestant Episcopal Church refuse to give it approval. SEE EPISCOPACY. In the Methodist Episcopal Church bishops are not regarded as the successors of the apostles, and the apostolical succession of its ministry is not maintained. SEE EPISCOPACY, § iv. The form of ordination is very like in the different churches, and its variability of opinion depends upon the interpretation of the language employed.

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

             of monks, nuns, and other religious persons, is the ceremonial whereby they are admitted to the probationary state called the novitiate (q.v.). Before the ceremony of reception a short preparatory stage must be passed through by the candidate (called at this stage a “postulant”), the duration of which usually ranges from two to six months. The ceremony of the reception, called also “clothing,” is performed by a bishop, or a priest delegated by a bishop, and consists in blessing the religious dress or habit and investing the postulant therein with appropriate prayers, the hair being at the same time cut off and the secular dress laid aside, in token of the renunciation of the world and its pomps and pleasures. The reception,  however, is understood to be only a provisional step, and the novice remains free to return to secular life at any time during the novitiate.

## Receptorium[[@Headword:Receptorium]]

             was the name of an ecclesiastical outer building, a kind of speaking-room, a parlor contiguous to the ancient churches; it is sometimes called salutatorium (q.v.). Mention of it occurs in Sidonius Apollinaris (1. v, epist. 17), Sulpitius Severus (Dial. ii, 1), the first Council of Macon (can. ii), Theodoretus, and many other authors. Theodoretus relates that Theodosius, when he came to request absolution from St. Ambrose, found the saint sitting in salutatorio. Scaliger is wrong in supposing this to be a room in the bishop's mansion; it adjoined the church, and was a part of the church building. In the receptorium the sacred utensils, the ornaments, and robes of the (medieval) clergy were deposited for safe-keeping. Here the clergy were accustomed to retire for private devotions, preparatory to their engaging in public exercises. It was also a general audience-room, where friends and acquaintances met to exchange their affectionate salutations and inquiries, and where the bishop or the priests received the people who came to ask their blessing or recommend themselves to their prayers, or to take their advice in matters of importance. Sulpitius Severus (Dial. ii, 1) shows us St. Martin sitting in a kind of sacristy, and his priests in another, receiving visitors and transacting business.

## Receveur, Francois Joseph Xavier[[@Headword:Receveur, Francois Joseph Xavier]]

             a French priest and historian, was born at Longeville (Doubs) April 30,1800. Hardly had he received his orders when he was called to Paris (Oct., 1824) to fill a subordinate position in the cabinet of the minister of ecclesiastical affairs and of public instruction. From June, 1828, to June, 1829, he was head of the bureau of secretary-ship to the same minister. Afterwards appointed a teacher in the theological faculty of Paris (May 1, 1831), he became titular professor of moral philosophy March 1, 1841, and dean of the faculty Dec. 6, 1850. He had not long been relieved from these last duties when he died in his native country, May 7, 1854. The various positions which he filled permitted him to devote his labors to several important works. We have: Recherches Philosophiques sur le Fondement de la Certitude (Paris, 1821, 12mo): — Accord de la Foi avec la Raison, ou Exposition des Principes sur lesquels repose la Foi Catholique (ibid. 1830-33, 12mo): — Essai sur la Nature de l'Ane, sur l'Origine des Idees  et le Fondemenzt de la Certitude (ibid. 1834, 8vo): — Tractatus Theologicus de Justitia et Contractibus (ibid. 1835, 12mo): — Introduction i la Theologie (Besan9on, 1839, 8vo): — Histoire de l'Eglise depuis son Etablissement jusqu'au Pontificat de Gregegoire XVI (Paris, 1840-47, 8 vols. 8vo). As an editor, abbe Receveur has given a new edition of the Theologie Dogmatique et Morale of Bailly (1830), and another of the Theologie Morale of Liguori, to which he has added some notes (1833). Collector for the Nouvelle Biographie Generale, he died a short time after having contributed the articles Saint-Cyprien and Saint-Cyrille. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rechab[[@Headword:Rechab]]

             (Heb. Recchab', רֵכָב, a rider; Sept. ῾Ρηχάβ), the name of three men.

1. The first named of the two “sons of Rimmon the Beerothite,” “captains of bands,” who murdered Ishbosheth in his bed in order to gain favor with David, but were put to death by him, with expressions of abhorrence for their crime (2Sa 4:5-12). B.C. 1046. Josephus calls him Thannus (θάννος, Ant. 7:2, 1). The other's name was Baanah (q.v.).

2. The “father” of Jehonadab (or Jonadab, Jer 35:6), who was Jehu's companion in destroying the worshippers of Baal (2Ki 10:15; 2Ki 10:23). SEE JEHONADAB. B.C. ante 882. He was the ancestor of the Rechabites (q.v.).

3. The father of Malchiah, which latter was ruler of part of Beth-haccerem, and is named as repairing the dung-gate in the fortifications of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh 3:14). B.C. ante 446.

## Rechabite[[@Headword:Rechabite]]

             [properly Re'chabite] (Heb. always in the plur. and with the art., ha- Rekabin', הָרֵכָבַים, a patrial from Rechab; Sept. Α᾿ρχαβείν, ῾Ραχαβείν, etc.), a tribe who appear only in one memorable scene of Scripture (Jer 35:2-18). Their history before and after it lies in some obscurity. We are left to search out and combine some scattered notices, and to get from them what light we can.

I. In 1Ch 2:55 the house of Rechab is identified with a section of the Kenites who came into Canaan with the Israelites and retained their nomadic habits, and the name of Hemath is mentioned as the patriarch of  the whole tribe. SEE HEMIATH; SEE KENITE. It has been inferred from this passage that the descendants of Rechab belonged to a branch of the Kenites settled from the first at Jabez, in Judah. SEE JEHONADAB. The fact, however, that Jehonadab took an active part in the revolution which placed Jehu on the throne seems to indicate that he and his tribe belonged to Israel rather than to Judah, and the late date of I Chronicles, taken together with other facts (infra), makes it more probable that this passage refers to the locality occupied by the Rechabites after their return from the captivity. In confirmation of this view, it may be noticed that the “shearing- house” of 2Ki 10:14 was probably the known rendezvous of the nomad tribe of the Kenites with their flocks of sheep. SEE SHEARING- HOUSE

Of Rechab himself nothing is known. He may have been the father, he may have been the remote ancestor, of Jehonadab. The meaning of the word makes it probable enough that it was an epithet passing into a proper name. It may have pointed, as in the robber-chief of 2Sa 4:2, to a conspicuous form of the wild Bedouin life; and Jehonadab, the son of the Rider, may have been, in part at least, for that reason. the companion and friend of the fierce captain of Israel who drives as with the fury of madness (2Ki 9:20). Another conjecture as to the meaning of the name is ingenious enough to merit a disinterment from the forgotten learning of the 16th century. Boulduc (De Ecclesiastes ante Leg. 3:10) infers from 2Ki 2:12; 2Ki 13:14, that the two great prophets Elijah and Elisha were known, each of them in his time, as the chariot (רֶכֶב, Re'keb) of Israel, i.e. its strength and protection. He infers from this that the special disciples of the prophets, who followed them in all their austerity, were known as the “sons of the chariot,” Beze-Rekeb; and that afterwards, when the original meaning had been lost sight of, this was taken as a patronymic, and referred to an unknown Rechab. At present, of course, the different vowel- points of the two words are sufficiently distinctive; but the strange reading of the Sept. in Jdg 1:19 (ὅτι ῾Ρηχὰβ διεστείλατο αὐτοῖς, where the A.V. has “because they had chariots of iron”) shows that one word might easily enough be taken for the other. Apart from the evidence of the name and the obvious probability of the fact, we'have the statement (quantum valeat) of John of Jerusalem that Jehonadab was a disciple of Elisha (De Instit. Monach. c. 25).

II. The personal history of Jehonadab has been dealt with under that name. Here we have to notice the new character which he impressed on the tribe of which he was the head. As his name, his descent, and the part which he played indicate, he and his people had all along been worshippers of Jehovah, circumcised, and so within the covenant of Abraham, though not reckoned as belonging to Israel, and probably therefore not considering themselves bound by the Mosaic law and ritual. The worship of Baal introduced by Jezebel and Ahab was accordingly not less offensive to them than to the Israelites. The luxury and license of Phoenician cities threatened the destruction of the simplicity of their nomadic life (Amo 2:7-8; Amo 6:3-6). A protest was needed against both evils, and, as in the case of Elijah, and of the Nazarites of Amo 2:11, it took the form of asceticism. There was to be a more rigid adherence than ever to the old Arab life. What had been a traditional habit was enforced by a solemn command from the sheikh and prophet of the tribe, the destroyer of idolatry, which no one dared to transgress. They were to drink no wine, nor build house, nor sow seed. nor plant vineyard, nor have any. All their days they were to dwell in tents, as remembering that they were strangers in the land (Jer 35:6-7). This was to be the condition of their retaining a distinct tribal existence. For two centuries and a half they adhered faithfully to this rule; but we have no record of any part taken by them in the history of the period. We may think of them as presenting the same picture mwhich other tribes, uniting the nomad life with religious austerity, have presented in later periods.

The Nabathbeans, of whom Diodorus Siculus speaks (19, 94) as neither sowing seed, nor planting fruit-tree, nor using nor building house, and enforcing these transmitted customs under pain of death, give us one striking instance. The fact that the Nabathueans habituallv drank “wild honey” (μέλι ἄγριον) mixed with water (Diod. Sic. 19:94), and that the Bedouin as habitually still make locutsts an article of food (Burckhardt, Bedouins, p. 270), shows very strongly that the Baptist's life was fashioned after the Rechabitish as well as the Nazaritish type. Another is found in the prohibition of wine by Mohammed (Sale, Koran, Prelim. Diss. § 5). A yet more interesting parallel is found in the rapid growth of the sect of the Wahabis during the last and present century. Abd-ul-Wahab, from whom the sect takes its name, reproduces the old type of character in all its completeness. Anxious to protect his countrymen from the revolting vices of the Turks, as Jelonnadab had been to protect the Kenites from the like  vices of the Phoenicians, the Bedouin reformer felt the necessity of returning to the old austerity of Arab life. What wine had been to the earlier preacher of righteousness, the outward sign and incentive of a fatal corruption, opium and tobacco were to the later prophet, and, as such, were rigidly proscribed. The rapidity wmith which the Wahabis became a formidable party, the Puritans of Islam, presents a striking analogy to the strong political influence of Jehonadab in 2Ki 10:15; 2Ki 10:23 (comp. Burckhardt, Bedouins and Wahabis, p. 283, etc.).

III. The invasion of Judah by Nebuchadnezzar in B.C. 607 drove the Rechabites from their tents. Possibly some of the previous periods of danger may have led to their settling within the limits of the territory of Judah. Some inferences may be safely drawn from the facts of Jeremiah 35. The names of the Rechabites show that they continued to be worshippers of Jehovah. They are already known to the prophet. One of them (Jer 35:3) bears the same name. Their rigid Nazaritish life gained for them admission into the house of the Lord, into one of the chambers assigned to priests and Levites, within its precincts. They were received by the sons or followers of a “man of God,” a prophet or devotee, of special sanctity (Jer 35:4). Here they are tempted, and are proof against the temptation, and their steadfastness is turned into a reproof for the unfaithfuilness of Judah and Jerusalem. SEE JEREMIAH.

The history of this trial ends with a special blessing, the full import of which has, for the most part, not been adequately apprehended: “Jonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me forever” (Jer 35:19). Whether we look on this as the utterance of a true prophet, or as a vaticinium e e ventu, we should hardly expect at this precise point to lose sight altogether of those of whom it was spoken, even if the words pointed only to the perpetuation of the name and tribe. They have, however, a higher meaning. The words “to stand before me” (עֹמֵד לַפָנִי) are essentially liturgical. The tribe of Levi is chosen to “stand before” the Lord (Deu 10:8; Deu 18:5; Deu 18:7). In Gen 18:22; Jdg 20:28; Psa 134:1; Jer 15:19, the liturgical meaning is equally prominent and unmistakable (comp. Gesenius. Thesaur. s.v.; Grotius, ad loc.). The fact that this meaning is given (“ministering before me”) in the Targuin of Jonathan is evidence (1) as to the received meaning of the phrase; (2) that this rendering did not shock the feelings of studious and devout rabbins in our Lord's time; (3) that it was at least probable that there existed representatives of the Rechabites connected with the Temple services in the  time of Jonathan. This, then, may possibly have been the extent of the new blessing. The Rechabites were solemnly adopted into the families of Israel, and were recognised as incorporated into the tribe of Levi. Their purity, their faithfulness, their consecrated life, gained for them, as it gained for other Nazarites, that honor. SEE PRIEST, HEBREW. In Lam 4:7 we may perhaps trace a reference to the Rechabites, who had been the most conspicuous examples of the Nazaritish life in the prophet's time, and most the object of his admiration.

It may be worth while to refer to a few authorities agreeing in the general interpretation here given, though differing as to details. Vatablus (Crit. Sac. ad loc.) mentions a Jewish tradition (R. Judah, as cited by Kimchi; comp. Scaliger, Elench. Trihaeres. Serrar. p. 26) that the daughters of the Rechabites married Levites, and that thus their children came to minister in the Temple. Clarius (ibid.) conjectures that the Rechabites themselves were chosen to sit in the great council. Sanctius and Calmet suppose them to have ministered in the same way as the Nethinim (Calmet, Diss. sur les Rechab. 1726). Serrarius (Trihaeres.) identifies them with the Essenes; Scaliger (loc. cit.) with the Chasidim, in ihose name the priests offered special daily sacrifices, and who, in this way, were “standing before the Lord” continually.

IV. It remains for us to see whether there are any traces of their after- history in the Biblical or later writers. It is believed that there are such traces, and that they confirm the statements made in the previous paragraph.

1. We have the singular heading of Psalms 71 in the Sept. version (τῷ Δανίδ, υἱῶν Ι᾿ωναδάβ, καὶ τῶν πρώτων αἰχμαλωτισθέντων), which, however, is evidence merely of a tradition in the 3d century B.C. indicating that the “sons of Jonadab” shared the captivity of Israel, and took their place among the Levitical psalmists who gave expression to the sorrows of the people. The psalm itself belongs to David's time. SEE PSALMS.

2. There is the significant mention of a son of Rechab in Neh 3:14 as co-operating with the priests, Levites, and princes in the restoration of the wall of Jerusalem.

3. The mention of the house of Rechab in 1Ch 2:55, though not without difficulty, points, there can be little, doubt, to the same conclusion. The Rechabites have become scribes (סוֹפְרַים, sopherimn). They give  themselves to a calling which, at the time of the return from Babylon, was chiefly, if not exclusively, in the hands of Levites. The other names (Tirathites, Shimeathites, and Suchathites in the A.V.) seem to add nothing to our knowledge. The Vulg. rendering, however (evidence of a traditional Jewish interpretation in the time of Jerome), gives a translation based on etymologies, more or less accurate, of the proper names, which strikingly confirms the view now taken: “Cognationes quoque Scribarum habitantium in Jabes, canentes atque resonantes, et in tabernaculis commorantes.” Thus interpreted, the passage points to a resumption of the outward form of their old life and its union with their new functions. The etymologies on which this version rests are, it must be confessed, very doubtful. Scaliger (Elench. Tihcer. Serrar. c. 23) rejects them with scorn. Pellican and Calmet, on the other hand, defend the Vulg. rendering, and Gill (ad loc.) does not dispute it. Most modern interpreters follow the A.V. in taking the words as proper names. It deserves notice also that while in 1Ch 2:54-55 the Rechabites and Netophathites are mentioned in close connection, the “sons of the singers” in Neh 12:28 appear as coming in large numbers from the villages of the same Netophathites. The close juxtaposition of the Rechabites with the descendants of David in 1Ch 3:1 shows also in how honorable an esteem they were held at the time wmhen that book was compiled.

4. The account of the martyrdom of James the Just given by Hegesippus (Euseb. H.E. ii; 23) brings the name of the Rechabites once more before us, and in a very strange connection. While the scribes and Pharisees were stoning him, “one of the priests of the sons of Rechab, the son of Rechabim, who are mentioned by Jeremiah the prophet,” cried out, protesting against the crime. Stanley (Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age, p. 333), struck with the seeming anomaly of a priest, “not only not of Levitical, but not even of Jewish descent,” supposes the name to have been used loosely as indicating the abstemious life of James and other Nazarites, and points to the fact that Epiphanius (Haer. 78:14) ascribes to Simeon, the brother of James, the words which Hegesippus puts into the mouth of the Rechabite, as a proof that it denoted merely the Nazaritish form of life. Calmet (loc. cit.) supposes the man to have been one of the Rechabite Nethinim, whom the informant of Hegesippus took, in his ignorance, for a priest. The view which has been here talken presents, it is believed, a more satisfactory solution. It was hardly possible that a writer like Hegesippus, living at a time when the details of the Temple services were fresh in the  memories of men, should have thus spoken of the Rechabim unless there had been a body of men to whom the name was commonly applied. He uses it as a man would do to whom it was familiar, without being struck by any apparent or real anomaly. The Targum of Jonathan on Jer 35:19 indicates, as has been noticed, the same fact. We may accept Hegesippus therefore as an additional witness to the existence of the Rechabites as a recognised body up to the destruction of Jerusalem, sharing in the ritual of the Temple, partly descended from the old “sons of Jonadab,” partly recruited by the incorporation into their rankls of men devoting themselves, as did James and Simeon, to the same consecrated life. The form of austere holiness presented in the life of Jonadab, and the blessing pronounced on his descendants, found their highest representatives in the two brothers of the Lord.

5. Some later notices are not without interest. Benjamin of Tudela, in the 12th century (ed. Asher, 1840, i, 112-114), mentions that near El Jubar (=Pumbeditha) he found Jews who were named Rechabites. They tilled the ground, kept flocks and herds, abstained from wine and flesh, and gave tithes to teachers who devoted themselves to studying the law and weeping for Jerusalem. They were 100,000 in number, and were governed by a prince, Salomon han-Nasi, who traced his genealogy up to the house of David, and ruled over the city of Thema and Telmas. A later traveller, Dr. Wolff, gives a yet stranger and more detailed report. The Jews of Jerusalem and Yemen told him that he would find the Rechabites of Jeremiah 35 living near Mecca (Journal, 1829, ii, 334). When he came near Senaa he came in contact with a tribe, the Beni-Khaibr, who identified themselves with the sons of Jonadab. With one of them, Musa,Wolff conversed, and he reports the dialogue as follows: “I asked him,' Whose descendants are you?' Musa answered, ‘Come, and I will show you,' and read from an Arabic Bible the words of Jer 35:5-11. He then went on. ‘Come, and you will find us 60,000 in number. You see the words of the prophet have been fulfilled: Jonadab the son of Rechab shall not want a man to stand before me forever'“ (ibid. p. 335). In a later journal (ibid. 1839, p. 389) he mentions a second interview with Musa, describes them as keeping strictly to the old rule, calls them now by the name of the Beni- Arhad, and says that Beni-Israel of the tribe of Dan live with them. A paper On Recent Notices of the Rechabites, by Signor Pierotti, was read at the Cambridge meeting of the British Association (October, 1862). He met with a tribe calling themselves by that name near the Dead Sea, about two  miles south-east from it. They had a Hebrew Bible, and said their prayers at the tomb of a Jewish rabbi. They toldl him precisely the same stories as had been told to Wolff thirty years before. The details, however, whether correct or not, apply to Talnudical Jews more than to Rechabites. They are described as living in caverns and low houses, not in tents-and this in Arabia, where Bedouin habits would cease to be singular; nor are any of the Rechabite rules observable in them except that of refraining from wine — an abstinence which ceases to be remarkable in Arabia, where no one drinks wine, and where, among the strongholds of Islam, it could probably not be obtained without danger and difficulty. There were large numbers of Talmudical Jews in Arabia in the time of Mohammed, and these supposed Rechabites are probably descended from a body of them. See Witsius. Dissert. de Rechabitis, in Miscell. Sacra, ii, 176 sq.; Carpzov, Apparat. p. 148; Calmet, Dissert. sur les Rechabites, in Commentaire Litterai, 6:18- 21. For the modlern temporance organization by this name, SEE TEMPERANCE.

## Rechac, Jean Giffre De[[@Headword:Rechac, Jean Giffre De]]

             (whose religious name was Jean de Sainte-Marie), a French Dominican, was born at Quillebceuf Aug. 25, 1604. he took the habit of a monk, and taught Greek and Hebrew at Paris, then at Bordeaux. He travelled in the Orient as an apostolic missionary, and visited the isle of Scio and Constantinople. Returning to Paris about the end of 1631, he became in 1637 prior of the convent of the Dominicans at Rouen, and devoted himself with success to preaching. Being sent to Bordeaux in 1640, he collected numerous materials for writing the history of his order; and when, in 1656, the monks of St. Dominic founded several houses in France, he was charged with the erection of divers novitiates. He died April 9, 1660. We have of his works, Les Vreis Exercices Solides et Pratiques de la Vie Spirituelle et Religieuse (loulen, 163840, 4 vols. 12mo): — Vie de Scaint- Hyacinthe (Paris, 1643. 12mo): — Les Viies e Trois Bienhaeureux de Bretagne. Ives Malcreuc, Evque de Rennes, Alain de lt Roche, Pierre Quinztin (ibid. 1645, 12mo): — Vie de Renaud de Saint-Gilles, Doyen de Saint-Agnau d'Orleans (who died in 1220) (ibid. 1646, 12mo): — Vie de Saint-Dominique, avec la Foundation de tous les Convents des Freres Precheurs de l'un et de l'autre Sexe en France Ce et dans les Pays-Bas (ibid. 1647. 4to): — Les Vies et Actions Minmorables des Sainties et Bienheureuses de l'Ordre des Frires Precheurs (1635, 2 vols. 4to): — and a great number of other works printed or in MS., among them Prophties  de Nostradamus s expliquees (Paris, 1656,12mo), published without the name of the author. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rechah[[@Headword:Rechah]]

             (Heb. Reklah', רֵכָה, hindermost; Sept. ῾Ρηχάβ v. r. ῾Ρηφά). In 1Ch 4:12, Beth-rapha, Paseah, and Tehinnah the father, or founder, of Ir-nahash, are said to have been “the men of Rechah.” In the Targum of R. Joseph they are called “the men of the Great Sanhedrin,” the Targumist apparently reading , רִבָּהSchwarz regards it as the name of a place inhabited by the posterity of Judah, and identifies it with “a village Rashsih, three English miles to the south of Hebron” (Palest. p 116).

## Reche, Johann Wilhelm[[@Headword:Reche, Johann Wilhelm]]

             the main representative of the Kantian rationalism in the Lutheran Church of the Rhine countries, was born Nov. 3, 1764, at Lennep. In 1786 he became pastor of the newly organized Lutheran church at Huckeswagen, and in 1796 pastor at Mulheim-on-the-Rhine, where, during the Revolution, he published a translation of Marcus Aurelius's philosophical treatise Τὰ εἰς ἑαυτὸν (1797), in order to show how a man should become a stoic. After the taking of the Rhine countries by Prussia, he became a member of the consistory of Cologne, which in 1826 was dissolved. In 1830 he retired from the ministry to his country-seat at Wesseling, between Cologne and Bonn, being dissatisfied with the new religious movement of his time, and died as an angry philosopher Jan. 9, 1835. He published some hymns, which, though of little value, are, however, found in some of the modernized German hymn-books. He also published a collection of sermons in two volumes, which are enumerated in Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1035 (comp. also Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 6, 259). (B. P.)

## Rechenberg, Adam[[@Headword:Rechenberg, Adam]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born September 7, 1642, at Leipsdorf, Saxony. He studied at Leipsic, where he began his academical career in 1666. In 1677 he was professor of languages, and in 1678 commenced his theological lectures. In 1699 he was doctor of theology, and died October 22, 1721. He published, Athensagorae Apologia pro Christianis (Leipsic, 1684): — Athenagorae Liber de Resurrectione Mortuorum (eod.): — Athenagorae Opera Greece et Latine cum Animadversionibus (1688): — Novum Testamentum Graecum cum Praefatione et Libris Parallelis (1691, 1702, 1709): — De Justitia Dei  Ultrice (1699): — Augustini Enchiridion ad Laurentium cum Praefatione de Studio Theologico (1705): — Exercitationes in Novum Testamentum, Historiam Ecclesiasticam et Literariam Varii Argumenti (1707; 2d ed. 1714): — Hierolexicon Reale, hoc est Biblio-Theologicum et Historico- Ecclesiasticum (1714): — De Theologiae et Philosophiae Pugna Apparmente (1717). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:321, 446, 533, 884, 903; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rechenberg, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Rechenberg, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born Feb. 10, 1817, at Barnickow, near Konigsberg, in Prussia. From 1835 to 1840 he studied in the seminary of the Berlin Missionary Society, and in 1841 he came to this country to work among his countrymen. His first pastorate was at Syracuse, N. Y., where he labored for about fifteen years. In the year 1855 he was called to Albany, at which place he remained three years. He then went to Canada, where he labored for thirteen years in Toronto and for five years at  Montreal. Amongs his co-religionists he was a prominent, member, and was the first president of the Canadian synod. He also edited for a long time the paper of his denomination, and as president of the Missionary Board he cared for his countrymen with word and sacrament. His bodily infirmities obliged him to retire from his large field of labor, and he accepted the call of a small congregation at Port Chester, N.Y., in 1875, where he died Dec. 13, 1877. (B. P.)

## Reclam, Peter Christian Friedrich[[@Headword:Reclam, Peter Christian Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born at Magdeburg, March 16, 1741. In 1765 lie was catechist, and in 1768 preacher of the French congregation at Berlin. He died January 22, 1789. He published, Memoires pour Servir a l'Histoire des Refugies Francais dants les Etats du Roi a Berlin (1782-94, 8 volumes): — Memoire Historique sur la Fondation des Colonies Francaises dans les Etats du Roi (1785): — Pensees Philosophques sur la Religion (eod.): — Sermons sur Divers Textes de l'Ecriture Sainte (1790, 2 volumes). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Recluse[[@Headword:Recluse]]

             (Lat. reclusus, also inclusus, shut up”), a class of monks or nuns who, from a moItive of special penance, or with a view to the more strict observance of Christian perfection, remained shut up from all converse, even with members of their own order, in a small cell of a hermitage or other place of strict retirement. This practice, which was a kind of voluntary imprisonment, either from motives of devotion or penance, was not allowed except to persons of tried virtue and by special permission of the abbot; and the recluse, who took an oath never to stir out of his retreat, was with due solemnity locked up in the presence of the abbot or the bishop, who placed his seal upon the door, not to be removed without the authority of the bishop himself. Everything necessary for support was conveyed through a window. If the recluse were a priest, he was allowed a small oratory with a window which looked into the church, through which he might make his offerings at mass, hear the singing, and answer those who spoke to him; but this wincdow had curtains before it, so that he could not be seen. In later medlieval times the recluse was allowed a small garden near his cell for the planting of a few herbs and for recreation in fresh air. If he fell sick, his door was opened by the authorities for the sake of affording assistance. The celebrated mediaeval theologian Rabanus Maurus was a recluse when elected archbishop of Mentz. Nuns also were found to practice the same voluntary seclusion, especially in the Benedictine, Franciscan, and Cistercian orders. A rule specially designed for female recluses was composed by AElred of Reresby, and is preserved by Holstenius in his Codex Regularum Monasticarum, i, 418 sq. In a wider sense, the name recluse is popularly applied to all cloistered persons, whether men or women — even those who live in community with their brethren. The inmates of the celebrated French retreat for Jansenists — Port-Royal — were also called recluses. See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen- Lexikon (art. “Inclusi”); Cults, Scenes, and Characters of the Middle Ages (Lond. 1873).

## Recognitions[[@Headword:Recognitions]]

             SEE CLEMENTINES.

## Recollet[[@Headword:Recollet]]

             (Lat. recollectus, “gathered together”) is the name given to the members of certain reformed bodies of monastic orders, whether of men or women, in the Roman Catholic Church. Among orders of men, an offshoot of the Augustinian hermits, which, under Louis de Montaya, in 1530, obtained considerable popularity in Spain, was called by this name, and the order still exists at Medina Sidonia, Leon, and Pamplona; but outside of Spain, this order is better known under the title of the Reformed Franciscans, who originated about 1592, and were established in France under Henry IV and Louis XIV, and spread thence into Belgium, their houses in these countries and Germany becoming so numerous that they reckoned no less than ten provinces. In the French army of Louis XIV the Reformed Franciscans used to administer the sacrament. A reform of the Cistercian order of nuns in Spain was also called by the same name (Chambers). See Histoire du Clergi Seculier et Regulier, ii, 367 sq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. 9:71.

## Reconciliatio Poenitentium[[@Headword:Reconciliatio Poenitentium]]

             is the act by which offenders of the Church are restored to ecclesiastical rights and privileges. SEE PENITENTS.

## Reconciliation[[@Headword:Reconciliation]]

             (usually some form of כָּפִר, to cover sin, καταλλαγή) is making those friends again who were at variance, or restoring to favor those having fallen under displeasure. Thus the Scriptures describe the disobedient world as having been at enmity with God, but “reconciled” to him by the death of his Son. The expressions “reconciliation” and “making peace” necessarily suppose a previous state of hostility between God and man, which is reciprocal. This is sometimes called enmity, a term, as it respects God, rather unfortunate, since enmity is almost fixed in our language to signify a malignant and revengeful feeling. Of this, the oppugners of the doctrine of the atonement have availed themselves to argue that as there can be no such affection in the divine nature, therefore reconciliation in  Scripture does not mean the reconciliation of God to man, but of man to God, whose enmity the example and teaching of Christ, they tell us, are very effectual to subdue. It is, indeed, a sad and humbling truth, and one which the Socinians, in their discussions on the natural innocence of man, are not willing to admit, that by the infection of sin “the carnal mind is enmity to God;” that human nature is malignantly hostile to God and to the control of his law. But this is far from expressing the whole of that relation of man in which, in Scripture, he is said to be at enmity with God, and so to need a reconciliation — the making of peace between God and him. That relation is a legal one, as that of a sovereign, iln his judicial capacity, and a criminal who has violated his laws and risen up against his authority, and who is therefore treated as an enemy. The word ἐχθρός is used in this passive sense, both in the Greek writers and in the New Test. So, in Rom 11:28, the Jews, rejected and punished for refusing the Gospel, are said by the apostle, “as concerning the Gospel,” to be “enemies for your sakes” — treated and accounted such; “but, as touching the election, they are beloved for the fathers' sakes.” In the same epistle (Rom 11:10) the term is used precisely in the same sense, and that with reference to the reconciliation by Christ: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God by the death of his Son,” i.e. when we were objects of the divine judicial displeasure, accounted as enemies, and liable to be capitally treated as such. Enmity, in the sense of malignity and the sentiment of hatred, is added to this relation in the case of man; but it is no part of the relation itself, it is rather a case of it, as it is one of the actings of a corrupt nature which render man obnoxious to the displeasure of God and the penalty of his law, and place him in the condition of an enemy. It is this judicial variance and opposition between God and man which is referred to in the term reconciliation, and in the phrase “making peace,” in the New Test.; and the hostility is therefore, in its own nature, mutual.

But that there is no truth in the notion that reconciliation means no more than our laying aside our enmity to God may also be shown from several express passages. The first is the passage we have above cited: “For if, when we were enemies, we were reconciled to God” (Rom 5:10). Here the act of reconciling is ascribed to God, and not to us; but if this reconciliation consisted in the laying-aside of our own enmity, the act would be ours alone. And, further, that it could not be the laying-aside of our enmity is clear from the text, which speaks of reconciliation while we were yet enemies. The reconciliation spoken of here is not, as Socinus and  his followers have said, our conversion. For that the apostle is speaking of a benefit obtained for us previous to our conversion appears evident from the opposite members of the two sentences — “much more, being justified, we shall be saved from wrath through him;” “much more, being reconciled, we shall be saved by his life.” The apostle argues from the greater to the less. If God were so benign to us before our conversion, what may we not expect from him now we are converted? To reconcile here cannot mean to colnvert, for the apostle evidently speaks of something greatly remarkable in the act of Christ. But to convert sinners is nothing remarkable, since none but sinners can be ever converted; whereas it was a rare and singular thing for Christ to die for sinners, and to reconcile sinners to God by his death, when there have been but very few good men who have died for their friends. In the next place, conversion is referred more properly to his glorious life than to his shameftil death; but this reconciliation is attributed to his death as contradistinguished from his glorious life, as is evident from the antithesis contained in the two verses. Besides, it is from the latter benefit that we learn the nature of the former. The latter, which belongs only to the converted, consists of the peace of God and salvation from wrath (Rom 5:9-10). This the apostle afterwards calls receiving the reconciliation. And what is it to receive the reconciliation but to receive the remission of sins? (Act 10:43). To receive conversion is a mode of speaking entirely unknown. If, then, to receive the reconciliation is to receive the remission of sins, and in effect to be delivered from wrath or punishment, to be reconciled must have a corresponding signification.

“God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself, not imputing their trespasses unto them” (2Co 5:19). Here the manner of this reconciliation is expressly said to be not our laying aside our enmity, but the non-imputation of our trespasses to us by God; in other words, the pardoning of our offences and restoring us to favor. The promise on God's part to do this is expressive of his previous reconciliation to the world by the death of Christ; for our actual reconciliation is distinguished from this by what follows, “and hath committed to us the ministry of reconciliation,” by virtue of which all men were, by the apostles, entreated and besought to be reconciled to God. The reason, too, of this reconciliation of God to the world, by virtue of which he promises not to impute sin, is grounded by the apostle, in the last verse of the chapter, not upon the laying-aside of enmity by men, but upon the sacrifice of Christ: “For he hath made him to be sin” (a sin-offering) “for us, who knew no sin, that we might be made the  righteousness of God in him.” “And that he might reconcile both unto God in one body by the cross, having slain the enmity thereby” (Eph 2:16). Here the act of reconciling is attributed to Christ. Man is not spoken of as reconciling himself to God; but Christ is said to reconcile Jews and Gentiles together, and both to God, “by his cross.” Thus, says the apostle, “he is our peace;” but in what manner is the peace effected? Not, in the first instance, by subduing the enmity of man's heart, but by removing the enmity of the law.” “Having abolished in,” or by, “his flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments.” The ceremonial law only is here probably meant; for by its abolition, through its fulfilment in Christ, the enmity between Jews and Gentiles was taken away. But still it was not only necessary to reconcile Jew and Gentile together, but to “reconcile both unto God.” This he did by the same act; abolishing the ceremonial law by becoming the antitype of all its sacrifices, and thus, by the sacrifice of himself, effecting the reconciliation of all to God, “slaying the enmity by his cross,” taking away whatever hindered the reconciliation of the guilty to God, which, as we have seen, was not enmity and hatred to God in the human mind only, but that judicial hostility and variance which separated God and man as Judge and criminal. The feeble criticism of Socinus on this passage, in which he has been followed by his adherents to this day, is thus answered by Grotius: “In this passage the dative θεῷ, to God, can only be governed by the verb ἀποκαταλλάξη , that he might reconcile; for the interpretation of Socinus, which makes to God stand by itself, or that to reconcile to God is to reconcile them among themselves that they might serve God, is distorted and without example. Nor is the argument valid which is drawn from thence, that in this place Paul properly treats of the peace made between Jews and Gentiles; for neither does it follow from this argument that it was beside his purpose to mention the peace made for each with God. For the two opposites which are joined are so joined among themselve ththat they should be primarily and chiefly joined by that bond; for they are not united among themselves, except by and for that bond. Gentiles and Jews, therefore, are made friends among themselves by friendship with God.”

Here, also, a critical remark will be appropriate. The above passages will show how falsely it has been asserted that God is nowhere in Scripture said to be reconciled to us, and that they only declare that we are reconciled to God; but the fact is, that the very phrase of our being reconciled to God imports the turning-away of his wrath from us. Whitby observes, on the  words καταλλάττειν and καταλλαγή, “that they naturally import the reconciliation of one that is angry or displeased with us, both in profane and Jewish writers.” When the Philistines suspected that David would appease the anger of Saul by becoming their adversary, they said, “Wherewith should he reconcile himself to his master? Should it not be with the heads of these men?” Not, surely, how shall he remove his own anger against his master? but how shall he remove his master's anger against him? — how shall he restore himself to his master's favor? “If thou bring thy gift to the altar and there rememberest that thy brother hath aught against thee,” not that thou hast aught against thy brother, “first be reconciled to thy brother,” i.e. appease and conciliate him; so that the words, in fact, import “See that thy brother be reconciled to thee,” since that which goes before is, not that he hath done thee an injulry, but thou him. Thus, then, for us to be reconciled to God is to avail ourselves of the means by which the anger of God towards it is to be appeased, whiich the New Test. expressly declares to be meritoriously “the sin-offering” of him “who knew no sin,” and instrumentally, as to each individual personally, “faith in his blood.” SEE PROPITATION.

“We know,” says Farrar, “that God cannot literally feel anger, or any other passion; nor can he be literally grieved and pained at anything man can do, since (as the 1st article of our [Anglican] Church expresses it) he is without body, parts, or passions; though in Scripture hands and eyes and other bodily members are figuratively attributed to him, as well as anger, repentance, and other passions. But all these are easily understood as spoken in reference to their effects on us, which are the same as if the things themselves were literally what they are called. It is well known to astronomers that the sun keeps its place, and yet they, as well as the vulgar, speak familiarly of the sun's rising and setting without any mistake or perplexity thence arising, because the effects on this earth — the succession of liglht and darkness — are exactly the same as if the sun did literally move round it daily. In like manner, when the Scriptures speak of God's wrath, fierce anger, etc., against sinners, it is meant not that he literally feels angry passions, but that th effect on men will be the same as if he did. And, similarly, when ‘reconciliation' with God is spoken of, it is to be understood as meaning that the effects of the death of Christ are such as to cause men to be regarded by God with that favor with which he would regard them if literally returned from a state of enmity to a state of reconciliation.”  See Nitzsch, Practische Theologie; Fletcher, Works (see Index); Presbyterian Confessions; Pearson, on the Creed; Goodwil. Works; Knapp, Christian Theology; Reynolds [John], On Reconciliation; Ritschl, Critical History of the Christian Doctrine of Justification and Reconciliation (Edinb. 1872); Pope, Compendium of Christian Theology (Lond. 1875, 12mo), p. 196-200.

## Recordare, Sanctae Crucis[[@Headword:Recordare, Sanctae Crucis]]

             is the beginning of a passion-hymn composed by the “Seraphic Doctor,” St. Bonaventura (q.v.). This is his best poem, and consists of fifteen stanzas, the last bearing a strong resemblance to the next to the last of the Stabat Mater Dolorosa. There are two English translations of this hvmnone by Dr. H. Harbaugh in the Mecersburg Review, 1858, p. 481 (“Make the Cross your Meditation”); another by Dr. J. X. V. Alexander, of which the first stanza runs thus:

“Jesus’ holy cross and dying,

Oh, remember! ever eying

Endless pleasure’s pathway here;

At the cross thy mindful station

Keep, and still in meditation

All unsated persevere.”

It has also been translated into German by Simrock, in his Lauctda Zion Salvatorem, p. 269; by Rambach, in his Anthology, i, 315, “An des Herrn ircuz zu denken,” which is now generally found in German hymn-books; by Stadelmann, in Blissler's Auswahl altchristlicher hymmen, p. 118, “Woll des heiligen Kilenzes deuken;” by Konigsfeld, in his collection of Latin Hymns,. i, 151, “An des Herrn Kreuzesleiden.” The English of Alexander is given in Schaff's Christ in Song, p. 165. (B. P.)

## Recorder[[@Headword:Recorder]]

             (מִזְכַּיר, mazkir', a remembrancer; Sept. ἀναμιμνήσκων, ὑπομνηματογράφος), an officer of high rank in the Jewish state, exercising the functions, not simply of an annalist, but of chancellor or president of the privy council (Isa 36:3; Isa 36:22). The title itself may, perhaps, have reference to his office as adviser of the king; at all events, the notices prove that he was more than an annalist, though the superintendence of the records was without doubt intrusted to him. In David's court the recorder appears among the high officers of his  household (2Sa 8:16; 2Sa 20:24; 1Ch 18:15). In Solomon's he is coupled with the three secretaries, and is mentioned last, probably as being their president (1Ki 4:3). Under Hezekiah, the recorder, in conjunction with the praefect of the palace and the secretary, represented the king (2Ki 18:18; 2Ki 18:37). The patronymic of the recorder at this time, Joah the son of Asaph, makes it probable that he was a Levite. Under Josiah, the recorder, the secretary, and the governor of the city were intrusted with the superintendence of the repairs of the Temple (2Ch 34:8). These notices are sufficient to prove the high position held by him. The same office is mentioned as existing in the Persian court, both ancient and modern, where it is called wauka nuwish; andl also in the time of the Roman emperors Arcadius and Honorius, under the name of magiste memorice. In Ezr 4:15, mention is made of “the book of the records,” and in Est 6:1; Est 10:2, of “the book of records of the chronicles,” written by officers of this nature. Many of the royal annals of Egypt and Assyria were sculptured on the obelisks, slabs, and monuments, and are still in fine preservation; and already they have contributed to the illustration of the inspired records. SEE SCRIBE.

## Records[[@Headword:Records]]

             a frequent name for the books and papers of a Church, which contain a record or accouLnt of the history and temporal business of the parish. In these books are written, from time to time, all such transactions as relate to the election of officers, — the purchase or sale, etc., of Church property, the erection of buildings, the engaging of ministers, the support of public worship, and other matters connected with the temporal affairs of the Church. Under the name of “parish records,” or “Church records,” may also be included the register, containing the minister's account of baptisms, marriages, etc. SEE REGISTER.

## Rectitude[[@Headword:Rectitude]]

             (or UPRIGHTNESS) is the choice and pursuit of those things which the mind, after due inquiry and attention, clearly perceives to be fit and good, and the eschewing of those that are evil. “Rectitude of conduct,” says Whately, “is intended to express the term κατόρθωσις, which Cicero translates recta efectio; κατόρθωμα he translates rectumfactum. Now the definition of κατόρθωμα was νόμου πρόσταγμα, ‘a thing commanded by law' (i.e. by the law of nature, the universal law). Antoninus, speaking of the reasoning  faculty, how, without looking futrther, it rests contented in its own energies, adds, ‘for which reason are all actions of this species called rectitudes (κατορθώσεις, κατὰ ὀρθός, right onwards), as denoting the directness of their progression right onwards'“ (Harris, Dialogue on Happiness, p. 73, ilote). “Goodness in actions,” says Hooker (Ecclesiastes Pol. bi. i, § 8), “is like unto straightness; wherefore that which is done well we term right, for, as the straight way is most acceptable to him that travelleth, because by it he cometh soonest to his journey's end, so, in action, that which doth lye the evenest between us and the end we desire must needs be the fittest for our use.” If a term is to be selected to denote that in action and in disposition of which the moral faculty approves, perhaps the most precise and appropriate is rectitude, or rightness. “There are other phrases,” says Dr. Reid (Active Powers, Essay v, ch. vii), “which have been used, which I see no reason for adopting, such as, acting contrary to the relations of things — contrary to the reason of things — to the fitness of things — to the truth of thinsqs — to absolute fitness. These phrases have not the authority of common use, which, in matters of language, is great. They seem to have been invented by some authors with a view to explain the nature of vice; but I do not think they answer that end. If intended as definitions of vice, they are improper; because in the most favorable sense they can bear, they extend to every kind of foolish and absurd conduct as well as to that which is vicious.” But what is rectitude, or rightness, as the characteristic of an action? According to Price and others, this term denotes a simple and primitive idea, and cannot be explained. “It might as well be asked what is truth, as the characteristic of a proposition? It is a capacity of our rational nature to see and acknowledge truth; but we cannot define what truth is. We call it the conformity of our thoughts with the reality of things.” “It may be doubted how far this explanation makes the nature of truth more intelligible. In like manner some explain rectitude by saying that it consists in a congruity between an action and the relations of the agent, It is the idea mwe form of an action, when it is in every way conformable to the relations of the agent and the circumstances in which he is placed. On contemplating such an action mve approve of it, and feel that if we were placed in such circumstances and in such relations, we should be under an obligation to perform it. Now the circumstances and relations in which man is placed arise from his nature and from the nature of things in general; and hence it has been said that rectitude is founded in the nature and fitness of things, i.e. an action is right when it is fit or suitable to all the relations and  circumstances of the agent, and of this fitness conscience or reason is the judge. Conscience or reason does not constitute the relations; these must arise from the nature of man and the nature of things. But conscience or reason judges and determines as to the conformity of actions to these relations; and these relations arising necessarily from the very nature of things, the conformity with them, which constitutes rectitude, is said to be eternal and immutable” (Krauth's Fleming, Vocab. of Philos. s.v.).

## Rector[[@Headword:Rector]]

             (Lat. rector, a ruler), the title of several classes of clerical and collegiate officials, some of which are referred to under their respective heads.

1. As regards clerical rectors, the title, in its most ordinary English use, is applied to the clergyman who holds complete and independent charge of a parish. This use, however, is a departure from the canonical signification of the title, which meant rather a clergyman who was appointed to govern a parish where the chief parochial jurisdiction was vested in a religious corporation or in some non-resident dignitary. The office of vicar is an outgrowth of the rectorate, on the appropriation of benefices to monasteries and other religious houses of old; and the distinction between rector and vicar, which is therefore to be noticed here, is as follows: The rector has the right to all the ecclesiastical dues in his parish, whereas the vicar has generally an appropriator or impropriator over him, who is entitled to part of the profits, and to whom he is, in effect, only perpetual curate, with an appointment of glebe and generally one third of the tithes. SEE VICAR.

2. In certain of the monastic orders, the name rector is given to the heads of convents, as it is

3. Also given to the heads of universities, colleges, seminaries, and similar educational corporate institutions.

## Rectoral View Of The Atonement[[@Headword:Rectoral View Of The Atonement]]

             is a phrase expressive of the aspect of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ upon the cross as it bears upon the divine government. While the reconciliation of legal justice with pardoning mercy is indeed thus beautifully exemplified, yet it is a very partial representation of the atonement which would make this the final cause or constraining purpose of it. "That God may be just and yet the justifier of him that believeth on Christ" is truly an important result of the vicarious redemption by the Saviour, but to put it forth as the one grand motive or impulse in the divine mind is to reduce the scheme of salvation to a mere piece of governmental policy, the retrievement of an original blunder, an expedient to remedy a constitutional defect in the divine plan. The atonement would have been equally necessary and equally efficacious had Adam been the sole erring or even the sole intelligent creature in the universe. It was required by the nature of God himself, and is demanded as a full theodicy by the moral sense of the sinner likewise, who is thus "without excuse." Neither the prophylactic nor the curative, the coercive nor the punitive, ends of government are normally involved in  it, and except as an exhibition of infinite and sovereign love it is logically abortive. SEE ATONEMENT, THEORY OF.

## Rectory[[@Headword:Rectory]]

             “A rectory or parsonage,” says Spelman, “is a spiritual living, composed of land, tithe, and other oblations of the people, separate or dedicate to God in any congregation. fIor the service of his Church there, and for the maintenance of the governor or minister thereof, to whose charge the same is committed.”

## Recusan[[@Headword:Recusan]]

             is, in English law, a person, whether Papist or Protestant, who refuses or neglects to attend at the worship of the Established Church on Sundays and other days appointed for the purpose. The offence may be dated back in its origin to 1534, when king Henry became head of the Church; but, as a legal one, may be held to date from 1 Elizabeth, c . 2. “There were four classes punishable under the statutes against recusancy: simple ‘recusants;' ‘recusants convict,' who asented themselves after conviction; ‘popish recusants,' who absented themselves because of their being Roman Catholics; and ‘popish recusants convict.' who absented themselves after conviction. It was against the last two classes that the statutes were mainly directed. In addition to the general penalties of recusancy, the popish recusants, for wilfully hearing mass, forfeited 100 marks (£66 13s. 4d.); and for saying mass, 200 marks, or £133 6s. 8d., in addition (in both cases) to a year's imprisonment. They were disabled, unless they renounced popery, from inheriting, purchasing, or otherwise acquiring lands; and they could not keep or teach schools under pain of perpetual imprisonment. Popish recusants convict could not hold any public office; could not keep arms in their houses; could not appear within ten miles of London under penalty of £100; could not travel above five miles from home without license; could not bring any action at law or equity; could not have baptism, marrige, or burial performed except by an Anglican minister — all under penalties of forfeiture and imprisonment. Protestant dissenting recusants were relieved from the penalties of recusation by the Toleration Act of I William and Mary, c. 18. Catholics were partially relieved in the year 1791, and completely by the Emancipation Act of 1829.” SEE MEMBERSHIP (IN THE CHURCH).

## Red[[@Headword:Red]]

             SEE COLOR; SEE RUDDY.

## Red Heifer[[@Headword:Red Heifer]]

             SEE PURIFICATION, WATER OF; SEE SIN-OFFERING.

## Red Sea[[@Headword:Red Sea]]

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

I. Names. — The sea known to us as the Red Sea was by the Israelites called the sea (הִיָּם, Exo 14:2; Exo 14:9; Exo 14:16; Exo 14:21; Exo 14:28; Exo 15:1; Exo 15:4; Exo 15:8; Exo 15:10; Exo 15:19; Jos 24:6-7; and many other passages); and specially “the sea of Siph” (יִםאּסוּ, Exo 10:19; Exo 13:18; Exo 15:4; Exo 15:22; Exo 23:31; Num 14:25; Num 21:4; Num 33:10-11; Deu 1:40; Deu 11:4; Jos 2:10; Jos 4:23; Jos 24:6; Jdg 11:16; 1Ki 9:26; Neh 9:9; Psa 106:7; Psa 106:9; Psa 106:22; Psa 136:13; Psa 136:15; Jer 49:21). It is also perhaps written Suphcah', סוּפָה (Sept. Ζωόβ), in Num 21:14, rendered “Red Sea” in the A.V.; and in like manner, in Deu 1:1, סוּ, without יִם. The Sept. always renders it ) ἡ ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα (except in Jdg 11:16, where סוּ, Σίφ, is preserved). So, too, in the New Test. (Act 7:36; Heb 11:29); and this name is found in the Apocrypha (1Ma 4:9; Wisdom of Solomon 10:18; 19:7) and Josephus (Ant. 8:6, 4). By the classical geographers this appellation, like its Latin equivalent Mare Rubrum or M. Erythroeum, was extended to all the seas washing the shores of the Arabian peninsula, and even the Indian Ocean: the Red Sea itself, or Arabian Gulf, was οΑ῾᾿ράβιος κόλπος, or Α᾿ραβικὸς κ.,, or Sinus Arabicus, and its eastern branch, or the Gulf of ‘Akabah, Αἰλανίτης, Ε᾿λανίτης, Ε᾿λανιτικὸς κόλπος, Sinus Elanites, or S. Elaniticius. The Gulf of Suez was specially the Heroopolitic Gulf, ῾Ηρωοπολίτης κόλπος, Sinus Heroopolites, or S. Heroopoliticus. Dr. Beke (Sinai in Arabia [Lond. 1878], p. 361 sq.) contends (in keeping with his wild notion that the Mizraim of the Bible was not Egypt, but the peninsula of Arabia) that the Gulf of ‘Akabah, and not that of Suez, was the Yam-Suph of the Hebrews, chiefly on the rash assumption that the former only was known to the Israelites, whereas the itinerary of Moses clearly distinguishes Eziongeber on the one from the crossing at the other (Num 33:8; Num 33:10; Num 33:35-36). Among the peoples of the East, the Red Sea has for many centuries lost its old names: it is now called generally by the Arabs, as it was in mediaeval times, Bahr-el-Kulzum, “the Sea of El-Kulzum,” after the ancient Clysma, “the sea-beach,” the site of which is near, or at, the modern Suez. In the Koran, part of its old name is preserved, the rare Arabic word ya1manm  being used in the account of the passage of the Red Sea (see also El- Beydawi, Comment. on the Kuran, 7:132, p. 341; 20:81, p. 602). These Biblical names require a more detailed consideration.

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

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

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

3. The “Red Sea,” ἡ ἐρυθρὰ θάλασσα. The origin of this appellation has been the source of more speculation even than the obscure suph, for it lies more within the range of general scholarship. The theories advanced to account for it have been often puerile and generally unworthy of acceptance. Their authors may be divided into two schools. The first have ascribed it to some natural phenomenon, such as the singularly red appearance of the mountains of the western coast, looking as if they were sprinkled with Havana or Brazil snuff, or brick-dust (Bruce), or of which the redness was reflected in the waters of the sea (Gosselin, ii, 78-84); the red color of the water sometimes caused by the presence of zoophytes (Salt; Ehrenberg); the red coral of the sea; the red sea-weed; and the red storks that have been seen in great numbers, etc. Reland (De Mare Rubro, Diss. Miscell. i, 59-117) argues that the epithet red was applied to this and the neighboring seas on account of their tropical heat; as, indeed, was said by Artemidorus (ap. Strabo, 16:4, 20), that the sea was called red because of the reflection of the sun. The second have endeavored to find an etymological derivation. Of these the earliest (European) writers proposed a derivation from Edom, “red,” by the Greeks translated literally. Among  them were Fuller (Miscell. Sacr. 4 c. 20); before him Scaliger, in his notes to Festues, s.v. “AEgyptinos” (ed. 1574); and still earlier Genebrard (Comment. ad Psalms 106). Bochart (Phaleg, 4:c. 34) adopted this theory (see Reland, Diss. Miscell. [ed. 1706] i, 85). The Greeks and Romans tell us that the sea received its name from a great king, Erythras, who reigned in the adjacent country (Strabo, 16:4, § 20; Pliny, H. N. 6 c. 23, § 28; Agatharch. i, § 5; Philostr. 3:15; and others). The stories that have come down to us appear to be distortions of the tradition that Himyer was the name of apparently the chief family of Arabia Felix, the great South Arabian kingdom, whence the Himyerites and Homeritae. Himyer appears to be derived from the Arabic “ahmar,” red (Himyer was so called because of the red color of his clothing; “aafar” also signifies “red,” and is the root of the names of several places in the peninsula so called on account of their redness (see Marasid, p. 263, etc.); this may point to Ophir: φοίνιξ is red, and the Phoenicians came from the Erythraean Sea (Herod. 7:89).

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

At Ras Mohammad the Red Sea is split by the granitic peninsula of Sinai into two gulfs — the westernmost, or Gulf of Suez, is now about 130 geographical miles in length, with an average width of about eighteen, though it contracts to less than ten miles; the easternmost, or Gulf of el- 'Akabah, is only about ninety miles long from the Strait of Tiran to  ‘Akabah, and of proportionate narrowness. The navigation of the Red Sea and Gulf of Suez near the shores is very difficult from the abundance of shoals, coral-reefs, rocks, and small islands, which render the channel intricate, and cause strong currents often of unknown force and direction; but in mid-channel, exclusive of the Gulf of Suez, there is generally a width of 100 miles clear, except the Dedalus reef (Wellsted, 2, 300). The bottom in deep soundings is in most places sand and stones from Suez as far as Jiddah, and thence to the strait it is commonly mud. The deepest sounding in the excellent Admiralty chart is 1054 fathoms, in lat. 22° 30'.

Journeying southwards from Suez, on our left is the peninsula of Sinai; on the right is the desert coast of Egypt, of limestone formation, like the greater part of the Nile valley in Egypt, the cliffs on the sea-margin stretching landwards in a great rocky plateau, while more inland a chain of volcanic mountains (beginning about lat. 28° 4' and running south) rear their lofty peaks at intervals above the limestone, generally about fifteen miles distant. Of the most importance is Jebel Ghirib, 6000 feet high; and as the Strait of Jubal is passed, the peaks of the primitive range attain a height of about 4500 to 6900 feet, until the “Elba” group rises in a huge mass about lat. 220. Farther inland is the Jebel ed Dukhkh an, the “porphyry mountain” of Ptolemy (4, 5, § 27; M. Claudianus, see Muller, Geogr. Min. Atlas 7), 6000 feet high, about twenty-seven miles from the coast, where the porphyry quarries formerly supplied Rome, and where are some remains of the time of Trajan (Wilkinson, Modern Egypt and Thebes, 2, 383); and besides these, along this desert southwards are “quarries of various granites, serpentines, breccia verde, slates, and micaceous, talcose, and other schists” (ibid. p. 382). Jebel ez-Zeit, “the mountain of oil,” close to the sea, abounds in petroleum (ibid. p. 385). This coast is especially interesting in a Biblical point of view, for here were some of the earliest monasteries of the Eastern Church, and in those secluded and barren mountains lived very early Christian hermits. The convent of St. Anthony (of the Thebais), “Deir Mar Antuniyus,” and that of St. Paul, “Deir Mar Bolus,” are of great renown, and were once important. They are now, like all Eastern monasteries, decayed; but that of St. Anthony gives, from its monks, the patriarch of the Coptic Church, formerly chosen from the Nitrian monasteries (ibid. p. 381). South of the “Elba” chain, the country gradually sinks to a plain, until it rises to the highland of Jidan, lat. 15°, and thence to the strait extends a chain of low mountains. The greater part of the African coast of the Red Sea is sterile, sandy, and thinly peopled —  first beyond Suez by Bedouin chiefly of the Ma'azi tribe; south of the Kliseir road are the ‘Abab'deh; and beyond, the Bisharis, the southern branch of whom are called by Arab writers Bejt, whose customs, language, and ethnology demand a careful investigation, lwhich would unldoubtedly be repaid by curious results (see El-Makrizi's Khitat, Descr. of the Beja, and Descr. of the Desert of Eydhdb; Quatremree's Essays, on these subjects, in his Memoires Hist. et Geor. sur l'Egypte, ii, 134, 162: and The Genesis of the Earth and of Milan, 2d ed. p. 109); and then, coast-tribes of Abyssinia.

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

The Arabian coast outside the Gulf of the ‘Akabah is skirted by the range of Arabian mountains, which in some few places approach the sea, but generally leave a belt of coast country, called Tihameh, or the Ghor, like the Shephelah of Palestine. This tract is generally a sandy parched plain, thinly inhabited, these characteristics being especially strong in the north (Niebuhr, Descr. p. 305). The mountains of the Hejtz consist of ridges running parallel towards the interior, and increasing in height as they recede (Wellsted, 2, 242). Burckhardt remarks that the descent on the eastern side of these mountains, like the Lebanon and the whole Syrian  range east of the Dead Sea, is much less than that on the western; and that the peaks seen from the east or land side appear mere hills (Arabicu, p. 321 sq.). In clear weather they are visible at a distance of forty to seventy miles (Wellsted, 2, 242). The distant ranges have a rugged pointed outline, and are granitic; at Wejh, with horizontal veins of quartz; nearer the sea many of the hills are fossiliferous limestone. while the beach hills “consist of light-colored sandstone, fronted by and containinng large quantities of shells and masses of coral” (p. 243). Coral also “enters largely into the composition of some of the most elevated hills.” The more remarkable mountains are Jebel ‘Ein-Unna (or ‘Eynuwunna, Mardsid, s.v. “‘Ein,” ῎Οννη of Ptol.), 6090 feet high near the strait; a little farther south, and close to Mo'eileh, are mountains rising from 6330 to 7700 feet, of which Wellsted says: “The coast... is low, gradually ascending with a moderate elevation to the distance of six or seven miles, when it rises abruptly to hills of great height, those near Mowilah terminating in sharp and singularly shaped peaks... Mr. Irwin [1777]... has styled them Bullock's Horns. To me the whole group seemed to bear a great resemblance to representations which I have seen of enormous icebergs” (2, 176; see also the Admiralty chart, and Muiller's Geogr. Min.). A little north of Yembo is a remarkable group, the pyramidal mountains of Agratharchides; and beyond, about twenty-five miles distant, rises Jebel Radwa. Farther south Jebel Subh is remarkable for its magnitude and elevation, which is greater than any other between Yembo' and Jiddah; and still farther, but about eighty miles distant from the coast, Jebel Ras el-Kura rises behind the holy city Mekkeh (Mecca). It is of this mountain that Burckhardt writes so enthusiastically (how rarely is he enthusiastic!), contrasting its verdure and cool breezes with the sandy waste of Tihameh (Arabia, p. 65 sq.). The chain continues the whole length of the sea, terminating in the highlands of the Yemen. ‘The Arabian mountains are generally fertile, agreeably different from the parched plains below and their own bare granite peaks above. The highlands and mountain summits of the Yemen, “Arabia the Happy,” the Jebel as distinguished from the plain, are precipitous, lofty, and fertile (Niebuhr, Descr. p. 161), with many towns and villages in their vallevs and on their sides. The coast-line itself, or Tihameh, “north of Yembo', is of moderate elevation, varying from fifty to one hundlmred feet. with no beach. To the southward [to Jiddah] it is more sandy and less elevated; the inlets and harbors of the former tract may be styled coves, in the latter they are lagoons” (Wellsted, 2, 244). The coral of the Red Sea is remarkably abundant, and beautifully colored and variegated. It is often red, but the  more common kind is white; and of hewn blocks of this many of the Arabian towns are built.

The earliest navigation of the Red Sea (passing by the prehistorical Phoenicians) is mentionedl by Herodotus. “Sesostris (Rameses II) was the first who, passing the Arabian Gulf in a fleet of long vessels, reduced under his authority the inhabitants of the coast bordering the Erythraann Sea. Proceeding still farther, he came to a sea which, from the great number of its shoals, was not navigable;” and after another war against Ethiopia he set up a stela on the promontory of Dira, near the strait of the Arabian Gulf. Three centuries later, Solomon's navy was built “in Eziongeber, which is beside Eloth, on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of Edom” (1Ki 9:26). In the description of the Gulf of el'Akabah, it will be seen that this narrow sea is almost without any safe anchorage, except at the island of Graia near the ‘Akabahl, and about fifty miles southward the Harbor of ed-Dhahab. It is supposed by some that the sea has retired here as at Suez, and that Eziongeber is now dry land. SEE ELATH; SEE EZIONGEBER.

Solomon's navy was evidently constructed by Phoenician workmen of Hiram, for he “sent in the navy his servants, shipmen that had knowledge of the sea, with the servants of Solomon.” This was the navy that sailed to Ophir. We may conclude that it was necessary to transport wood as well as men to build and man these ships on the shores of the Gulf of the ‘Akabah, which from their natural formation cannot be supposed to have much altered, and which were, besides, part of the Wilderness of the Wandering; and the Edomites were pastoral Arabs, unlike the seafaring Himyeritcs. Jehoshaphat also “made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold; but they went not, for the ships were broken at Eziongeber” (1Ki 22:48). The scene of this wreck has been supposed to be ed-Dhahab, where is a reef of rocks like a “giant's backbone” (=Eziongeber) (Wellsted, 2, 153), and tlis may strengthen an identification with that place. ‘These ships of Jehoshaphat were mannled by “his servants,” who, from their ignorance of the sea, may lave caused the wreck. Pharaoh-necho constructed a number of ships in the Arabian Gulf, and the remains of his works existed in the time of Herodotus (p. 159), who also tells us that these ships were manned by Phoenician sailors.

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

The Red Sea, as it possessed for many centuries the most important sea- trade of the East, contained ports of celebrity. Of these, Elath and Eziongeber alone appear to be mentioned in the Bible. The Heroopolitic Gulf is of the chief interest — it was near to Goshen; it was the scene of the passage of the Red Sea; it was also the seat of the Egyptian trade in this sea and to the Indian Ocean. Heroapolis is doubtless the same as Hero, and its site has been probably identified with the modern Abi-Kesheid, at the head of the old gulf. By the consent of the classics, it stood on or near the head of the gulf, and was sixty-eight miles (according to the Itinerary of Antoninus) from Clysma, by the Arabs called el-Kulzum, near the  modern Suez, which is close to the present head. Suez is a poor town, and has only an unsafe anchorage with very shoal water. On the shore of the Ieroopolitic Gulf was also Arsinol, founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus; its site has not been settled. Berenice, founded by the same, on the southern frontier of Egypt, rose to importance under the Ptolemies and the Romans; it is now of no note. On the western coast was also the anchorage of Myos Hormos, a little north of the modern town el-Kuseir, which now forms the point of communication with the old route to Coptos. On the Arabian coast the principal ports are Mu'eileh, Yembo' (the port of el-Medineh), Jiddah (the port of Mekkeh), and Mukh, by us commonly written Mocha. The Red Sea in most parts affords anchorage for country vessels well acquainted with its intricacies, and able to creep along the coast among the reefs and islands that girt the shore. Numerous creeks on the Arabian shore (called “shuram,” sing. “sharm”) indent the land. Of these the anchorage called es-Sharm, at the southern extremity of the peninsula of Sinai, is much frequented.

The commerce of the Red Sea was, in very ancient times, unquestionably great. The earliest records tell of the ships of the Egyptians, the Phoenicians, and the Arabs. Although the ports of the Persian Gulf received a part of the Indian traffic, and the Himveritic maritime cities in the south of Arabia supplied the kingdom of Sheba, the trade with Egypt was, we must believe, the most important of the ancient world. That all this traffic found its way to the head of the Heroopolitic Gulf seems proved by the absence of any important Pharaonic remains farther south on the Egyptian coast. But the shoaling of the head of the gulf rendered the navigation, always dangerous, more difficult: it destroyed the former anchorages, and made it necessary to carry merchandise across the desert to the Nile. This change appears to have been one of the main causes of the decay of the commerce of Egypt. We have seen that the long-voyaging ships shifted their cargoes to Red-Sea craft at the strait; and Ptolemy Philadelphus, after founding Arsinoe and endeavoring to reopen the old canal of the Red Sea, abandoned the upper route and established the southern road from his new city Berenice, on the frontier of Egypt and Nubia, to Coptos, on the Nile. Strabo tells us that this was done to avoid the dangers encountered in navigating the sea (xvii, 1, § 45). Though the stream of commerce was diverted, sufficient seems to have remained to keep in existence the former ports, though they have long since utterly disappeared. Under the Ptolemies and the Romans the commerce of the  Red Sea varied greatly, influenced by the decaying state of Egypt and the route to Palmyra (until the fall of the latter). But even its best state at this time cannot have been such as to make us believe that the 120 ships sailing from Myos Hormos, mentioned by Strabo (ii, v, § 12), were other than an annual convoy. The wars of Heraclius and Chosroes affected the trade of Egypt as they influenced that of the Persian Gulf. Egypt had fallen low at the time of the Arab occupation, and yet it is curious to note that Alexandria even then retained the shadow of its former glory. Since the time of Mohammed the Red Sea trade has been insignificant. But the opening of the Suez Canal has lately rendered it the great thoroughfare to India.

## Red Sea, Passage Of[[@Headword:Red Sea, Passage Of]]

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

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

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

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

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

1. On the Meiditerranean Shore. — M. Brugsch has recently discovered a new crossing-place for the Israelites on their passage out of Egypt, which, on account both of the fame of the author and his confident announcement, has attracted no little attention (L'Exode et les: Monuments Eqyptiens: Discours prononce a l'occasion du Congres International d'Orientalistes Londres, par Henri Brugsch-Bey, delegue de son Altesse Ismael Premier, le Khedive d'Egypte; accompagne d'une carte [Leipsic, J. C. Hinrichs, 1872, 8vo], p. 36). he conceives that they did not cross the Red Sea at all, but a noted morass — the Sirbonian Bog of antiquity, the modern Sabaket Bardawa — a shallow lake along the Mediterranean, on the confines of Egypt towards Palestine. He thinks he has found all the names of the Biblical account in the Egyptian papyri, and that he has succeeded in identifying them with modern localities. Thus On he sets down as equivalent to Anu, a city, according to him, in the Heroopolitic nome. Pi- beseth or Bubastis is, of course, Tell-Bast. Goshen he traces, through the  hieroglyphical Phacoussa, to the modern Kils or Facus; and in the Sethroitic nome on the north of this he finds mention of Pithan and Sukkoth, with Pi-ramses, or Rameses, in the same neighborhood. Etham he conjectures to be Khetam, noticed as another of three ancient stations in this latter region of Tanis-Rameses; the remaining one adjoining being Migdsl, which, of course, must be the Magdolum of classical writers, and the present Tell es-Semut. Baal-Zephon becomes Mnounlt Casius, and Pi- hahiroth is the entrance upon the narrow sand-beach separating the Mediterranean from the Sirbonian Lake just east of Pelllsium. Many of these identifications, which M. Brugsch gives with great brevity, and without the detailed authority, the reader might reasonably question, both on the ground of strained etymological resemblance and inadequate historical data for position. But we prefer to call attention to a few palpable discrepancies with the scriptural narrative, which seem to put this locality utterly out of the question, notwithstanding the author's claim of their perfect accord. To be sure, the Hebrews, on this theory, simply threaded their way along a narrow beach till they came to a bar which allowed them an easy crossing-place over the marsh, and M. Brugsch candidly admits (p. 32), “The miracle, it is true, then ceases to be a miracle; but let us acknowledge, with all sincerity, that Divine Providence always maintains its place and authority.” What childlike faith!

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

In the next place, the route which this theory selects for the Israelites on setting out is exactly the one which they avoided. “And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go. that God led them not through the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near,... but God led the people about, through the way of the wilderness of the Red Sea” (Exo 13:17-18). Moreover, it makes no proper account of the  abrupt turn, or rather retrogression, on their way in order to reach the sea (Exo 14:2).

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

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

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

The great bed of the Bitter Lakes extends in a northerly and southerly direction, and is separated from the Red Sea by a sand-bank 4000 to 5000 meters long, which is seldom more than one meter higher than the sea. It is forty to fifty lower than the water-level of the sea basin, and from plain indications was once covered with the sea (Du Bois Aimee, in the Descr. de I'Egypt. Mod. i, 188 sq., 1st ed.). Before it had a connection with the Nile by means of the well-known canal, and thus received fresh water, its waters were bitter (Strabo, 17:804). It is a favorite theory that it was originally embraced in the Heroopolitan Gulf (Stickel, in the Stud. u. Kritiken, 1850, p. 328 sq.). Yet this is no proof that the ancient Heroopolis  was situated in the inner corner of the Arabian Sea (Strabo, 16:767; 17:836; Pliny, 6:33), and that vessels sailed thence (Strabo, 16:768); but more probably this city was located far north of Clysma, the modern Kolsum, near the present Suez (Ptolemy, 4:5, 14, and 54; Itinerar Anton. p. 107, e(l. Wess.), namely, somnewhere about tlhe modern Abu-Keished, or Mukfar (Knobel, Commentar zu Exodus, p. 140 sq.). Its ruins are still visible there (Champollion, Eyypte, ii, 88). Its importance gave name to the entire adjacent nome and to the contiguous gulf. Both were likewise more properly designated from Arsinoi, which was situated near the present head of the bay (see Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, s.v. “Arsinoi”). This latter seems to have been the official designation of the place which was popularly termed Clysma (namely, the beach, τὸ κλύσμα [Reland, Palaestina, p. 472, 556]).

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

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

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

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

(1.) In order to go round the head of the sea (if thus far north) the Israelites would be obliged to start, not by “the way of the wilderness,” as the text states, but precisely by that direct “way of the land of the Philistines” which the text expressly says they did not take (Exo 13:17-18).

(2.) There would be no change of their course requisite or possible in order to reach this point, as the word “turn” (Exo 14:2) demands; they were already going on the direct and only route they could well have taken. Indeed, if the region of Lake Timsah were then so low as to be filled from the Red Sea, it is difficult to see how the water from the Mediterranean on the other side could have been kept out, and then there would be a continuous lake from sea to sea, and a miracle would have been necessary, at all hazards, in order to effect the passage anywhere. The Hebrews had no occasion to “turn” at all, for that matter.

(3.) In that case Pharaoh's observation (Exo 14:3-4), “The children of Israel are entangled in the land, the wilderness hath shut them in,” would have been very inapt; at least, its force is not at all clear; for, go which way they might, the material obstacle would be the same, viz. the water merely.

(4.) There is no local or historical tradition confirmatory of this spot; in short, circumstances on this theory are all so uncertain and ill-defined that we may safely dismiss it as altogether hypothetical. If we are to determine  anything definite concerning the place of the transaction. it must be based upon the known relations of the localities as they now exist.

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

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

In favor of this view we may say that —

(1.) The distance from Belbeis (assuming that to correspond substantially with the site of Rameses) sufficiently agrees with the requirements of a three days' march, being about fifty miles in a straight line.

(2.) The general direction is about the required one for the Israelites at the outset.

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

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

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

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

(2.) None of the places given in the Biblical account as fixing the spot determine it at Suez. Even Jebel Atakah, if Migdal, is too far away to be naturally selected for such a minute specification of the immediate scene. Any point from Ras Atakah to the south end of the Bitter Lakes would be “east” of (or “before”) that mountain in this general sense. As for Pi- hahiroth (whether Hebrew for mouth of the ravines, or, as is more likely,  Coptic for the sedge-plat), it finds no special adaptation to any place in that neighborhood. The attempt to identify it with Ajrud fails utterly, for the Hebrew and Arabic names have but one radical letter in common. Equally unsatisfactory is every effort to discover Baal-zephon in any prominent landmark north of Jebel Atakah. (Some writers refer Migdol to Muktala, but this seems to be an error for the pass Mantulah, and therefore fails of verbal correspondence.) There is in that direction nothing but a flat, monotonous tract of sand, with no striking name or object to fix upon.

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

(4.) “A strong east wind blowing all night” across the head of the gulf (Exo 14:21) would leave by morning no “wall of waters” either “on the right hand or on the left” of passengers at Suez. As will be seen by inspecting the soundings on the accompanying slketch from the British sailing-chart, the channel opposite Suez is (except, of course, the artificial bed of the Suez Canal) nowhere over four feet deep at low water, and not more than one twelfth of a mile wide. It could be waded across without any miracle or extra wind at all; in fact, this has actually been done. One traveller hired a man to walk through the water at ebbtide at Suez, which he effected, holding his hands over his head (Madden, Travels, 2, 143, 150). So all the way down to the bar at the mouth of the creek which puts up into Suez the water is at the most only five or six feet deep (in one or two spots), and generally three or four at ordinary low tide, with a tolerably uniform width of about one tenth of a mile. But a powerful and prolonged east wind, acting upon the mass of water in the outer or broad part of the bay itself, would so greatly lower the tide on the eastern shore, where the channel of Suez lies, as to drain the latter almost, if not absolutely, dry throughout its whole extent. It is true there would be water enough left in the bay itself to prevent an enemy from surrounding the passing host on that side, but on the north there would be no such  protection. Thus, even on the supposition that the term “wall” is used in Exo 14:22 in the sense of defence, the explanation clearly fails to meet the language of the text: “The waters were a wall unto them on the right hand and on the left.” We desire to insist on this fact, and to us it appears decisive of the whole issue. But the phraseology seems to us to be stronger even than this interpretation. The term “wall” (חֹמָה) is rarely, if ever, used in this metaphorical sense of protection, but invariably (1Sa 25:16 is, we believe, the only doubtful instance) signifies some physical barrier, whether of stone or other material, placed more or less vertically for the purpose of protection. Its meaning is by no means fulfilled in the supposition of a vague water-line, shelving away at a distance on one side. Surely nothing but a desire to minify the preternatural element in the discussion could lead to the adoption of so inadequate an interpretation; for the language, it must be remembered, occurs not in a poetical or figurative connection, but in a plain, prosaic history. The poetical version of the transaction (Exo 15:8) uses much stronger language: “The floods stood upright as a heap, and the depths were congealed in the heart of the sea.” The phraseology here, although figurative, no doubt correctly represents the facts as seen by an eye-witness. Psa 78:13. “He made the waters to stand as a heap,” silows the same traditional interpretation, and 1Co 10:2 confirms it, “Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea” — that is, wet with the spray.

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

4. At Ras Atakah. — This place has been preferred as that of the crossing by the great majority of writers and travellers, including Pococke, Joly, Monconys, Shaw, Ovington, Sicard, Bruce, Arundale, Raumer, Kitto, Olin, Wilson, Durbin, Bartlett, Porter, Bonar, Murphy, etc. It seems to us to meet the demands of the Biblical account more perfectly than any other. This cape is situated about six miles, in a direct line, south of Suez, opposite the southern end of Jebel Athkah. It is a tongue running out more than a mile into the water beyond the average shore-line, and continued nearly a mile farther by a shoal, over which the water at ordinary low tide is not more than fourteen feet deep. Beyond this again stretches, for nearly a mile and a half in the same direction, a lower shoal, covered nowvhere by  more than twenty-nine feet of water at low tide. Opposite this point there reaches out, for about two miles from the eastern shore, a similar shoal, only thirty feet under water at its deepest place. The entire width of the sea at this point is about five miles, while the space where it is not over fifteen feet deep is but three and a half miles, and the channel, itself not over fifty feet deep, is less than three quarters of a mile wide. The sea immediately above and below this spot, in the channel, is about seventy feet deep. Here, then, is a place where a strong and continued east wvind, of the preternatural character implied in the sacred narrative, might open a passage suitable for the occasion, and leave a mass of water fitly comparable to a “wall on either hand.” Moreover, the Israelites would, in that case, emerge on the shore near Ayun Musa (Wells of Moses), the very name of which, in addition to other local traditions, represents the scene of the event.

A close examination of the text itself confirms this view of the transaction. It says (Exo 14:21), “Jehovah caused the sea to go (וִיּוֹלֶךְ, cmad/e it wallk) by a strong east wind all night,... and tie waters were divided (וִיּבָּקְעוּ, were split).” Similar is the language in Exo 14:16 : “Divide it (the sea), and the children of Israel shall go... through the midst of the sea.” The statement that the wind blew “all night” gives no just countenance to the inference that the Israelites did not begin the passage till near morning, and therefore could have gone but a very short distance in all, or, at least, when the wind lulled and the miracle ceased. For aught that appears, they may have already walked many miles, or even have continued their march some time the next forenoon if necessary in order to cross. True, the text says (Exo 14:27), “The sea returned at the turning of the morning (לַפְנוֹת בֹּקֵר, at daybreak; comp. Jdg 19:25-26) to its usual bed (לְאֵיתָנוֹ, to its perennial flow),” but it does not necessarily foilow from this that the Israelitish host had at that time all reached the opposite shore. Indeed, rather the contrary is intimated by the statement, givenn subsequently to this, that “the children of Israel walked upon dry land in the midst of the sea” (Exo 14:29), as if they continued their march some time after the overthrow of the Egyptians in their rear. Nor is it certain from Exo 14:20 that both camps remained quiet all the night, although such might be the inference at first sight. The true state of the case appears to have been about this: the Egyptians overtook the Israelites about nightfall, just as they were about to encamp (חֹנַים, in the act of pitchling their tents, or  preparing to do so) near the shore of the sea (Exo 14:9), and marched down directly upon them (Exo 14:10). In their dismay at the prospect of instant destruction, Moses ordered them to press forward immediately (Exo 14:15, וְיסָּעוּ, and they shall pull up stakes, that is, break up their preparations for camp). While they were doing this the wind sprang up, which did not lull till daylight. As they were marching to the beach the guardian pillar took its position in their rear (Exo 14:19), and so followed them all night as a light to their steps (Exo 14:20). When they had reached the middle of the sea (Exo 14:21), and the Egyptians were not far behind them (Exo 14:22), the morning began to dawn (Exo 14:24), and to prevent the enemy from overtaking the fugitives the march of the Egyptians was miraculously retarded, so that they, in their panic, were about to retreat (Exo 14:25). This they would hardly have thought of doing had they been nearly across, or had it been but a little way to the opposite shore: indeed, every reference to their destruction shows that they were yet in the middle of the sea. So, too, was Moses apparently at this juncture, when, at his extended rod, the water behind the host — who had gained somewhat by the delay of the enemy — began to fall, and the Egyptians actually turned to flee, but were overtaken in the heart of the sea (Exo 14:27), while the Israelites continued their march through the channel, still open in front of them (Exo 14:29), till they reached the shore, which the following waves soon strewed with the corpses of the foe (Exo 14:30). From this recital of incidents in the exact order of the text, it appears that the march really lasted some part of the night, and we consequently require a considerable width of water for its occurrence.

Ras Athkah, too, seems to correspond to the geographical features of the case. The point where the Israelites struck the western coast-line of the Red Sea is (as we have seen above) explicitly defined in three passages of the sacred itinerary, which we translate literally: “Speak to the sons of Israel, and they shall return (וְיָשֻׁבוּ) and encamp before (לַפְנֵי) Pi-ha- Chirothl between Migdol and the sea; before (לַפְנֵי) Ba'al-Tsephon, opposite it (נַבְחו) shall ye encamp upon (עִל) the sea” (Exo 14:2). “And they [the Egyptians] overtook (וִיִּשַּׂיגוּ) them [the Israelites] encamping upon the sea; upon (עִל) Pi-ha-Chirbth, which is before Ba'al- Tsephon” (Exo 14:9). “And they [the Israelites] removed from Etham, and he [Israel] returned (וִיָּשָׁב) upon (עִל) Pi-ha-Chirsth, which is before B'allsephon; and they encamped before Migdol” (Num 33:7). The meaning of Pi-hahiroth, if it be Hebrew, canl only be mouth of the goges  (root חוּר, to bore); or, if Egyptian (as Gesenius and Furst prefer), it is doubtless sedgy spot ( Coptic, pi-achi-roth, “the place of meadows,” according to Jablonski). In either etymology it would most probably designate a grassy shore, as at the opening of a valley with a brook into the sea. Such a spot is found in the reedy plain (sometimes called Baderh) at the mouth of a wide valley just south of Jebel Atikah. The writer's Egyptian dragoman, who was thoroughly familiar with these localities, called it Wady Ghubbeh (“cane-valley”); Robinson calls it Wady Tawazdriik, others Wady Mfusa, and still other names are assigned to it. Baal-zephon is doubtless a Hebrew rendering of the name of a place “sacred to Typhon,” the Greek form of the Egyptian malignant deity, of whose haunt in this vicinity there are traces in ancient writers (see the Hebrew lexicographers). In that case it was probably a mountain, or at least an eminence, in accordance with the heathen preference for hills as sites of shrines. Migdol is the common Hebrew word for a tower, and was, therefore, most likely also a commanding position. It occurs, however, as the name of a town in this quarter of Egypt (Jer 44:1; Jer 46:14), and may be nothing more than a Hebraized form of the Coptic megtol, “many hills” (see the authorities in Gesenius). In Eze 29:10; Eze 30:6, it recurs in the phrase מַגְדֹּל סְוְנֵה, which may most naturally be rendered from Megdol of Seveneh; in the English Bible, “from the tower of Syene,” after the Vulg. (a turre Syene; but the rendering of the Sept., ἀπὸ Μαγδώλον ἕως [once καὶ] Συήνης, suggests that the latter name should be pointed סְוֵנָה, to Seven, thus marking out the natural limits of Egypt, from Migdol on the north to Assuan on the south, precisely as today; and this conclusion is generally adopted by modern scholars. Furst, in his Hebrewn Lexicon, gives a curious interpretation of this whole geographical question: “From Aligdol a road led to Baal-zephon, the later Heropolis on the Red Sea, and therefore the Red Sea is mentioned with it, Exo 14:2; Num 33:7.” Most readers, however, will prefer to see in these texts, so carefully worded in almost exact agreement with each other, a precise indication of the very spot where the Israelites crossed; and if the above reasons be correct, we ought to find on each side of the crossing-place a conspicuous landmark, probably a mountain. This we exactly have at the valley in question, with Jebel Atakah — (“hill of liberty”) on the north, and Jebel AbiiDaraj (“hill of the father of steps,” that is, long march) on the south, and a fine well-watered plain between suitable for an encampment. In this position the Israelites would be effectually hemmed in by the sea in front,  the mountains on eithlr hand, and the Egyptians in their rear. The enemy, of course, came directly down from Memphis along Wady et-Till (“the valley of wandering”), which terminates in the wady in question, thus intercepting the Israelites, who could not escape along the narrow, rocky margin of the shore around the point called Ras Atakah. The writer tried to travel that rough coast and found it impracticable enough. Small companies, as was the case with Dr. Durbin, may, indeed, pass slowly along it, but not so great and encumbered a multitude as the Israelites. Besides, it is about a day's march by this route from Ras Atakah to Suez, and the Egyptians might readily have intercepted the fugitives by sending a detachment around the other side of the mountain.

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

Kurtz (History of the Old Covenant [Clarke's transl. Edinb. 1859, 4 vols. 8vo], i, 357 sq.) has an extended observation on the time that elapsed upon the route from Rameses to the Red Sea, which he argues must have been more than the three days that appear in the narrative (by implication only,  however, for there is no express statement to that effect). We condense his statements into the following points:

(1.) Jewish tradition assigns seven days, and this seems to have been the origin of the Passover week.

(2.) The term מִסִּע, “journey,” denotes only an encampment, while the successive days of travel are expressed by יָמַים, or “day's journey.”

(3.) In Num 10:33, we find stations three days apart, with no locality named between (the same, we may add, is the case in 33:8, 16).

(4.) It would have been impossible for the Israelites all to rendezvous at one place and start together, especially as they all kept the Passover in their own homes the preceding night, and were n bot allowed to leave till morning (Exo 12:22).

(5.) The distance, under any calculation, was too great for a three days' continuous march.

(6.) The message to Pharaoh of their movements at Etham (Exo 14:5) requires at least four days from that point to the Red Sea-two for him to get the information, and two more for his army to be got ready and overtake tihe Israelites. To these arguments we may add the fact that a whole month was consumed (Num 23:3; Exo 16:1) in making the first eight stations (Num 33:5-11), containing-so far as the narrative directly states-but ten days of marching. As the remainder of the time could hardly have been all spent in camp-of which, moreover, there is no mention in the account — there arises a suspicion that the most prominent stations only are named, or those where more than one night's halt was made, or some notelworthy incident occurred. Of course the fiugitives would travel faster, longer, and more continuously. till they were escaped from Egypt, and more leisurely after the event at the Red Sea had relieved them from danger. Be all this as it may, it is in any case clear that they could as easily journey from Ajrud to the mouth of Wady Tawarik in one day as they could from Tell Ramsis to Ajrud in two.

5. Capt. Moresby (in Aiton's Land of the Messiah, p. 118 sq.) is of the opinion that the Israelites crossed at Ras Tarafineh, south of Mount Abu- Deraj, some sixty miles below Suez. where the sea is twenty miles wide and two hundred and fifty feet deep. This accords with certain traditions of the Arabs of the Desert, who name the warm springs in the rocks opposite  after Pharaoh. The inducement, however, to this view seems chiefly to be a desire to exaggerate the miracle.

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

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

Besides the works cited above, and the commentaries on Exodus, the question has been discussed by the following among the more modern writers: Kitto, Pictorial History of the Jews (Lond. 1843, 2 vols. small 4to), i, 187 sq.; Latrobe, Scripture Illustrattions (ibid. 1838, 8vo ), p. 29 sq.; Raumer, Beitrage zur biblischen Geographie (Leips. 1843, 8vo), p. 1 sq.; Sharpe, in Bartlett's Forty Days in the Desert (Lond. 2d ed. large 8vo), p. 23 sq.; Wilson, The Lands of the Bible (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 149 sq.; Olin, Travels in Egypt, etc. (N.Y. 1843, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 342 sq.; Durbin, Observations in the East (ibid. 1845, 2 vols. 12mo), i, 120 sq.; Porter, in Murray's Hand-book of Syria (Lond. ed. 1868, 12mo), i, 9 sq.; Palmer, Desert of the Exodus (N.Y. reprint, 1872, 8vo), p. 42 sq.; Bonar, The Desert of Sinai (ibid. reprint, 1857, 12mo), p. 82 sq.: Morris, Tour through Turkey, etc. (Phila. 1842, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 219 sq.; Strauss, Sinai und Golgotha (Berl. 1850, 12mo), p. 147 sq. One of the most recent monographs on the subject — that of Unruh, Der Zug der Israeliten aus Aegypte nach Canaan — (Langensalza, 1860, 8vo) after extending the Gulf of Suez so far north as nearly to join a deep bay of the Mediterranean, locates Succoth at the narrow isthmus, Pi-hahiroth at Suez, and the other scriptural localities (Etham, Migdol. and Baal-zephon) east of the gulf, which on this view was not actually crossed at all. This is the rationalistic theory fully carried out. The lively writer (Kinglake ) of Eothen (Lond. 1844; N. Y. 1845, 12mo), p. 188, thus briefly puts the main points of the controversy: “There are two opinions as to the point at which the Israelites passed the Red Sea. One is that they traversed only the very small creek at the northern extremity of the inlet, and that they entered the bed of the water at the spot on which Suez now stands; the other that they crossed the sea from a point many miles down the coast. The Oxford theologians,  who, with Milman, their professor, believe that Jehovah conducted his chosen people without disturbing the order of nature, adopt the first view, and suppose that the Israelites passed during the ebb-tide, aided by a violent wind. One among many objections to this supposition is that the time of a single ebb would not have been sufficient for the passage of that vast multitude of men and beasts, or even for a small fraction of it. Moreover, the creek to the north of this point can be compassed in an hour, and in two hours you can make the circuit of the salt marsh over which the sea may have extended in former times. If, therefore, the Israelites crossed so high up as Suez, the Egyptians, unless infatuated by divine interference, might easily have recovered their stolen goods from the encumbered fugitives by making a slight detour.” SEE EXODE.

## Redditio Symboli[[@Headword:Redditio Symboli]]

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

## Redeemer[[@Headword:Redeemer]]

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

## Redemption[[@Headword:Redemption]]

             in theology, denotes our recovery from sin and death by the obedience and sacrifice of Christ, who on this account is called the “Redeemer” (Isa 59:20; Job 19:25). “Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus” (Rom 3:24). “‘ Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us”  (Gal 3:13). “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace” (Eph 1:7). “Forasmuch as ye know that ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, from your vain conversation received by tradition from your fathers; but with.the precious blood of Christ, as of a lamb without blemish and without spot” (1Pe 1:18-19). “And ye are not your own, for ye are bought with a price” (1Co 6:19-20).

By redemption those who deny the atonement made by Christ wish to understand deliverance merely, regarding only the effect, and studiously putting out of sight the cause from which it flows. But the very terms used in the above-cited passages, “to redeem” and “to be bought with a price,” will each be found to refute this notion of a gratuitous deliverance, whether from sin or punishment, or both. “Our English word redemption,” says Dr. Gill, “is from the Latin, and signifies buying again; and several words in the Greek language of the New Test. are used in the affair of our redemption which signify the obtaining of something by paying a proper price for it; sometimes the simple verb ἀγοράζω, to buy, is used; so the redeemed are said to be bought unto God by the blood of Christ, and to be bought from the earth, and to be bought from among men, and to be bought with a price — that is, with the price of Christ's blood (1Co 6:20); hence the Church of God is said to be purchased with it (Act 20:28). Sometimes the compound word ἐξαγοράζω is used, which signifies to buy again, or out of the hands of another, as the redeemed are bought out of the hands of justice, as in Gal 3:13; Gal 4:5. To redeem literally means ‘to buy back;' and λυτρόω, to redeem, and ἀπολύτρωσις, redemption, are, both in Greek writers and in the New Test., used for the act of setting free a captive by paying λύτρον, a ransom) or redemtion price.” Yet, as Grotius has fully shown by reference to the use of the words both in sacred and profane writers, redempn tion signifies not merely “the liberation of captives,” but deliverance from exile, death, and every other evil fromi which we may be freed; and λύτρον signifies everything which satisfies another so as to effect this deliverance. The nature of this redemption or purchased deliverance (for it is not gratuitous liberation, as will presently appear) is therefore to be ascertained by the circumstances of those who are the subjects of it. The subjects in the case before us are sinful men; they are under guilt, under “the curse of the law,” the servants of sin, under the power and dominion of the devil, and “taken captive by him at his will,” liable to the death of the body and to  eternal punishment. To the whole of this case the redemption-the purchased deliverance of man as proclaimed in the Gospel — applies itself. Hence in the above-cited and other passages it is said, “We have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins,” in opposition to guilt; redemption from “the curse of the law;” deliverance from sin, that “we should be set free from sin;” deliverance from the power of Satan; from death, by a resurrection; and from future “wrath” bv the gift of eternal life. Throughout the whole of this glorious doctrine of our redemption from these tremendous evils there is, however, in the New Test., a constant reference to the λύτρον, the redemption price, which λύτρον is as constantly declared to be the death of Christ, which he endured in our stead. “The Son of man came to give his life a ransom for many” (Mat 20:28). “Who gave himself a ransom for all” (1Ti 2:6). “In whom we have redemption through his blood” (Eph 1:7). “Ye were not redeemed with corruptible things, as silver and gold, but with the precious blood of Christ” (1Pe 1:18-19). That deliverance of man from sin, misery, and all other penal evils of his transgression, which constitutes our redemption by Christ, is not, therefore, a gratuitous deliverance, granted without a consideration, as an act of mere prerogative; the ransom — the redemption price — was exacted and paid; one thing was given for another — the precious blood of Christ for captive and condemned men. Of the same import are those passages which represent us as having been “bought” or “purchased” by Christ. Peter speaks of those “who denied the Lord τὸν ἀγοράσαντα αὐτούς, that bought them;” and Paul, in the passage above cited, says, “Ye are bought with a price” (ἠγοράσθητε), which price is expressly said by John to be the blood of Christ: “Thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God (ἡγόρασας, hast purchased us) by thy blood' (Rev 5:9). The ends of redemption are, that the justice of God might be satisfied; his people reconciled, adopted, sanctified, and brought to glory. The properties of it are these:

(1) it is agreeable to all the perfections of God;

(2) what a creature never could merit, and therefore entirely of free grace;

(3) it is special and particular;

(4) full and complete;

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

.

## Redemptorists Order Of[[@Headword:Redemptorists Order Of]]

             or “the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer,” was established by Alfonso Maria di Liguori (q.v.) in the city of Scala in 1732, and spread first in the kingdom of Naples and in the Papal States. The end of this institute was the association of missionary priests who should minister by special services to the spiritual wants of the abandoned in towns and villages, without undertaking regular ordinary parochial duties. After St. Alfonso had founded several houses of his community. pope Benedict XIV solemnly approved of his rule and institute, under the above title, Feb. 25, 1749. The order rapidly found favor, and was introduced into other countries, chiefly through the instrumentality of Clement Maria Hoffbauer. This man, the first German Redemptorist, was born in Moravia Dec. 26, 1751. He became a baker, and exercised his profession for some years in the Premonstrant convent of Bruck. Here he obtained the favor of the abbot, who made him commence his studies.

After studying four years very actively, he left the convent in 1776 with a view to turn hermit. and spent two years at the renowned shrine of Miihlfrauen. When the hermitages were abolished, he went to Vienna, where he supported himself by working at his former trade. In company with his friend Peter Emanuel Kunzman, who eventually joined the Liguorians as a lay-brother, he made several pilgrimages to Rome, and subsequently completed his studies at Vienna. Here he became acquainted with John Thaddetus Hibel, who was  afterwards his most zealous follower and firm friend. The two friends visited Rome, and together entered the convent of the Priests of the Most Holy Redeemer.

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

In 1813 he was appointed confessor and ecclesiastical director of the Ursuline convent of that city, an office which he retained until his death. The church of the convent was soon transformed into a mission church, Hoffbauer's reputation as a confessor became considerable, and he preached, besides, every Sunday in the church of St. Ursula. As he died March 15, 1820, he did not witness the establishing of his order in Austria; although, one month after his death, the Redemptorists were permitted to establish a college, and before the close of the year the emperor granted them a church at Vienna. In the fall of 1826 they formed a branch establishment at Frohnleiten. The Liguorians now continued in Vienna until driven out of it in March, 1848. In Bavaria the king authorized, March 11, 1841, fifteen to twenty members of the Congregation of the Most Holy Redeemer to establish themselves at Alt- Oetting. On the other hand, the government became satisfied in 1848 that the Redemptorists and their doctrines would prove dangerous to Bavaria. They were therefore replaced by the Benedictines. The authorities gave as their reasons for this change that the fathers were instilling fanatical views among the people by means of the confessional, and that their preaching excited the lower classes to disorder. A part of the members of the society remroved to America after its dissohltion, others went to Austria, and some became secular priests.

In France the Redemptorists established themselves first at Vischenberg, in the diocese of Strasburg: they were suppressed by the revolution of July, 1830, but succeeded in obtaining their re-establishment, and have at present several establishments in France. The Redemptorists still adhere to the rule of their original constitution. We find in the Catholic Directory for England for this year, after mention of their church at Bishop Eton, Liverpool, a memorandum to the effect that “this is not a parochial church — hence the fathers do not baptize children, or assist at marriages and funerals, except in cases of necessity; but they are always ready to hear confessions, visit the sick, administer the sacraments, preach, and instruct.” The Redemptorists have also a house at Clapham, Surrey. Of late years they have been busily pursuing their mission in various parts of Ireland. In America they have founded establishments at New York, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Rochester, Albany, Buffalo, and Mouzon. According to the Catholic Directory, they number over 100 members in this country, about 90 of them priests, who have charge of 20 or more churches, mostly at important centres, viz. New York (2), Rochester, Buffalo, and Elmira, N. Y.; Philadelphia and Pittsburgh, Pa.; Baltimore (4), Annapolis, Ilchester, etc., Md.; New Orleans (3), La.;  Chatawa, Pike County, Miss.; Detroit, Mich.; Chioncgo, Ill.; St. Louis, Mo. They are building a church in Boston; and the large cathedral on Fifth Avenue, New York, which has cost over $1,000,000, is under their supervision. They have 5 convents in Maryland, with a novitiate and a house of studies, 27 or 28 clerical members (including the provincial, the “Very Rev. Joseph Helmpricht, C.SS.R.”), 5 novices, 36 lay brothers, and 50 students connected with them; 2 houses in New York city, with 14 priests and 2 lay brothers; and houses in other cities, etc., usually with from 4 to 8 priests, besides lay brothers, connected with each. The headquarters is at present at Nocera dei Pagani, in the kingdiom of Naples. Their present number, according to the Statistical Year-book of the Roman Catholic Church, is about 2000.

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

## Redenbacher, Wilhelm[[@Headword:Redenbacher, Wilhelm]]

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

## Redepenning, Ernst Rudolf[[@Headword:Redepenning, Ernst Rudolf]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Stettin, May 24, 1810. He studied at Berlin and Bonn, and commenced his academical career at the latter place. In 1836 he was professor there, and in 1839 went. to Gottingen, where, in connection with his professorship, he acted as university-preacher. In 1855 he was called as superintendent to field, and died March 27, 1883. He is the editor of Origenis de Principiis (Leipsic, 1836), and the author of, Origines. Eine Darstellung seines Lebeans und seiner Lehre (Bonn, 1841-46, 2 volumes): — Vorschlage und leitende Gedanken zu einer Kirchenorung fur das protestantische Deutschland (Gottingen, 1848): — Unrisse und Bestandtheile einer kirchlichen Lehrordnung (1849): — Christliche Wahrheiten fur unsere Zeit (1850). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Redford, George, D.D[[@Headword:Redford, George, D.D]]

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

## Reding, Joseph[[@Headword:Reding, Joseph]]

             a pioneer Baptist minister, was born in Fauquier County, Virginia, about 1750. He was baptized in 1771; began to preach immediately; labored successfully in South Carolina and Kentucky, and died in December 1815. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. s.v.

## Redman (Redmayne), John, D.D[[@Headword:Redman (Redmayne), John, D.D]]

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

## Redslob, Gustav Moritz[[@Headword:Redslob, Gustav Moritz]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 21, 1804. In 1835 he was professor of philosophy at Leipsic, in 1841 professor of Biblical philology at Hamburg, and died February 28, 1882, doctor of philosophy and theology. He published, De Particulae Hebraicae כַּיOrigine et Indole (Leipsic, 1835): — De Hebraeis Obstetricantibus Commentatio (eod.): — Die Levirats-Ehe bei den Hebraern (1836): — Der Begriff des Nabi bei den Hebrern (1839): — Spraichliche Abhandlungen zur Theologie (1840): — Die Integritat der Stelle Hos 7:4-10 in Frage gestellt (Hamburg, 1843): — Die alttestamentlichen Namen der Bevolkerung des wirklichen und idealen Isralelitenstaates etymologisch betrachtet (1846): — Der Schopfungs-Apolog Gen 2:4 to Gen 3:24 ausfuhrlich erlautert (eod.), etc. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reece, Richard[[@Headword:Reece, Richard]]

             a preacher of Methodism in England, who travelled without interruption for a longer period than any other Methodist preacher — no less than fifty-  nine years — and thus figured at one time as the oldest effective Mlethodist preacher in the world, was born about the year 1765. In 1823 he visited this country with John Hannah as a delegate of the Wesleyans to the Methodist Episcopal Church; and he spent some time here visiting the societies, from Lynn, Mass., to Winchester, Va., and by his and Hannah's profound interest attested the general unity of all Methodists. In 1846 he was obliged to take a supernumerary relation, and he died in 1850. “He was a good, if not a great, preacher,” says Stevens, “and a most amiable man. He is still generally remembered, by both English and American Methodists, for his perfect courtesy and his venerable appearance. His person was tall, his complexion ruddy, his head silvered with age, his voice commanding, his language flowing and pertinent, his piety tranquil, and his wisdom in counsel always reliable. He lived to share in the centenary celebration of Methodism, and by proposing that it should be signalized in England by the contribution of a million dollars for its public charities, excited the suspicion that his usual good judgment had suffered from the effect of age; but the people justified his calculation by giving seventy-five thousand dollars more. He was honored with an election to the presidency of the Conference.” See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism. ii, 315, 316; 3:236, 308; West, Sketches of Weslyan Preachers (N. Y. 1848); Wesleyan Magazine, 1850, p. 652. (J. H. W.)

## Reed[[@Headword:Reed]]

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

1. Usually kaneh (קָנֶה; Sept. κάλαμος, καλαμίσκος, καλάμινος, πῆχος, ἀγκών, ζυγός, πυθυήν; Vulg. culmus, calamus, arundo, fistula, statera), the generic name of a reed of any kind. It occurs in numerous passages of the Old Test., and sometimes denotes the “stalk” of wheat (Gen 41:5; Gen 41:22), or the “branches” of the candlestick (Exodus 25, 37); in Job 31:22, kanzeh denotes the bone of the arm between the elbow and the shoulder (os humersi); it was also the name of a measure of length equal to six cubits (Eze 41:8; Eze 40:5). The word is variously rendered in the A.V. by “stalk,” “branch,” “bone,” “calamus,” “reed.”  In the New Test. the corresponding Greek word, κάλαμος, may signify the “stalk” of plants (Mar 15:36; Mat 27:48, that of the hyssop, but this is doubtful), or “a reed” (Mat 11:7; Mat 12:20; Luk 7:24; Mar 15:19), or a “measuring-rod” (Rev 11:1; Rev 21:15-16), or a “pen” (3Jn 1:13).

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

.

Some kind of fragrant reed is occasionally denoted by the word kaneh (Isa 44:24; Eze 27:19; Son 4:14), or more fully by keneh bosenz (קְנֵה בֹשֶׂם) (see Exo 30:23), or by kanek hat- tob (קָנֶה הִטּוֹב) (Jer 6:20), which the A.V. renders “sweet cane,” and “calamus.” Whatever may be the substance denoted, it is certain that it was one of foreign importation, “from a far country” (Jer 6:20). Some writers (see Sprengel, Comr. in Dioscor. 1, 17) have sought to identify the kaneh bose: with the Acorns calamus, the “sweet sedge,” to which they refer the κάλαμος ἀρωματικός of Dioscorides (1, 17), the κάλαμος εὐώδης of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 4:8, § 4), which, according to this last-named writer and Pliny (H. N. 12:22), formerly grew about a lake “between Libanus and another mountain of no note;” Strabo identifies this with the Lake of Gennesaret (Geog. 16 p. 755, ed. Kramer). Burckhardt was unable to discover any sweet-scented reed or rush near the lake, though he saw many tall reeds there. “High reeds grow along the shore, but I found none of the aromatic reeds and rushes mentioned by Strabo” (Syria, p. 319); but whatever may be the “fragrant reed” intended, it is certain that it did not grow in Syria, otherwise we cannot suppose it  should be spoken of as a valuable product from a far country. Dr. Royle refers the κάλαμος ἀρωματικός of Dioscorides to a species of Androopogon, which he calls A. calamus aromaticus, a plant of remarkable fragrance, and a native of Central India, where it is used to mix with ointments on account of the delicacy of its odor (see Royle, Illustrations of Himalayan Botany, p. 425, t. 97). It is possible this may be the “reed of fragrance;” but it is hardly likely that Dioscorides, who, under the term σχοῖνος, gives a description of the Andropogon schoenanthus, should speak of a closely allied species under a totally different name. SEE CANE

“The beasts of the reeds,” in Psalm l48:30, margin, literally from the Hebrew, but rendered in the text of the A.V. “the company of spearmen,” probably means the crocodiles. Yet for other interpretations see Rosenmuller ad loc. Gesenius, on Isaiah 27, 1, understands Babel. SEE CROCODILE

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

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

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

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

2. The Hebrew achu', אָחוּ, originally an Egyptian word (see Jerome, ad Isa 19:7; comp. Jablonski, Opusc. i, 45; ii, 160; Gesen. Thesaur. i, 67), occurs in Gen 41:2; Job 8:11; in the first place the A.V. has meadow, in the second rush. It seems to mean, not reed, bait “reed-grass,” Carex (comp. Celsius, Hierobot. i, 340 sq.). On the other hand, suph, סוּ, Exo 2:3; Exo 2:5, growing on the Nile, but distinct from laneh, may be the sari (Pliny, 13:45). SEE FLAG.

3. The word go'me, גֹּמֶא, Gr. βύβλος, the papyrus, paper-reed (so rendered, among the old interpreters, by the Sept.; Job loc. cit.; Isa 18:2; Vulg. Isa 18:2; Syr. Isaiah 18:35; Arab. Exo 2:3. In the Talmud this word means rush; comp. Mishna, Erubin, 10:14. The leaves were used for binding wounds), does not belong to the genus Arundo, and is not a proper reed (called by Pliny, 24:81 akin to the reed). It is the Cyperus papyrus of Linnaeus, Class. 3 Monogynia. This plant, anciently so important, grew abundantly in the Egyptian swamps (even perhaps in those of the Nile, Pliny, 13:22; comp. v, 8. Hence Ovid, Miletaph. 15:753; Trist. 3:10:27, calls this river papyrifer; comp. Mart. 10:1, 3), and is mentioned Isa 35:7; Job 8:11; Exo 2:3; Isa 18:2. The A.V. has rush in the first two places, bulrush in the others. It is now rarely met with in Egypt (according to Minutoli, Abhandl. verm. Inhalts [Berl. 1831], vol. ii, No. 7, only at Damietta; while Pluver, Egypt. Naturgesch. p. 55, says it does not now grow in Egypt), but in Palestine — it is occasionally found at the Jordan (Von Schubert, 3:259). It has a three-edged stalk, which below bears hollow, sword-formed leaves, covering each other; it grows to a height of ten feet or more, and has above a flower cup of reddish leaves, out of which a thick body of hair-like shoots spring up (comp. Theophr. Plant. 4:9). The root is as thick as a man's arm, and is used as fuel (Dioscor. i, 115); vessels were framed of the  stalks (Exo 2:3; Isa 18:2; Pliny, 6:24; 7:57, p. 417; Hard. Plutarch, Isid. c. 18; Lucan, 4, 136; Rosellini, Monument. Civ. II, 3:124; Wilkinson, 3:185 sq.), which sailed very fast (Helidor. Ethiop. 10:4). Sails, shoes, ropes, sieves, mattresses, wicks, etc., were made of the green rind (Pliny, 13:22; 18:28; 28:47; Herod. 2, 37; Veget. Veterin. 2, 57; Philo, Op. 2, 482; comp. Wilkinson, 3:62, 146), but especially paper, on the mode of preparing which comp. Pliny, 13:23 sq. (see Rosellini, Monument. Civ. II, 2, 208 sq.; Becker, Charicles, 2, 219 sq.). SEE WRITING. The plant is now called berde or berdi by the Arabs (so Job 8:11, in the Arabic). SEE PAPYRUS.

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

1. The water-reed in pools, marshes, and on the shores of rivers, as of the Nile (Exo 2:3; Exo 2:5) and of the Jordan (1Ki 14:15; Job 8:11; Isa 19:6; Isa 35:7). The most common species are Arundo phragmites and Arundo calamagrostis (comp. Oken, Botany, 1. 805). SEE BULRUSH.

2. The stronger reed, adapted for staves and canes, and as measuring-rods (Eze 40:3 sq.; Rev 11:1; Rev 21:15 sq.; 2Ki 18:21; Isa 36:6; Eze 29:6; Mat 27:29; Mishna, Shab. 17:3; Diog. Laert. Protem. 6), the Arundo denax, whose hard, woody stem reaches a height of eight feet, and is thicker than a man's thumb. This, too, is very frequent on the banks of the Nile (Forskal, Flora, p. 24; comp. Descript. de l'Egypte, 19:74).

3. The writing-reed (Arundo scriptoria) (3Jn 1:13; see Mishna, Shab. 8:5). It grows in the marshes between the Euphrates and Tigris; at Hellah, in the Persian Gulf, etc. The stalks are first soaked, then dried, and when properly cut and split make tolerable pens. Formerly the writing-reed grew in Egypt, in Asia Minor, and even in Italy (Pliny, 16:64; Martial, 14:36; comp. Beckmann, Gesch. der Erfindungen, 3:48 sq.; see on the Hebrew name, Celsius, Hierobot. 2, 312 sq.). — SEE PEN.

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

## Reed, Alanson[[@Headword:Reed, Alanson]]

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

## Reed, Alexander[[@Headword:Reed, Alexander]]

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

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

## Reed, Andrew[[@Headword:Reed, Andrew]]

             D.D., an English Independent divine, noted as one of the greatest philanthropists of our age, was born in 1788 at London, where his father, a pious man, was a watchmaker in Butcher Row, St. Clement's Danes. Many a time, it is said, Andrew's mother would keep the shop while his father was off on a preaching tour; for he was much given to itinerating in the suburban towns, proclaiming among the benighted “the truth as it is in Jesus,” and so interested became he in this glorious work that Mrs. Reed found it needful to provide for the family herself by opening a china-shop, which she kept for twenty years in Chiswell Street. Young Andrew was brought up in the trade of his father, and no one supposed that he would ever leave watch-making to go on the same errand as his father. Sent to a school in Islington to get such an education as was needful for an ordinary artisan, Andrew evinced a predilection not only for all study, but especially  for the dead languages. He begged to be allowed to study Greek and Hebrew. The careful mother, anxious to prevent her son's defection-for she hoped from him support in the business his father had so much neglected -took him finally from school and apprenticed him to a master. But the temptation of books was a very harmless one compared with the temptations of another kind that awaited Andrew in his new situation. His master's son was a wild youth, and the young apprentice entered on his diary the following: “By the wicked behavior of my master's son I was made still worse. I went twice or thrice to the accursed play-houses.” On this account he got his indentures cancelled and returned to the parental roof.

Working the usual hours at watchmaking, in his leisure he kept his mother's books, instructed his sister, and taught a little orphan girl, their servant, to read and write — thus early beginning his orphan work. Books, books, evermore books, were the choice friends of his leisure hours; and though he worked well at his trade, his good mother in her diary might well write down, “These are things which, if the lad be for business. show too much taste for study.” She was so far right that God was leading him through secular to sacred pursuits. Andrew Reed's Hebrew and Greek studies led him to theology, and his joy knew no bounds when it was decided in the family counsels that he might go to college. He dismantled his little workshop, sold his tools, and laid out the money in books. He entered Hackney Seminary, a collegiate and theological school of the Independents. It is needless to say that when he was ready to graduate his record was already begun as a preacher. He had many invitations to settle. Among other calls was that of colleague to the celebrated preacher Matthew Wilks (q.v.) at the Tabernacle. But Reed gave the preference to the church in the New Road, East London, where he remained the pastor for half a century. He resigned the place on Nov. 27, 1861, the anniversary of his birth and of his ordination. He died Feb. 25, 1862, happy to the last and conscious of his Master's love. Rarely, if ever, was such a record closed as this event ended. More than most men — even Christian ministers —Dr. Reed seems to have lived in the presence of some great public purpose, and to have consecrated, or rather sacrificed, all things to its accomplishment. Thus we read in the Memoir' published by his sons (Lond. 1863) that at times he was so engrossed that he would not dine with his family for a week. “In the last four years,” he writes in his diary, “I have been four hundred times to Earlswood [asylum for idiots]; each time has consumed the best part of a day, so that I may fairly say that it has cost me a whole year.” Indeed, nothing less than a consecration like this could  have accomplished Dr. Reed's work. He must, moreover, have combined the physical strength of a giant with the powerful will of the Christian philanthropist. He was one of the most successful and popular preachers of his day — the laborious pastor of one of the largest churches in the metropolis; and yet he found time to originate not only the Hackney Grammar-school, but five great national benevolent institutions — viz. the London Orphan Asylum, the Infant Orphan Asylum at Wanstead, the Asylum for Fatherless Children at Reedham, the Idiot Asylum at Earlswood, with its branch establishment at Colchester, and the Hospital for Incurables.

The aggregate cost of their erection was £129,320; they accommodate 2110 objects of charity; and their total receipts under his administration amounted to the respectable sum of £1,043,566 13s. ld. Emphatically was his “a life, with deeds to crown it.” Andrew Reed began his work among the seafaring population of London. He befriended the parents, established schools for the children, and founded the first penny bank for savings. Besides these stupendous works of faith and labors of love, he founded a Home for Incurables; and, not forgetting the interests of education while employed in helping the helpless, he was the friend of the Hackney Grammar-school, and always the active promoter of Sabbath and day schools for the children of the industrial classes. He not only refused all remuneration for his great services, but contributed, besides, a large part of his yearly income in charity. The five asylums that he founded alone received from his hand £4540. When he opened a chapel he was ever ready with his £10, £20, and even £50, to encourage its friends to discharge a debt incurred in its erection. He lived in the most simple way, that he might have the more to give to him that needed. His remarkable success in his vast and varied enterprises he owed to his extraordinary business powers, his great sagacity, and his determined will. Few men saw more clearly what was to be done, or knew better how to do it. One record strikingly exhibits the stern kind of discipline that he was wont to exercise upon himself, and the resolute determination with which he concentrated his energies upon his object:

“The measure of mercy is the measure of obligation. Of the course I should take at present I see nothing. All is dark. very dark. Work which I had thought to do is now abandoned. This one thing is left me, and I will do it. For discipline I will do it. I have naturally a love for the beautiful, and a shrinking, almost a loathing, of infirmity and deformity. The thing I would not do is the very thing I  am now resolved to do. Alas! poor idiot! while he is the greater sufferer, I am the greater sinner.”

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

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

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

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

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

## Reed, Caleb[[@Headword:Reed, Caleb]]

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

## Reed, Fitch[[@Headword:Reed, Fitch]]

             D.D., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, whose memory is precious in all the communities where he has resided, was born March 28, 1795. His early Christian training was under Calvinistic influences, but, in his nineteenth year, while studying medicine, he was converted under the labors of the Rev. Marvin Richardson, and accepted Arminian doctrines as preferable. In 1815 he was licensed to preach, and was employed upon a circuit by Dr. Nathan Bangs, then presiding elder. In 1817 he was admitted into the New York Conference, and was sent to the extreme eastern point  of Long Island. His second appointment was Dunham Circuit, in Canada East, which offered him all the hardships which the severity of a northern winter, a new country, unimproved and sometimes almost impassable roads, a poor people, and ill-constructed loghuts could afford. Of this he himself told, as follows, in a semi-centennial sermon: “I did at first wonder that my lot had fallen just here, and thought that possibly, after all, the bishop had made a mistake; yet the harsh climate, the hard work, and plenty of it, and harder fare were just what Infinite Wisdom saw I needed. I praise the Lord to this day for Dunham Circuit; it saved me from an early grave.” His next field of labor was in the wilderness lying north of Lake Ontario. To this region he was sent as the first minister of the Gospel, within about twelve months after the first settlement had been made. He established his appointments, organized his circuit, which he travelled on foot, making his way through the trackless forest by the aid of a compass, and carrying with him” an Indian hatchet, as a defence against wild beasts and as a means of constructing bridges over streams of water too deep to ford.” From 1820 to 1828 Mr. Reed was a member of Genesee Conference. He filled some of its most important stations, and, when twenty-eight years of age, was appointed presiding elder of Susquehanna District. After eight years he was again transferred to New York Conference and stationed at Rhinebeck, and subsequently in New York city, Brooklyn, Poughkeepsie, and other important fields of labor, including New Haven District. In 1848 he was transferred to Oneida Conference, to which he gave fourteen years of effective service, including seven years in the office of presiding elder. In the year 1862 he was compelled by increasing bodily infirmities to retire to the superannuated relation, and thereafter, though his love for the work never abated, he preached only as health and opportunity would permit. He died Oct. 10, 1871, leaving behind the record of a life well spent in the service of his heavenly Master. See Christian Advocate, Dec. 9, 1871.

## Reed, John[[@Headword:Reed, John]]

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

## Reed, John (2)[[@Headword:Reed, John (2)]]

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

## Reed, Joseph[[@Headword:Reed, Joseph]]

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

## Reed, Nelson[[@Headword:Reed, Nelson]]

             a pioneer minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ann Arundel County, Md., Nov. 27, 1751. Nothing positive is known of his early history. In 1779 his name appears on the minutes as a travelling preacher, and he is believed to have thus preached for four years. His appointments were, in 1779 to Fluvanna; in 1780, Amelia; in 1781, Calvert; in 1782, Little York; in 1783, Caroline; in 1784, Dover. From 1785 to 1795 he had the charge of districts in Maryland and Virginia. In 1796 he was stationed at Fell's Point; in 1797, at Baltimore city; in 1798, at Fell's Point again; in 1799, on Baltimore Circuit. In 1800 his name is found among those “who are under a location through illness of body or family concerns,” and it disappears now from the minutes until 1805, when we find him again on the Baltimore Circuit. The next year he was placed in  charge of the Federal and Annapolis Circuit. In 1807, 1808, 1809, and 1810 he presided over the Baltimore District, on which were stationed at that time some of the strong men of the itinerancy. In 1811, 1812,1813, and 1814 he presided over the Georgetown District. In 1815 we find him on the Baltimore District again, where he presided four years. Inl 1819 he stands connected with the Baltimore Circuit as a supernumerary. In 1820 his name appears on the super-annuated list; in this relation he continued till the close of his life. At the time of his death, which occurred Oct. 20, 1840, he was the oldest Methodist preacher in Europe or America. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1840; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:68-70.

## Reed, Sampson[[@Headword:Reed, Sampson]]

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

## Reed, Samuel[[@Headword:Reed, Samuel]]

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

## Reelaiah[[@Headword:Reelaiah]]

             (Heb. Reelayah', רְעֵלָיָהfearer of Jehovah; Sept. ῾Ρεελίας), one of “the children of the province” who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2); called in the parallel passage (Neh 7:7) by the synonym RAAMIAH SEE RAAMIAH (q.v.).

## Reelius[[@Headword:Reelius]]

             ( ῾Ρεελίας v. r. Βορολίας), one of the Israelites who returned with Zerubbabel, from Babylon (1Es 5:8); inserted in place of the BIGVAI of the Hebrew lists (Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7) by confusion for the Reelaiah of Ezra's list.

## Rees, Abraham, D.D.[[@Headword:Rees, Abraham, D.D.]]

             a dissenting minister who held a distinguished rank in the literary and scientific world, was the son of a Welsh Nonconformist minister, and was born at Montgomery in 1743. Intended for the ministry, he was first placed under Dr. Jenkins, of Carmarthen, whence he was removed to the Hoxton Academy, founded by Mr. Coward, where his progress in his studies was so rapid that in his nineteenth year he was appointed mathematical tutor to the institution, and soon after resident tutor, in which capacity he continued upwards of twenty-two years. In 1768 he succeeded Mr. Read as pastor to the Presbyterian congregation of St. Thomas's, Southwark. On the death of Mr. White, in 1783. Rees accepted an invitation to become minister of a congregation in Jewin Street, Cripplegate, where he continued to officiate till the time of his death, June 9,1825. On the establishment of the dissenting seminary at Hackney in 1786, Dr. Rees, who had, in conjunction with Dr. Y. Savage and Kippis, seceded from that at Hoxton two years before, was elected to the situation of resident tutor in the natural sciences. This position he held till the dissolution of the academy, which took place on the death of Dr. Kippis (q.v.). It is, however, in a literary capacity that Dr. Rees is principally and most advantageously known. In 1776 he was appliedto by the proprietors of Chambers's Encyclopedia to superintend a new and enlarged edition of that valuable compilation, which, after nine years' incessant labor, he brought to a conclusion in four folio volumes. The success of this work stimulated the proprietors to still further exertions. A new undertaking, similar in its nature, but much more comprehensive in its plan, and printed in quarto size, was projected and carried on by him; and he had at length the satisfaction to see the new Cyclopedia, now generally known by his name, advance from the publication of the first volume in 1802 to its completion in forty-five volumes with undiminished reputation. His other works, besides those of a secular character, are, Practical Sermons (1809-12, 2 vols.): — The Principles of the Protestant Dissenters Stated and Vindicated: — besides a variety of occasional discourses. See Jones,  Christian Biography, p. 357; Annual Biography, 1825; London Gentleman's Magazine, 1825.

## Rees, George, D.D[[@Headword:Rees, George, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born near Brynberian, Pembrokeshire, in 1797, of eminently pious parents. He joined the Church in 1813, and soon began preaching. He received his ministerial education at the Carmarthen Presbyterian College, and, on completing his course, taught and preached for some time in the English portion of Pembrokeshire. Thence he removed to Fishguard. where, with great  efficiency, he conducted a grammar-school forty-three years. In 1835 he was ordained pastor at Gideon. His last five years were spent in confinement from paralysis. He died August 31, 1870. Dr. Rees was a thorough Hebrew and Greek scholar. His character was most exemplary. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1871, page 338.

## Rees, Thomas Swansea, D.D[[@Headword:Rees, Thomas Swansea, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born in Carmarthenshire, December 13, 1815. He was converted at thirteen, began to preach in 1832, was ordained in 1836, labored with great success in various pastorates in Wales, and died April 29, 1885. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1886, page 204.

## Reesaias[[@Headword:Reesaias]]

             ( ῾Ρησαίας), given (1Es 5:8) in place of the above REELAIAH (Ezr 2:2) or RAAMIAH (Neh 7:7).

## Reese, Daniel C., D.D[[@Headword:Reese, Daniel C., D.D]]

             one of the four brothers who became distinguished ministers in the Methodist Protestant Church, was born at Baltimore, Maryland, February 17, 1810. He was converted in his fourteenth year, and in 1830 became an itinerant minister in the Maryland Conference of the Methodist Protestant Church, in which he soon took a prominent position. For years he filled the onerous duties of conference steward, was repeatedly elected a representative to the General Conference, and was a member of the convention which met at Montgomery, Alabama, in 1867. From 1871 to 1873 he was president of the Maryland Annual Conference, and for forty- four years faithfully served the Church as an itinerant minister. In 1875 on account of feeble health, he was granted a superannuated relation, and died April 23, 1877. See Cobhauer, Founders of the Meth. Prot. Church, page 308.

## Reese, E. Yates[[@Headword:Reese, E. Yates]]

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

## Reese, Levi R[[@Headword:Reese, Levi R]]

             a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Harford County, Md.. Feb. 8, 1806, enjoyed a good preparatory training, and taught school for a while after he was seventeen. When about twenty years of age he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church, but shortly after the agitation opened which resulted in the formation of the Methodist Protestant Church, he was, it is said, the first preacher appointed by the new body. The first three years of his ministerial life were spent at Philadelphia and New York. In 1833 he was appointed by the Maryland Annual Conference to labor in Alexandria, Va., and there succeeded so  well that he was successively given “every important position and every official position within the gift of the body with which he was connected.” He was for two years president of the Church, and repeatedly a representative in their General Conference. In 1837 and 1838 he was chaplain to the United States Congress. He died in Philadelphia Sept. 21,1851. He was highly esteemed as a preacher, and the seals of his ministry are all through Maryland. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7:751-754.

## Reese, Thomas[[@Headword:Reese, Thomas]]

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

## Reeve, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Reeve, Thomas, D.D.]]

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

## Reeves, William[[@Headword:Reeves, William]]

             an Anglican divine, was born in 1668, and was educated at King's College, Cambridge, of which he was made a fellow. He took holy orders, and in 1694 became rector of Cranford, Middlesex, and in 1711 vicar of St. Mary, Reading. He died in 1726. He published, Sermons (1704, 4to): — Sermon  (1706, 4to): — The Apologies of Justin Martyr, Tertulliuan, and Minucius Felix in Defence of the Christian Religion, with the Commonitory of Vincentius Lirinensis concerning the Primitive Rule of Faith (transl., with notes and a preliminary discourse upon each author, Lond. 1709-16, 2 vols. 8vo). “The translation is generally perspicuous and faithful. The notes contain a good deal of learning, and frequently illustrate the meaning where it is obscure. The preliminary dissertation may be considered an answer to the valuable work of Daille on the same subject” (Orme). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Reeves, Williams, D.D[[@Headword:Reeves, Williams, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Protestant Church, was born in Kent, England, December 5, 1802. His parents being poor, his early education was limited. He was converted at the age of twenty-three, and united with the Church. Landing in America about the time of the organization of the Methodist Protestant Church, he united with the Ohio Conference at its first session. In 1833, at the formation of the Pittsburgh Conference, he became one of its members, and was frequently its president. At various times he was elected delegate to the general conferences and conventions of the Methodist Protestant Church. He died April 20, 1871. See Cobhauer, Founders of the Meth. Prot. Church, page 437.

## Refectory[[@Headword:Refectory]]

             the dining-hall of a monastery, college, etc. The internal arrangements and fittings were very similar to those of the ordinary domestic halls, except that it was usually provided with a raised desk or pulpit, from which on some occasions one of the inmates of the establishment read to the others during meal-time. There are remains of old English refectories at Chester and Worcester now used as a schoolhouse, at Carlisle and Durham as a library, and at Beaulieu as a church. Portions of the beautiful arcaded walls of one remain at Peterborough. It was usually as at Lanercost and Rievalle, raised upon cellarage, which at Cluigny contained the bath-rooms; and in Benedictine friars' and regular canons' houses it lay parallel to the minster, in order that the noise and fumes of dinner might not reach the sanctuary; but in most Cistercian houses, as Beaulieu, Byland, Ford, Netley, Tintern, Rievalle, Furness, and Kirkham, Maulbronn, Clairvaux, Braisne, Savigny, and Bonport, it stood at right angles to the cloister, as it did in the Dominican convents of Toulouse and Paris. A few foreign monastic refectories were of two alleys, as Tours, Alcobaga, the Benedictines', and St. Martin des Champs at Paris.

At St. Alban's an abbot, on his resignation, went to reside in a chamber which he had fitted up under the refectory. The usual dinner-hour was three P. M. The small bell rang and the monks came out from the parlor and washed at the lavatory, and then entered the hall, two and two, taking their appointed places at the side-tables. At the high- table on the dais the superior sat, in the centre of the east wall, under a cross, a picture of the Doom, or the Last Supper, having the squilla-bell on his right hand, which he rang at the beginning and end of dinner. Usually the number of each mess varied between three and ten persons. Each monk drew down his cowl and ate in silence. While the hebdomadaries or servers of the week laid the dishes, the reader of the week be gan the lection from Holy Writ or the lives of saints in the wall pulpit. During dinner all the  gates were closed, and no visitors were admitted. After dinner the broken fragments were sent down to the almonry for the poor and sick, and the brethren either took the meridian sleep, talked in the calefactory, read, or walked, but in some houses went in procession to the cemetery and prayed a while bareheaded among the graves of the brotherhood. At Durham the frater-house was used only on great occasions. It was fitted with benches and mats. The ordinary fare was pulse, fruit, vegetables, bread, fish, eggs, cheese, wine, or ale; and the evening meal, the biberes, collation, mistum, or caritas, consisted of bread and wine, and was followed by prayer in church before bedtime. The dinner-hour at length became put back to noon, and the supper was continued at the old time, about five P. M. At the entrance of the hall there was a large ambry for the mazers, cups, and plate. The Clugniacs distributed the unconsecrated hosts in hall. The Last Supper of Leonardo da Vinci, painted for the Dominicans of Milan, represents the high-table of a refectory of the order. French or Latin only was allowed to be spoken in hall or cloister, and in 1337 meat was not eaten on Wednesdays and Saturdays during Advent, or from Septuagesima to Easter-day. The hall of a guest-house was lined with beds at Clugny and Farfa, for men on one side and for women on the other, while movable tables down the centre were laid out at mealtime.

## Refine[[@Headword:Refine]]

             The art of refining, as referred to in Scripture, was of two different kinds, according as it was applied to liquids or to metals; and the processes, in themselves quite diverse. are expressed by different words. — In respect to liquids the primary idea was that of straining or filtering — the word for which was זָקִק, za(akdk (Isa 25:6); but in respect to metals it was that of nelting, and thereby separating the ore from the dross and for this the word was צָרִ, tsaraph. But the first word also in the course of time came to be used of gold or other metals, to denote their refined or pure state (1Ch 28:18; 1Ch 29:4; Job 28:1; Psa 12:6; Mal 3:3). In figurative allusions, however, to the idea of refining, while both words might have been employed, we find almost exclusive use made of that which points to the more searching process of purification by fire (Isa 1:25; Isa 40:19; Isa 48:10; Zeckariah 13:9; Mal 3:2-3). Hence the term “refiner” or smelter (צֹרֵ, tsoreph; מְצָרֵ, metsareph, Mal 3:2-3) denotes a worker in metals, specially of gold and silver (Pro 25:4). a founder (Jdg 17:4), a goldsmith (Isa 41:7). That the ancients acquired, in comparatively remote times, some knowledge and skill in this art, as in the working of metals generally, admits of no doubt. SEE METAL.

The Egyptians carried the working of metals to an extraordinary degree of perfection, as their various articles of jewelry preserved in museums evince; and there is no doubt that the Hebrews derived their knowledge of these arts from this source — though there is evidence that the art of working in copper and iron was known before the flood (Gen 4:22). The Egyptian monuments also give various representations on the subject, and in particular exhibit persons blowing at the fire, with a pot of metal on it, in order to raise it to a melting heat. SEE BELLOWS.

The creation of a heat sufficiently intense for the purpose was the chief element in the process of refining, although, probably, borax and other substances were applied to expedite and perfect the result. The refiner's art was especially essential to the working of the precious metals. It consisted in the separation of the dross from the pure ore, which avas effected by reducing the metal to a fluid state by the application of heat, and by the aid of solvents, such as alkali (ָֹבּר A.V. “purely,” Isa 1:25) or lead (Jer 6:29), which, amalgamating with the dross, permitted the extraction of the unadulterated metal. The Hebrews evidently llunderstood the process of melting the metals, not only to make them fluid for the purpose of casting, but also for separating from the precious metals the mixed common minerals, such as silver from the lead ore with which it was combined (Eze 22:18-22; Eze 24:11). The instruments required by the refiner were a crucible or furnace (כּוּר) and a bellows or blowpipe (מִפֻּחִ). The workman sat at his work (Mal 3:3, “He shall sit as a refiner”); he was thus better enabled to watch the process, and let the metal run off at the proper moment. SEE MINE.

The notices of refining are chiefly of a figurative character, and describe moral purification as the result of chastisement (Isa 1:25; Zec 13:9; Mal 3:2-3). The failure of the means to effect the result is graphically depicted in Jer 6:29 : “The bellows glow with the fire (become quite hot from exposure to the heat); the lead (used as a solvent) is expended (תִּם מֵאֵשׁ [keri]); the refiner melts in vain, for the refuse will not be separated.” The refiner appears, from the passage whence this is quoted, to have combined with his proper business that of assaying metals: “I have set thee for an assayer” (ָָבּחוֹן A.V. “a tower,” Jer 6:27). SEE FINING-POT

.

## Reformatio, Legum Ecclesiasticarum[[@Headword:Reformatio, Legum Ecclesiasticarum]]

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

## Reformation[[@Headword:Reformation]]

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

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

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

In the latter part of the Middle Ages, the deviation of the ruling Church from Scripture and primitive Christianity became more and more glaring, and the corruption among all classes of the clergy, from the highest to the lowest. more and more general. The call for a “reformation in the head and members” spread rapidly, and even great nations began to look upon the reformation of the Church as a national cause. It has been justly remarked that the meaning given to the term “reformation in the head and members” was by no means uniform, and that “every one understood it to mean primarily that which he most desired — the removal of what seemed to him most oppressive and unchristian.” All malcontents, however, appeared to agree in regarding the administration of the Christian Church by the papal court as utterly depraved, and as subversive of true Christianity.  The efforts made for putting an end to papal misrule and achieving a reformation of the Church were chiefly of two kinds. The one class found the seat of the degeneration not so much in a departure from the doctrine of the Bible as in the usurpation by the popes of greater power than belonged to them by divine and Church right. These men stroligly believed in the continuity of the visible Church; they rejected the right of separation and secession, and looked upon the oecumenical councils of the Church as the only medium through which the needed reformation of the Church should be effected. This school had for a long time a centre in the most famous literary institution of the Church — the University of Paris. Its chief representatives were Peter d'Ailly, the chancellor, his pupil Gerson, and Nicolas de Climanges, rector of that university. The hearty support of many of the foremnost princes of the age, including several emperors, was secured, and at the three great councils of Pisa, Constance. and Basle the majority of the assembled bishops and theologians expressed their: concurrence in these views, and earnestly endeavored to effect a radical reformation on this basis. Thejoyous hopes which had been raised in the Church by these reformatory efforts were, however, sorely disappointed when the pope succeeded in dissolving the Council of Basle.

Much more thorough than this class of reformers were a second, who not only turned against papal usurpations in the government of the Church, but also by a study of the Scriptures were led to look upon the entire doctrinal system of the Church, as it had gradually developed under the misguidance of the popes, as an apostasy from the Christianity of the Bible, and who therefore believed that, more than a reformation in its head and members, the Church needed a reformation in its spirit and doctrines. The foremost representatives of this: school were Wycliffe in England, and Huss in Bohemia. To Wycliffe the papacy appeared as anti-Christianity, and the papal power, in his opinion, was not derived from God, but from the emperor. He rejected altogether the existing hierarchical constitution of the Church, and advocated the substitution for it of the presbyterial constitution as he believed it to have existed in the apostolical age. To the traditions of the Church he absolutely denied an authoritative character, and declared the whole Scripture to be the only source and rule of religious knowledge. Huss derived his views of Church reform largely from Wycliffe, and in 1410 was excommunicated from the Church as a Wycliffite. One of the central doctrines of the reformation of' the 16th century rose, however, in his system to greater prominence, and he also  resembled his great followers more than Wycliffe by arousing the masses of the people in behalf of reform. Neither Wycliffe nor Huss succeeded in carrying through a reformation. When the English governmelnt, which had protected Wycliffe during his lifetime from personal injury, began a bloody persecution against his followers, most of whom were found in the higher classes and among the men of learning, the reformatory movement in England came to a sudden standstill. The reformatory ideas of Huss appeared for a time to gain complete control of an entire country, and thus to establish a stronghold of evangelical Christianity: in the centre of Europe. But internal dissensions and the superior power of the German emperor annihilated in 1434 the prospects of the Hussite movement, which dwindled down into a small sect called the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. Numerically too weak to exercise a missionary influence upon the remainder of Christian Europe, this religious denomination will yet always be counted among the ripest and most delicious fruits of the reformatory tendencies of the Middle Ages.

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

One of the most gifted reformatory preachers of the Middle Ages appeared towards the close of the 15th century in Italy. With a rare eloquence and boldness he attacked the immoral life prevailing in both Church and State, and demanded a radical reform of both. Though few reformatory preachers have ever succeeded better than Savonarola in swaying the emotions of large masses of the people, he did not lay the foundation of any  reformatory organization; and when he was burned at the gibbet, there was no one to continue the work of his life.

2. At the close of the 15th century, the Church had succeeded in repressing all the reformatory movements of the Middle Ages, at least so far as to prevent, mostly by the sword of the secular arm, the consolidation of any of these movements into a powerful ecclesiastical organization, like that of the Eastern Church. But her triumph, after all, was more apparent than real. Her authority had been thoroughly undermined, and remained shaken in every country of Europe. The threats of the Church might extort reluctant recantations from a number of intimidated reformers; but her very successes of this kind had the effect of spreading the latent discontent with a religious organization which so palpably cared more for power than for the purity of Christian doctrine and Christian life. Other powerful agencies aided in shaking the belief of the educated classes in the Church. The most influential among them was the school of the Humainists,.who used the revival of classical studies for promoting a general literary culture, which not only fully emancipated itself from the gilardianship of the Church, but frequently assumed an indifferent and antagonistic position even with regard to Christianity. Especially in Italy, humanism became an enthusiastic worshipper of pagan antiquity, and it became quite common that high dignitaries of the Church were in the circles of their friends and acquaintances known as avowed atheists. Even pope Leo X was credited with the remark — and, whether true or not true, it was regarded as credible by his contemporaries — “It is generally known how much we and ours have profited by the fable of Christ.” While in Italy many of the leading humanists became opponents of Christian belief, though they had no objection to retaining their positions, which often were of the highest rank, in the Church, the chief patrons of the classical studies in the Teutonic countries were mostly men of earnest Christian convictions, who cultivated them with a view to strengthening the cause of Christianity, and of reforming the Church. It was especially the community of the Brothers of the Common Life who founded a number of excellent schools, in which the highest attainments in the revived classical studies, and an education in the principles of earnest, purified Christianity, were aimed at. Though the community as a whole never entered into an oppositional attitude with regard to the Church, but rather, like its greatest member, Thomas a Kempis, limited itself to teaching, preaching, and practicing that which in the system of the ruling Church appeared to be unobjectionable to earnest  and pious Christians, its teachers and pupils generally favored the idea of a Church reformation, and in the 16th century many of them became enthusiastical co-workers in the reformatory labors of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin.

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

II. Luther's Reformation in Germany. — While the forerunners of the Reformation diffused in the Church the yearning for a radical purification of Christianity, and while the humanists were educating a race much better fitted for being the standard-bearers of a thorough reform than were the reformers of preceding centuries, a number of other great events co- operated for bringing the mediaeval history of mankind to a close, and for ushering in a new sera. Maritime discoveries of unparalleled magnitude widened the horizon of the European nations and led to a rapid growth of commerce, to an increase of manufactures, and a greater and more general diffusion of wealth. The invention of the art of printing diffused knowledge among the masses of the people to an extent which former generations would have regard ed as impossible. Feudalism and medieval chivalry collapsed before the rise of the wealthier and more intelligent burgherdom of the cities and towns, on the one hand, and the consolidation of powerful states under centralized governments, on the other. The new forces which obtained a controlling influence upon modern society were not always, and not by necessity, hostile to the rulling Church; but it is at once apparent that when in alliance with reformatory Church movements they were a considerable aid in raising up more formidable oppositions to the popes and their Church than those which had been put down in the Middle Ages. Soon after the beginning of the':6th century, Germany, then the soil most  favorable to religious reform, produced the man who succeeded in carrying through the reforms which the preceding centuries had so often in vain attempted, who dealt to the papacy a heavier blow than it had received since the separation of the Eastern Church, and whose name, forever associated with “The Reformation,” stands at the portal of modern history as one of its greatest pillars. No one disputes the eminent position which Martin Luther occupies in history, nor the extraordinary qualities which elevated him to it. The Manual of Church History, by Dr. Alzog, which has been translated into nearly all the languages of Europe, and is very extensively used in the theological schools of the Roman Catholic Church, says of Luther: “If we look upon his agitated, eventful life, we must count him among the most remarkable men of all centuries, althrough he has not grasped his mission as a reformer of the Church. We must also recognise his courage, though it frequently degenerated into defiance — his untiring activity, his popular, irresistible eloquence, sparkling wit, and disinterestedness. He did not lack a profound religious sentiment, which yearned for satisfaction, and which constitutes the fundamental character and the most brilliant feature of his system.” A Protestant Church historian (Kurtz) justly calls Luther a religious genius, who was called to his great work by the rarest union of the necessary qualifications and gifts of the intellect, sentiment, character, and will; who was trained and educated by a providential guidance of his life; who, in his own life, had passed through the entire essential course of reformation, had tested in himself its divine power, and then could not but make the holiest and dearest experience of his life serviceable to all the world.

1. The origin of the German Reformation was quite humble and indefinite. Pope Leo X, of whom even Roman Catholic writers must say that “he does not appear to have experienced the blessing and power of the Christian faith,” and that “religion was not to him the highest affair of life,” had arranged for a very extensive sale of indulgences. It was not deemed worth while to assign for such an outrage upon the religious sentiment of pious Christians a more specious pretext than that the proceeds of the sale were intended for a war against the Turks and the erection of St. Peter's church. The real destination of the money, it was quite commonly believed, was to defray the exorbitant expenditures of the pope's court and to serve as a marriage dowry of his sister. Archbishop Albert of Mentz, of whose Christian belief as little was known as of that of the pope, authorized the sale in Germany on condition that fifty per cent. of the gross income should  flow into his own pocket. A Dominican friar (Tetzel) carried on the trade with an effrontery which outraged the sentiments of thousands of earnest Christians. Among those who were urged by their conscience to rise against this profanation of Christianity was Luther, then a young monk in an Augustinian convent. When a young student, he had been driven by his anxiety for the salvation of his soul into the retirement of a convent. After long doubts and mental troubles, he had derived from a profound study of the Scriptures, and of the writings of Augustine and Tauler, the consolatory belief that man is to be saved, not by his own works, but by faith in the mercy of God in Christ.

When he became a doctor of the Sacred Scriptures, he was deeply impressed with the duty imposed upon him by the oath he had to take on the occasion of teaching and making known to the world the truths of Christianity. Both as an earnest Christian, who sincerely believed in the Christianity of the Scriptures, and as a conscientious teacher of theology, Luther felt himself impelled to enter an energetic protest against the doings of Tetzel. In accordance with the principles of the Church of Rome, he wrote to several neighboring bishops to stop the sale of indulgences, and only when this appeal remained unheeded he determined to act himself. On the eve of All-Saints' Day, Oct. 31, 1517, he affixed to the castle church of Wittenberg the celebrated ninety-five propositions, which are generally looked upon as the beginning of Luther's reformation. Both Protestant and Roman Catholic writers are agreed that these theses involved by no means on Luther's part a conscious renunciation of the Roman Catholic faith. Luther himself showed this clearly by his subsequent appeal to the pope; but Dr. Hase justly remarks that Luther certainly must have been aware that he had thrown out a challenge to the most powerful prelates and monks. On the other hand, the opposition to Rome was so widespread that Luther's words worked upon public opinion as the kindling spark in a powdermagazine. Even the pope, who had at first looked upon the matter as another monkish quarrel, became startled at the electric shock which it produced throughout the Christian world. Serious measures for arresting the progress of the movement were resolved upon. At first the pope cited Luther to Rome, but at the request of the University of Wittenberg and the elector of Saxony the concession was made that the papal legate, Thomas de Vio, of Gaeta (better known in history under the name Cajetanus), should examine Luther in a paternal manner.

The characteristic feature in Luther's line of defence was the rejection of the arguments taken from the fathers and the scholastics, and the demand to be refuted by arguments taken from the  Bible. It was also remarkable that soon after appealing from the cardinal's treatment to the pope when better informed, he was urged on, by a fresh papal bull in behalf of indulgences, to change his appeal and to direct it to an oecumenical council. Soon after, the Roman court found it expedient to change its policy with Luther, and to endeavor to bring him back by means of compromise and kindliness. The papal chamberlain, Karl von Miltiz, a native of Saxony, was so far successful that Luther promised to write letters in which he would admonish all persons to be obedient and respectful to the Roman Church, and to write to the pope to assure him that he had never thought of infringing upon the privileges of the Roman Church. The promised letter was actually indited; its language is full of expressions of humility, and exalts the Roman Church above everything but Christ himself. He also promised to discontinue the controversy if his opponents would do the same. But soon he was drawn into the Disputation of Leipsic (June 27 to July 15, 1519), which the vain-glorious Dr. Eck (even Roman Catholic writers thus characterize him) had originally arranged with Carlstadt. History awards to Dr. Eck the glory of having been the more clever disputant, but Luther's cause was nevertheless greatly benefited by it. The arguments of his opponents drove Luther onward to a more explicit rejection of Romish innovations. He was led to assert that the pope was not by divine right the universal bishop of the Church, to admit a doubt of the infallibility of councils, and to be convinced that not all Hussite doctrines were heretical.

At the same time the reformatory movement was greatly strengthened by the universal sympathy that began to be expressed with Luther, by the alliance with the liberal humanists and knights of Germany, and especially by the open accession to his cause of one of the greatest scholars of the age, Dr. Melancthon. The conflict between Rome and Luther now became one for life and death. Dr. Eck returned from a journey to Rome with a bull which declared Luther a heretic and ordered the burning of his writings. Luther, on the other hand, systematized his views in three works, all of which appeared in 1520: To his Imperial Majesty and the Christian Nobility of the German Nation; On the Babylonian Captivity of the Church; and Sermon on the Freedom of a Christian Man. Finally he broke away the last bridge of retreat by publicly burning (Dec. 10, 1520) the papal bull with the papal canon law. The pope succeeded in prevailing upon the German emperor and the German Diet of Worms (1521) to proceed against Luther; and when the latter firmly refused to recant, and avowed that he could yield nothing but to the Holy Scriptures and reasonable argument, he was placed under the ban of the  empire; but so great was the discontent in Germany with Rome that the same assembly that condemned Luther for opposing the faith of their ancestors presented 101 articles of complaint against the Roman see. The ban of the empire involved serious dangers for Luther, for it gave permission to any one to assault his person and seize upon his property; but he was saved from these dangers by his secluded life at the Castle of Wartburg, to which disguised horsemen, according to a previous understanding with the elector, but against his own desire, had conducted him. Far from the turmoil of political agitation, he found time not only to issue several powerful polemical essays (against auricular confession, against monastic vows, against masses for the dead, and against the new idol of the archbishop of Mentz), which refuted the rumor that he was dead, but to conceive and partially execute the plan of translating the Bible into the native tongue. During the absence of Luther from Wittenberg, the Reformation under the leadership of men who were more impetuous and practical, but less circumspect and theplogical, assumed a more aggressive turn against Rome.

Several priests renounced celibacy and were married; Carlstadt administered the Lord's supper in both kinds, and in the German language. To these changes Luther made no objection; but when Carlstadt began to commit open acts of violence in disturbing the public worship of the Roman Church — when enthusiastic prophets appeared from Zwickau, who boasted of immediate divine revelations, rejected infant baptism, and denounced Church, State, and science — he emerged once more from his seclusion, silenced by powerful sermons his adversaries at Wittenberg, and once more placed himself at the helm of the movement. In intimate union with. Melancthon, he now labored for completing the theological system of the Church which began to rear itself on the basis of his reformatory movement. Luther himself gave his chief attention to continuing the translation of the Bible in German, which was completed in 1534, and constitutes in every respect one of the master-productions of the reformatory age; while Melancthon, in his celebrated work on theological science (Loci Communes Rerum Theologicarum), gave to the theological leaders of the new Church a hand-book of doctrine which, as a literary production, ranked with the best works that the Church of Rome had produced up to that time.

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

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

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

2. A new crisis for the German Reformation began in 1529 with the Diet of Spire. The emperor having victoriously finished his wars, was now free from foreign entanglements, and showed himself determined to maintain the religious unity of the empire. A very numerous attendance of bishops and prelates secured a Catholic majority, which, in accordance with the imperial demand, decreed that the Edict of Worms should be carried through in the states which had hitherto acknowledged its authority, but that no innovations should be required in the remaining provinces; that none should be obstructed in celebrating the mass; and that the privileges of every spiritual estate should be respected. Against this recess, which if carried out would have made a further progress of the Reformation impossible, Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Luneburg, Anhalt, the margrave of Brandenburg, and fourteen imperial cities entered a protestation, from which they were henceforth called Protestants. They appealed from it to the emperor-to a free council and a German national assembly. Philip of  Hesse urged the evangelical princes to assume a defiant attitude for the defence of the Reformation, and, in order to strengthen their alliance, advised a union with the imperial cities that favored the Reformation of Zwingli. In accordance with his wishes, a theological colloquy was arranged at Marburg (Oct. 1 to 3, 1529), in which Zwingli, Luther, OEcolampadius. and Melancthon took part.

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

The Edict of Worms was to be carried out, and the imperial court was to proceed against the disobedient. As, soon after the close of the diet, a legal process was actually begun against the Protestant states for having confiscated the property of the Church, the Protestant powers met at Smalkald, and concluded (1531) a defensive alliance for six years, at the head of which the elector of Saxony and the landgrave of Hesse were placed. Fortunately for the new alliance, the emperor was soon again involved in a war with the Turks, who threatened an invasion of Austria and Germany, and his desire to obtain the aid of the Protestant churches once more disposed him favorably towards toleration. New negotiations resulted in the conclusion of the religious peace of Nuremberg (July 23, 1532), which enjoined upon both parties mutual friendship and Christian love until the approaching council. Pope Clement VII so far yielded to the demands of the emperor that he promised in 1533 to convoke a council within the space of a year at Mantua, Bologna, or Piacenza; but he demanded, at the same time, from the Protestants a previous unconditional submission to the decrees of the council. This promise the Protestants naturally refused to give, though they were ready to attend the council and plead their cause. The power of the Protestants in the meanwhile was greatly strengthened by the accession of the dukes of Pomerania and Wurtemberg, and by a union with the cities which favored the Zwinglian Reformation; and which, after a religious colloquy, held at Cassel in 1535, between Melancthon and Bucer, agreed in May, 1536, upon the Wittenberg Concord, by which the cities unequivocally accepted the Augsburg Confession.

When in July, 1536, the pope actually convoked the council at Mantua, the Protestant states met again for consultation at Smalkald. They accepted and signed the “Articles of Smalkald” which had been composed by Luther, and which presented the doctrines of the Reformation in much stronger terms than the Confession of Augsburg, and they remained unanimous in the resolve not to attend an Italian council, at which the pope would appear both as a party and as a judge. The council did not meet, but in 1538 a “holy league” for the suppression of Protestantism was formed at Nuremberg by the archbishops of Mentz and Salzburg, the dukes of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Henry of Brunswick. But the next year George died, and was succeeded by his Protestant brother Henry, who found it easy to carry through the Reformation; and a few years later (1542), Henry of Brunswick was driven from his dominions, into which his conquerors  likewise introduced the Reformation. The elector of Brandenburg, Joachim I, a decided enemy of Luther, was likewise (1535) succeeded by a Protestant son. Thus gradually the Reformation gained over to its side nearly all the secular princes of Germany, with the exception of the dukes of Bavaria and the house of Hapsburg, which found it necessary to adhere to the old faith on account of its connection with Spain, Belgium, and Italy. Several new attempts were made to effect a reconciliation of the contending parties.

The Colloquy of Worms (1540) remained without any result. At the Diet of Ratisbon (1541), where Rome was represented by the pious legate Contarini, who himself favored the fundamental doctrines of Protestantism as they were then maintained, an agreement was effected between the theologians concerning the doctrine of justification and other points, but it was found impossible to harmonize views on transubstantiation. The Protestants, but not the Catholics, had to pledge themselves to abide by the agreed articles (the Ratisbon Interim) until the meeting of the council. The pope was finally prevailed upon by the emperor to open (Dec. 13, 1545) the long-promised council at Trent, a city of the German empire. The emperor still adhered to the plan to force the pope into a Catholic reformation of the Church, and the Protestants into submission to the Church. Another colloquy at Ratisbon was arranged in 1546 to draw up a basis of union to be submitted to the council, but it remained without result. At the same time, the emperor was determined to break the political power of Protestantism by annihilating the Smalkald alliance, and in this he was quite successful. The elector and the landgrave were declared guilty of high-treason, and in the ensuing Smalkaldic war, in which duke Maurice, though himself a Protestant, fought from political motives on the side of the emperor, both princes were defeated and made prisoners. The other members of the league, with the exception of a few cities, submitted.

The emperor was anxious not to give to his expedition the name of a religious war. but the pope accorded a plenary indulgence to all who would aid in the extermination of the heretics. Shortly before the beginning of the war (Feb. 18, 1546), Luther had died at Eisleben, where he had been invited to act as umpire between the counts of Mansfeld. In order to prevent the participation of the Protestants in the council, the pope caused the immediate condemnation of some important Protestant doctrines in the first session of that body; and to escape the reformatory pressure of the emperor, he transferred the council (March, 1547), on the pretext that in Trent it was threatened by the pestilence, to Bologna, where it soon dissolved. The emperor was greatly dissatisfied, and determined to  go on with his own reformatory policy for preserving the religious unity of Christendom. At his request, the conciliatory and nobble-minded bishop of Naumburg, Julius von Pflugk, and the court preacher of the elector of Brandenburg, John Agricola, drew up the Augsburg Interim (1548), which was adopted by the diet, and was to serve as the standard according to which all matters relating to religion should be arranged until the decision of the council. At first the Interim was intended to be valid for both Protestants and Catholics, but it really remained in force only among the former, to whom it conceded the marriage of the clergy, the use of the cup in the sacrament, and some indefinite constructions of particular doctrines of the Catholic Church. The Protestants submitted to the Interim with great reluctance; and even the emperor's ally; Maurice of Saxony, did not risk its uuconditional introduction, and at his advice the Leipsic Interim (1548) was drawn up by Melancthon, in which the greater part of the Catholic ritual was declared to be indifferent (adiaphoron), and therefore fit to be retained.

It also declared that the power of the pope and of the bishops might be acknowledged so long as they used it for the edification, and not for the destruction, of the Church. But even this more Protestant Interim gave no satisfaction, and the fermentation continuied until the new pope, Julius III, reconvoked the Council of Trent for May 1,1551. The emperor demanded that Protestants should attend the council, but Maurice made the attendance dependent upon the condition that Protestants should receive the right of voting, that the former resolutions against the Protestants should be annulled, and that the pope himself should be subject to a general council. Melancthon elaborated as the basis of the doctrinal negotiations the Confessio Saxonica, or Repetitio Confessionis Augustance. Protestant deputies from Wiirtemberg, Brandenburg, Saxony, and Strasburg appeared at Trent, and Melancthon, accompanied by several theologians of Wittenberg, set out to join them. The situation of the Reformation was radically changed when Maurice concluded a secret alliance against the emperor with a uIumber of Protestant princes and the Catholic king of France, to whom, for his assistance, the three German bishoprics of Metz, Toul, and Verdun were treacherously surrendered by the allies.

Maurice, in a short and decisive war (1552), completely defeated the emperor, who was sick at Innsbruck, and compelled him to agree to the Treaty of Passau (July 30, 1552), which set the landgrave of Hesse at liberty (the elector of Saxony had been liberated previously), opened the imperial council to the adherents of the Reformation, promised a diet for the settlement of the religious differences, and provided a permanent peace for at least all those  who sympathized with the Augsburg Confession. The continuance of the war between Germany and France delayed the convocation of the.Diet of Augsburg until Feb., 1555. Both parties in Germany had arrived at the conviction that the hope of terminating the religious controversy by means of religious colloquies or by a general council must be abandoned for the present, arid that peace and order in the empire could only be maintained by mutual forbearance. After long negotiations, the “Religious Peace of Augsburg” was concluded. — It guaranteed the free exercise of religion to the Catholics and the adherents of the Confession of Augsburg. According to the “territorial system,”which now came into use, the prince of every German state had a right to reform the Church within his dominion. The subjects of both Protestant and Catholic governments who were unwilling to conform to the ruling religion retained only the right to leave their country without obstruction. The Protestants remained in possession of the ecclesiastical benefices which they held in 1555. But with regard to the future, it was provided that all spiritual states of the empire which should subsequently go over to the Augsburg Confession should by that act forfeit their offices and possessions. The Catholics remembered with fear the losses which they had sustained by the secession of the grand master of the German order, Albert of Brandenburg, and with which they were threatened by the sympathy with the Reformation of the archbishop Hermann of Cologne; and they therefore believed that on the adoption of the articles securing to them the possession of bishoprics and other ecclesiastical states, even if their actual incumbents should become Protestants, the very existence of their Church would depend. The article called “Ecclesiastical Reservation” (Reservatun Ecclesiasticum) was proclaimed by the Roman king Ferdinand as an actual ordinance of the diet, though the Protestants loudly protested against it, and their protest had to be recorded in the peace.

III. Zwingli's and Calvin's Reformation in Switzerland. — Next to Germany, Switzerland became the principal source of the Reformation. But it sent forth two currents which have never fully united, though many connecting canals have been built between them, and both are now usually acknowledged as belonging to one comprehensive system; which is commonly designated as the Reformed Church. One of the movements originated in German, the other in French, Switzerland. At the head of the one was Ulric Zwingli, at the head of the other John Calvin. The thirteen cantons which constituted Switzerland at the beginning of the 16th century  were still in nominal connection with the German empire; and the same causes, therefore, which have been referred to in our account of Germany favored the growth of the Reformation in Switzerland. Dissatisfaction with and contempt of Rome were, moreover, promoted in Switzerland by the large number of mercenaries who were employed in the military service of the popes, and who, after returning home, not only diffused a knowledge of the utter corruption prevailing in Rome, but by their own unworthy lives helped to bring Rome into disrepute.

1. Ulric Zwingli, who gave the first impulse to the Reformation in German Switzerland, SEE ZWINGLI, had received his education at the universities of Vienna and Basle, and in the latter place had joined himself to a circle of enthusiastic admirers of ancient learning and of enlightelned religious views who gathered around Erasmus. It was more classical education and scientific study of the Holy Scriptures than, as in the case of Luther, religious experience which made Zwingli an earnest advocate of religious reform, although, like his teacher Erasmus, he continued to hope for a reformation within the Church by the ecclesiastical authorities themselves. Such views were entertained quite generally in Switzerland; and thus, though Zwingli in 1518 raised his voice against the effrontery of a trader in indulgences, the Franciscan monk Bernardin Samson, he was appointed papal chaplain by the papal legate. His preaching against the corruptions prevailing in the Church became more earnest after he had been appointed, in 1519, “Lent priest” in Zurich. The influences proceeding from Luther did not remain without effect upon him, and he began to be looked upon in Zurich as a Lutheran at heart. When he designated the rule of fasting as an ordinance of man, the Council of Zurich, in 1522, took his part against the bishop of Constance.

Zwingli's first reforming work, Von Erkiesen und Freyheit der Spysen, which was published at this time, gave a new imptuse to the movement. In the same year Zwingli, in the name of the reformatory party among the clergy, addressed the Diet of Lutcerne and the bishop of Constance in behalf of a free preaching of the Gospel; he also demanded the abolition of priestly celibacy. In accordance with Zwingli's wish, the Council of Zurich arranged on Jan. 29, 1523, a religious conference, at which Zwingli presented the reformatory doctrines he had preached in sixty-seven articles, and defended them so successfilly that the Council of Zurich charged all the preachers to preach the pure Gospel in the same manner. Soon after, Zwingli received an efficient co-laborer in his reformatory efforts by the appointment of Leo Judae as Lent priest at  Zurich. Several events signalized at this time the steady advance of the cause. The council allowed nuns to leave their convents, several of the clergy married without hindrance, a German baptismal service was introduced, and the cathedral chapter, at its own request, received new andt suitable ordinances. In other cantons, especially in Lucerne, Fribourg, and Zug, a violent opposition was manifested against the Reformation, but in Zurich its success was fully secured. The council convoked a new conference for October 26, upon images and the mass, to which all Swiss bishops and cantons were invited, but only Schaffhausen and St. Gall sent delegates. No champion for images and mass was found at the conference, and the Council of Zurich concluded to promote the reformation of the canton by diffusing the proper instruction in the country districts, for which purpose Zwinigli, the abbot Von Cappel, and Conrad Schmidt, commnander of the knights of St. John at Kussnacht, were appointed. With the assent of the council, Zwingli published his Christian Introduction, which was to explain to the people more fully the meaning of the religious Reformation. Soon new reformatory measures were adopted by the council. The shrined pictures in the churches were shut up, and every priest was left free to celebrate mass or not as he chose (Dec., 1523). On Whit- Sunday, 1524, the work of removing the images from the churches was begun, and it was completed in thirteen days.

The abolition of many other usages followed in rapid succession; and the transformation in religious service was completed by the celelration on April 13, 14, and 16, 1525, of the Lord's supper again in its original simplicity in the great minster. The publication of Zwingli's De Vera et Falsa Religione and the first part of the Zurich translation of the Bible likewise gave a favorable impulse. Beyond Zurich, the Reformation was carried through in nearly the whole canton of Appenzell, and in the town of Muhlhausen; a broad foundation was laid in Berne by the preaching of the prudent Berchtold Haller; in Basle, Wolfgang Fabricius Capito and Caspar Hedio were the first preachers, and in 1524 the authorities conceded to John CEcolampadius those conditions in regard to reform under which he accepted an appointment as minister. The Reformation also gained a firm ground in Schaffhausen and St. Gall. The majority of the cantons were, however, still opposed to the Reformation, and the Diet of Lucerne (Jan., 1525) endeavored to satisfy the longing for a reformation without rending the Church. Its decrees, however, did not go into effect; and the Catholic cantons, in accordance with the advice of Dr. Eck, arranged a new religious disputation at Baden (May 19, 1526), where (Ecolampadins acted  as the spokesman of the Reformed theologians.

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

2. In French Switzerland, the reformatory movement began in 1526 in the French parts of the cantons Berne and Biel, where the Gospel was preached by William Farel, a native of France. In 1530 he established the Reformation in Neufchatel. In Geneva a beginning was made as early as 1528; in 1534, after a religious conference held at the suggestion of the  Bernese, in which Farel defended the Reformation, public worship was allowed to the Reformed; rapid progress was then made through the zeal of Farel. Froment, and Viret; and in 1535, after another disputation, the papacy was abolished by the council anid the Reformation adopted. In 1536 John Calvin, SEE CALVIN arrived in Geneva, and was induced by Farel to remain in the city and to aid him in his struggle against a party of freethinkers who called themselves Spirituels. In October of the same year he took part with Farel and Viret in a religious disputation held at Lausanne, which resulted in the adhesion of the Pavs-de-Vaud to the cause of the Reformation. In 1538 both Calvinn and Farel were banished by the council, which had taken offence at the strict Church discipline introduced by the Reformers. Soon, however, the friends of the Reformation regained the ascendency, and Calvin was recalled in 1541, while Farel remained in Neufchatel. For several years Calvin had to sustain a desperate struggle against his opponents, but in 1555 they were finally subdued in an insurrection set on foot by Ami Perrin. From that time the reformatory ideas of Calvin were carried through in both Church and State with iron consistenc,. and Geneva became a centre whence reformatory influences spread to the remotest parts of Europe. By an extensive correspondence and numerous religious writings, he exerted a strong personal influence far bevond the boundaries of Switzerland. The theological academy of Geneva, founded in 1588, supplied the churches of many foreign countries, especially France, with preachers trained in the spirit of Calvin. When Calvin died, in 1564, the continuation of his work devolved upon the learned Theodore Beza. Calvin disagreed in many points with Zwingli, whose views gradually lost ground as those of Calvin advanced. The Second Helvetic Confession, the most important among the symbolical books of the Reformed Church, which was compiled by Bullinger in Zurich, published in 1566, and recognised in all Reformed countries, completed the superiority of Calvin's principles over those of Zwingli.

3. Although the majority of the German Protestant churches remained in connection with the Lutheran Reformation, a German Reformed Church which wore a moderately Calvinistic aspect sprang up in several parts of Germany. In 1560 the elector Frederick III of the Palatinate embraced the Reformed creed, and organized the Church of his dominions according to Reformed principles. By his authority, Ursinus and Olevianus composed the Heidelberg Catechism, which soon came to be regarded not only as the standard symbolical book of the German Reformed Church, but was highly  esteemed throughout the Reformed world. Maurice. the learned landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, after several fruitless attempts to reconcile the Lutheran and Reformed churches, joined the latter in 1564, and compelled the Lutheran Church of his dominion to enter into communion with Calvinism. In Anhalt, Calvinism was introduced chiefly from attachment to Melancthon, and Nassau introduced the Heidelberg Catechism in consequence of its relation to the house of Orange. The most important accession to the Reformed Church of Germany was that of John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, who onl Christmas day, 1613, received the Lord's supper in the court church of Berlin according to the Calvinistic ritual. Although he tried, as all princes of these times did, to induce the people to follow his example, the overwhelming majority of the country continued to remain Lutheran. Among the free imperial cities, it was especially Bremen which adopted the Reformed creed.

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

The cloisters were subjected to a visitation in 1535, and totally abolished in 1536; and the Bible was diffused in the mother tongue (1538) as the only source of doctrine; but the statute of 1539, imposed distinct  limits upon the Reformation, and, in particular, confirmed transubstantiation, priestly celibacy, masses for the dead, and auricular confession. A considerable number of those who refused to comply with the religious changes introduced into England were executed. A powerful party, headed by Thomas Cranmer, after 1533 archbishop of Canterbury, and Thomas Cromwell, after 1534 royal vicargeneral for ecclesiastic affairs, exerted a silent influence in behalf of a nearer approach towards the Reformed churches of continental Europe. They met with little success during the reign of Henry, but obtained a majority in the regency which ruled England during the minority of Edward VI. Peter Martyr, Occhino, Bucer, and Fagius were called to England to aid Cranmer in carrying through the Reformation. The basis was laid in the Book of Homilies (1547), the new English liturgy (the Book of Common Prayer, 1548), and the Forty-two Articles (1552); but the labors of Cranmer were interrupted by the death of Edward VI (1553). His successor, queen Mary, the daughter of Henry and Catharine of Aragon, was a devoted partisan of the Church of Rome, during whose reign Cranmer and from three hundred to four hundred other persons were executed on account of their religion. A papal nuncio appeared in England, and an obsequious parliament sanctioned the reunion with Rome; but the affections of the people were not regained, and the early death of Mary (1558) put an end to the official restoration of the Papal Church. Queen Elizabeth, the daughter of Henry and Anne Boleyn, whose birth, in consequence of the papal decision, was regarded by the Roman Catholics as illegitimate, resumed the work of her father, and completed the English Reformation, as distinct both from the Church of Rome and the Reformations of Germany and Switzerland.

The Book of Common Prayer which had been adopted under Edward was so changed as to be less offensive to Catholics, and by the Act of Uniformity, June, 1559, it was made binding on all the churches of the kingdom. Most of the Catholics conformed; of 9400 clergy, their benefices were only lost by fourteen bishops, fifteen heads of ecclesiastical corporations, fifty canons, and about eighty priests. Matthew Parker, the former teacher of the queen, was appointed archbishop of Canterbury. The validity of his ordination, which was not sanctioned by the pope, nor made according to the Roman rite, was at once disputed in numerous Catholic writings, but has also found some Catholic defenders, as Le Courayer. The Confession of Faith which had been drawn up under Edward in forty-two articles was reduced to thirty-nine articles, and in this form it was adopted by a convocation of the clergy at London in 1562, and by Parliament made, in  1571, the rule of faith for all the clergy. According to the Thirty-nine Articles, the Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation; justification is through faith alone, but works acceptable to God are the necessary fruit of this faith; in the Lord's supper there is a communion of the body of Christ, which is spiritually received by faith; and predestination is apprehended only as it is a source of consolation. Supreme power over the Church is vested in the English crown, but it is limited by the statutes. Bishops continued to be the highest ecclesiastical officers and the first barons of the realm. Subscription to the articles was made binding only on the clergy; to the laity freedom of conscience was allowed.

The adoption of the Thirty-nine Articles completed, in the main, the constitution of the Episcopal Church of England. Some parts of the Church government and the liturgy, especially the retaining of sacerdotal vestments, gave great offence to a number of zealous friends of a radical religious reformation who had suffered persecution during the reign of Mary, and, while exiles, had become strongly attached to the principles of strict Calvinism. They demanded a greater purity of the Church (hence their name Puritans), a simple, spiritual form of worship, a strict Church discipline, and a Presbyterian form of government. The Act of Uniformity (1559) threatened all Nonconformists with fines and imprisonment, and their ministers with deposition and banishment. When the provisions of the act began to be enforced, a number of the Non-conformist clergy formed separate congregations in connection with presbyteries (since 1572), and a considerable portion of the clergy and laity of the Established Church sympathized with them. The rupture between the parties was widened in 1592 by an act of Parliament that all who obstinately refused to attend public worship, or led others to do so, should be imprisoned and submit, or after three months be banished; and again in 1595, when the Presbyterians applied the Mosaic Sabbath laws to the Christian Sunday, and when Calvin's doctrines respecting predestination excited animated disputes.

A much more uncompromising opposition than that by the Puritans was made to the Established Church by Robert Brown, who embraced (from 1580) Calvinism in its strictest form, denounced the English Church as a false Church, and demanded that, in accordance with the apostolic example, every congregation should be an independent Church. His adherents, who were variously designated as Brownists, Independents, and Congregationalists, renounced all fellowship with the Church of England, and met with great success, though Brown himself returned to the Church  of England. In 1593 there were about 20,000 Independents in England: those who fled to Holland founded a number of churches there, and from Holland the Pilgrim fathers brought this branch of the English Reformation over to the New World.

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

V. The Presbyterians of Scotland. — The first knowledge of the Reformation begun in continental Europe was brought to Scotland by  several Scotch students of Wittenberg. They tried to circulate Luther's writings, but found the ground not favorable to a reformation, because king James V had intimately allied himself with the clergy for the purpose of curbing the power of the nobility. Stringent measures were adopted against the favorers of the Reformation. The first victim was Patrick Hamilton (March 1, 1528), a youth of royal blood, who, while studying in Germany, had imbibed a love of the Reformation. Two more Reformers were burned in 1534; in 1539, five in Edinburgh and two in Glasgow. Nevertheless, tlie adherents of the Reformation steadily increased in number, especially among the nobles. When James V died, the leader of the reformatory party, James Hamilton, earl of Arran, succeeded in seizing the regency. When the latter saw his political influence endangered by the Reformed earl of Lennox, he was gained over by the widowed queen and by David Beautoun (Beton), cardinal-archbishop of St. Andrew's, to the Catholic side, and persecution began afresh. The Catholic party derived some advantages from the national war against Henry VIII of England, as the latter was looked upon as a patron of reformatory movements; but the burning of George Wishart, one of the theological leaders of the Reformation, rallied the reformatory party anew. Under the guidance of John Knox they began to advance more firmly, and to develop their ecclesiastical affairs more definitely. As both Knox and Wishart had been educated at Geneva, and were firmly addicted to the Reformed Confession, the reformed type of the Reformation now obtained in Scotland a decided and lasting ascendency over the Lutheran.

The Reformed party allied itself with the English government, the Catholics with that of France. The latter sent the young daughter of James V, Mary Stuart, to France for education, where she was subsequently married to king Francis II of France, and imbibed an enthusiastic attachment to the Church of Rome. In 1554 the fanatical dukes of Guise, the brothers of the widowed queen, became regents of Scotland. The French influence was strongly used for the repression of the reformatory party, which, on the other hand, was benefited by the accession to the English throne of Mary, daughter of Henry VIII. Protection was afforded to the English Protestants who had fled on account of their religion, and freedom of worship was again secured by the native friends of the Reformation. John Knox, who in 1546 had had to flee from Scotland, returned in 1555 to strengthen the Reformed faith and to urge on the nobility and the people to an unceasing contest against the idolatries of Rome. Dissatisfied, however, with the feeble support which he found, Knox returned in 1556 to Geneva, in which  city he received from the Scotch bishops the sentence to the stake which had been passed against him. The stirring letters which Knox wrote to Scotland from Geneva led (1557) to the formation of a defensive league of the Protestant nobility — the “Congregation of Christ.” The accession of Elizabeth to the English throne was followed in Scotland by the adoption of new measures against the Reformation, which French troops were to carry into effect. This led to a furious outbreak of the Reformed party. John Knox once more returned, the Covenant of May 31 was signed, a new alliance with England was concluded, and the widowed queen deposed as regent. The iconoclastic devastation of Catholic churches and cloisters began at Perth and rapidly spread over the kingdom.

A civil war which ensued was concluded by the treaty of Edinburgh (1560), which recognised the rights of the Refo)rmed. The Scotch Parliament, whiich met soon after, immediately abolished the papal jurisdiction over Scotland, forbade the mass, and approved an entirely Calvinistic Confession (Confessio Scottica). In the next year (1561) the Presbyterian Church government was set in order in the Book of Discipline. These acts of the Parliament were, however, not sanctioned by the government until 1567, after the overthrow of Mary Stuart, who, notwithstanding her fanatical zeal in behalf of Rome, had been unable since her return from France (1561) to arrest the complete victory of the Reformed party. While the theology of the Scotch Confession was strictly Calvinistic, the episcopal benefices were allowed to continue, as the regents during the minority of James VI, and still more James himself, had a strong personal interest in their preservation. Melville, the successor of Knox, induced the Assembly of 1578 to adopt a strictly Presbyterian Church constitution, which admits no Church office except the four recognised by Calvin — of pastor, doctor, elder, and deacon. The sanction of this Church constitution (the Second Book of Discipline) by Parliament and the youthful king was not obtained until 1592. James was, however, personally averse to Presbyterianism and a strong adherent of an episcopal form of government. He left no means untried, especially after he had united the crown of England with that of Scotland, to force an episcopal form of government upon the Church of Scotland. Charles I went still further than his father, and gave to the Scotch a liturgy which the Presbyterians denouneced as a service to Baal. The union of Scotch Presbyterians with the Puritans and Independents of England led to the overthrow of Charles I.

In 1643 a new league and covenant was adopted, and in 1645 Scotland received the Westminster standards. After the execution of Charles I, the Scotch, from opposition to  Cromwell, proclaimed Charles II, who had signed the covenant, as king. This led, however, to a serious and lasting division among Scotch Presbyterians. Other divisions, from various causes, followed in the course of time, and even at the present time (1879) Scotch Presbyterianism is split up into a large number of divisions. The Presbvterian character of the people has, however, remained unimpaired. Cromwell, who several times defeated the Scotch, did not allow the assembly to meet, but in no other way interfered with the freedom of the Scotch Church. Charles II relapsed into the Stuart tendency to introduce Episcopalianism; but on the expulsion of the Stuarts in 1689, the Church constitution of 1592, and the Westminster Confession were definitely restored. To the adherents of an Episcopalian Church an act of 1712 granted freedom of worship, and in 1792 they received the full enjoyment of civil rights.

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

The vigor of the persecution during the reign of Charles was somewhat mitigated by the mild disposition of the two stadtholders, Margaret of Savoy, and Mary, widowed queen of Hungary, the latter of whom, a sister of the emperor, was even suspected of a secret syrmpathy withi the Reformation; and in many places the execution of the  obnoxious decrees was even prevented by the out-spoken personal inclinations of municipal and provincial authorities. An effort made by Charles V (1550) to establish a regular inquisition, after the pattern of the Spanish, was not successful. Philip II did not shrink from measures of the utmost cruelty to enforce submission to the laws and to the Council of Trent; but, instead of submitting, the people rallied for the defence of their religious and civil liberty. A Calvinistic confession of faith (Confessio Belgica) was in 1562 drawn up by Guido de Bres, and in 1566 it was recognised by a synod of Antwerp as a symbolical book of the Reformed churches of the Netherlands. In the latter year a defensive league, the Conmpromiss, was also concluded by the nobles, which spread with great rapidity. The name of Gueux (Beggars), by which the court at first had ridiculed the confederates, was received by the people as a title of honor, and served as a rallying-point for a great national movement towards freedom. When the stadtholder Margaret of Parma felt unable to curb any longer the rising opposition, the duke of Alba undertook to extinguish the Reformation with fire and sword. In the southern provinces he was successful; but seven of the northern provinces formed, in 1579, the Union of Utrecht, and renounced allegiance to the king of Spain. A long and bloody war of independence followed, which terminated in the establishment of the independent Dutch Republic. In the southern provinces, which remained under the crown of Spain, the Reformation was almost wholly extinguished. The Dutch Republic, though only one of the smaller Protestant states of Europe, soon added to the reputation of the Reformation by the conspicuous position it occupied in regard to literature and art, to civilization and to maritime conquest.

In the inner history of the Reformed churches, the Arminian controversy, SEE ARMINIANISM, and the Synod of Dort (q.v.) — which was attended by delegates of the English Episcopal Church and the churches of Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse, Switzerland, Wetteran, Geneva, Bremen, and Emden — were of considerable importance. The decision of the Synod of Dort led for a time, both in Holland and in the Reformed churches of several other countries, to a complete victory of strict Calvinism over a party which demanded more Biblical simplicity and less rigid conformity with the system of any theologian, even if it be Calvin; but soon strict Calvinism lost more ground in Holland than in any other Reformed Churcli, and rationalism obtained an ascendency so decisive and of so long duration that in the 19th century a numerous party of orthodox members of the National Church separated from the latter and constitilted a Free Reformed Church. The Dutch  Reformed Church has planted large and flourishing offshoots in North America and several countries of South Africa, and thus contributed an important share to the ascendency which Protestantism enjoys in these regions. In Belgium, under the cruel rule of tie Spaniard's, but very few and small Reformed congregations were able to continue their always endangered existence, until, in the 19th century, the reunion of the country with Holland began an aera of greater freedom and of progress, which continued after the erection of Belgium into an independent kingdom. Now Belgium has again a National Reformed Church, which is still one of the smallest Reformed national churches of Europe, but is recognised by the State, enjoys a steady progress, and the outspoken sympathy of many of the foremost statesmen of the country.

VII. The Lutheran Reformation in the Scandinavian Kingdoms. — At the time when Luther began his reformation, Christian II ruled over all the Scandinavian countries — Denmark, Norway, Iceland, and Sweden. He was an unprincipled tyrant, who favored the Reformation in Denmark in order to strip the bishops of their political power, while in Sweden he executed the noblest men under the plea that they were under the papal ban. As early as 1519 he called Martin Reinhard from Wittenberg to Copenhagen into the theological faculty, and in 1521 he issued a decree encouraging the marriage of the priests. When, in 1522, a papal delegate appeared in Denmark, Christian took back his decree on the marriage of the priests. He was, nevertheless, deposed in 1523, and among the grounds of the deposition which the estates brought forward was, that he had infected his wife with the Lutheran heresy, and introduced promoters of this same heresy into the Catholic kingdom of Denmark. Christian was succeeded by his uncle Frederick I, duke of Holstein, who strongly inclined towards the Reformation, but who had, nevertheless, to promise to the estates of Denmark to put down, with persecution, the heresy that was pressing in. In the hereditary duchies of Schleswig and Holstein all violent interference with the great religious struggle was in 1524 forbidden, and the king's well-known sympathy with the Reformation greatly promoted the more rapid diffusion of Luther's doctrines and writings. Tie provincial of the Carmelite order, Paulus Elise, translated part of the Psalms; the New Test., translated by John Michelsen, a companion of the expelled king, Christian II, and printed in Leipsic in 1524, found a large circulation, and in 1525 the reading of the Bible was declared free. The nobility at an assembly at Viborg showed itself favorable; the king declared himself  openly for it in 1526; the Diet of Odense, in 1527, deprived the bishops of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and granted religious liberty to all, and the right of marriage to the clergy until the meeting of a general council. Viborg, in Jutland, Maimij, in Scania, and Copenhagen became important centres of the movement, which now spread with great rapidity over the whole kingdom. At the Diet of Copenhagen in 1530, which was to attempt a reunion of the parties, the Lutheran preachers, with John Jansen (preacher at Copenhagen) at their head, presented a confession of faith in forty-three articles. Though the object for which the diet had been coinvokedt was not attained, the predominance of the Lutherans was now fully decided, and the king openly ranged himself on their side. On the death of Frederick I the bishops used the political ipower which had been left to them for a last attempt to put down the Reformation, but it was of no avail. The new king, Christian III, by energetic and violent measures, soon destroyed the last remnant of the old Church and completed the victory of the Reformation. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he confirmed the freedom of religion. On Aug. 20, 1536, all the bishops were imprisoned. A diet held at Copenhagen decreed that the bishops should thereafter be deprived of all secular power, and that the Church property should be confiscated, and divided among the king, the nobility, and ecclesiastical and charitable institutions. When the imprisoned bishops declared their willingness to renounce their dignities, they were restored to liberty; only Ronnov, bishop of Roeskilde, refused, and died in prison. At the invitation of the king, John Bugenhagen came to Denmark, crowned (1537) the king and the queen, consecrated two evangelical bishops or superintendents, and took a leading part in the framing of a new Church constitution, which was published on Sept. 2, 1537, and sanctioned by the Diet of Odense in 1539. From that time all Denmark has firmly adhered to the Lutheran Church. For many years no other worship was allowed; and, even after the establishment of complete religious liberty in 1848, more than ninety-nine per cent. of the entire population continue to be classed as Lutherans.

On the progress of the Reformation in Norway we are but imperfectly informed. A monk Anthony is mentioned who preached the Gospel in Bergen. The majority of the bishops and the clergy appear to have been opposed to the Reformation, which was almost unknown until the reign of Christian III; then the Danish government began to introduce the Reformation. Olaf Engelbrechtsen, archbishop of Drontheim, soon  abandoned his opposition to the Danish king and fled (1537) with his treasures to the Netherlands, and resistance to the new Church constitution soon ceased. Many of the bishops and clergy, however, left their positions; there was a scarcity of preachers, and the people for a long time showed a marked preference for Catholicism. But when the people had become settled in their new belief they became strongly attached to the Lutheran Church, with which now fully ninety-nine per cent. of the population are connected.

Iceland had become a part of the Danish kingdomn by the Calmar Union of 1397, and the decree of the Danish Diet of 1536, which declared the Evangelical Church as the State religion of Denmark, became also valid for Iceland. For several years the two bishops of the country successfully neutralized the efforts of the Danish government. In 1540 Gifur Einarsson, who had studied in Wittenberg, became bishop of Skalholt, and began the introduction of the Reformation. His successor, Martin Einarsson, worked in the same direction, but was violently opposed by the other bishop, John Aresen, of Holar, who even took him prisoner, and had Gifur's bones dug up and interred in an unconsecrated place. But finally bishop Aresen was overpowered, and in 1550 executed as a rebel. This ended all opposition to the Reformation in Iceland. The entire population, as in Denmark and Norway, has ever since belonged to the Lutheran Church. In Sweden the Reformation was hailed as a useful ally in the struggle for shaking off the yoke of Denmark and re-establishing the national independence.

The bishops and higher clergy were the strongest supporters of Danish rule, and when Gustavus Vasa achieved the freedom of Sweden and was elected king (1523) by the Diet of Strelngnas he was looked upoh by the bishops as a dangerous enemy. The king, who needed part of the immense wealth of the clergy to relieve the people of their taxes, at first endeavored to gain pope Adrian VI's co-operation for a reformation of the Church. When this was found to be useless, he commissioned the brothers Olaf and Lawrence Petersen, who had studied at Wittenberg, to introduce the Lutheran Reformation. The two brothers had returned to Sweden in 1519, gained a number of adherents, the most prominent of whom was the archdeacon Lawrence Andersen, and Olaf's sermons had made a great sensation at the Diet of Strengniis. The king appointed Olaf preacher in Stockholm, Lawrence Petersen professor of theology in Upsala, and Lawrence Andersen his chancellor. In 1526 a public discussion took place under the king's protection at Upsala, and a translation of the New Test. into  Swedish was made by chancellor Andersen. The bishops, however, whose prominent champion was bishop Brask, of Linklping, made a successful resistance to the progress of the Reformation; and the people, though irritated against the power and wealth of the clergy, manifested at the same time a superstitious attachment to the old Church. To bring matters to a crisis, the king offered (1527) at the Diet of Westeras to resign; but the Estates, placed before the alternative of either accepting the king's resignation or of surrendering the Church to his discretion, chose the latter. On account of the very outspoken aversion of the lower classes of the people to a change of religion, the king proceeded, however, with great caution. According to the so-called Western Ordinance the bishops were to give efficient preachers to the congregations, otherwise the king was to see to it. The bishops were to hand in to the king a schedule of their revenues, that he might determine how much should remain to the churches and what was to fall to the crown. The priests, in secular matters. were to be under the jurisdiction of the king; the Gospel was to be read in all the schools; excommunication wvas to be pronounced only after an investigation before a royal court. An assembly of clergy at Orebro in 1529 declared in favor of the Church Reformation, but retained many usages of the old Church, as the Latin language at divine service, the elevation of the host at the eucharist, the prayer for the dead, and the episcopal constitution. In 1531 Lawrence Petersen became archbishop of Upsala, and in 1537 another assembly of the clergy at Orebro provided for a more thorough evangelical purification of divine worship. The continuing aversion of the people to the new order of things was ascribed by the king to a want of energy on the part of the bishops, and he therefore appointed George Normann, a Pomeranian nobleman, superiln tendent of all theiclergy of the kingdom, with a number of custodians and religious councillors as overseers of particular provinces.

This arrangement was received with general disfavor, and led to a number of conspiracies. At the death of the king (1560) the ecclesiastical condition of the kingdom was quite undecided. The oldest son and successor of Gustavus, Eric XIV, removed some more Catholic elements from the new constitntion of the Swedish Church, and gave a hospitable asylum to persecuted Protestants of every creed; the orthodox Lutherans suspected him of an inclination towards Calvinism, which, however. did not gain any ground in Sweden. Eric's brother and successor, John III, was prevailed upon by his Catholic wife, who was a Polish princess, and by the hope of succeeding to the Polish throne, to, attempt the re-establishment of a closer connection with the Church of Rome. The  king was willing to recognise the supremacy of the pope, but demanded a number of concessions for the Swedish Church. The archbishop of Upsala was gained for the plan, a strongly Romanizing liturgy was introduced, but the boldness of the Jesuits incensed clergy and people against the counter- reformation, and the king finally took offence at the refusal of the pope to accept his proposition. The death of the Catholic queen and the king's second marriage with a Lutheran princess put an end to the negotiations with Rome, though the king stubbornly clung to the new liturgy. While John was wavering between Catholicism and Protestantism, his younger brother Charles, who was regent of South Ermeland, was an unflinching protector of the Reformation, and did not hesitate to incur the anger of his royal brother by affording a place of resort to the Lutheran clergy who had been expelled from the royal dominions for their unyielding character. King John was succeeded (1592) by his son Sigismund, who was already king of Poland and had been brought up a Catholic. Popular opinion by this time had undergone a great change, and demanded, prior to the recognition of Sigismund, a guarantee of the Lutheran State Church. An ecclesiastical council at Upsala (1593), which was convened by duke Charles as regent, decreed, even before the arrival of Sigismund, the exclusion of Catholicism from Sweden, and the official authority of the Confession of Augsburg. In 1595 the Diet of Sinderkoping declared the Lutheran Church as the only tolerated State Church. In 1599 duke Charles was appointed administrator, and in 1604 he was elected king. The new king was somewhat inclined to Calvinism, but he confirmed the resolutions of the diets in favor of the exclusive rights of the Lutheran State Church, which since then has retained full control of the kingdom.

VIII. Protestantism in the Austrian States. — In the various states governed by the house of Hapsburg both the Lutheran and the Reformed Reformation spread with great rapidity. Great enthusiasm was awakened by Luther's Reformation in Bohemia. where deep-rooted opposition to Rome still pervaded the masses of the people. Both the Bohemian Brethren and the Calixtines entered into communication with the German Reformer. Though a full union between Luther and the Brethren, who had never returned to the communion with Rome, was not effected, there was a mutual recognition as evangelical Christians; and the Brethren, whose number now increased again rapidly, and who in 1533 handed in their confession of faith to Ferdinand, helped to strengthen the reformatory host in Europe. Among the Calixtines, so large a number adopted the doctrines  of Luther that an assembly of the Estates in 1524 declared in favor of a continuation of the reformation begun by Huss in the way set forth by Luther. At the time of the Smalkald war, a majority of the Bohemians were attached to the Reformation; the Estates denied to king Ferdinand the aid of their troops, and united with the elector. When they had finally to submit, the king gave orders that in future only Catholics and Utraquists should be tolerated in the royal domains, and a large number of the Breth. ren deemed it best to emigrate to Poland and Russia. In the last years of his life Ferdinand showed a greater moderation towards Protestants, and his son Maximilian II was even, by Protestants as well as Catholics. regarded as a secret friend of the Reformation; but he was unable to protect the Protestants of his states against the persecutions instigated by the Jesuits. In 1575 the Calixtines and Brethren united and presented a common confession of faith, and received from Maximilian an oral pledge of recognition. In 1609 the king was forced to give to the adherents of the Confession of 1575 equal rights with the Catholics; but practically the persecutions continued. When the Estates of Bohemia refused to recognise Ferdinand as their king, and elected the Protestant elector of the Palatinate, Frederick V the Thirty Years' War broke out, in the course of which appeared the fatal decree of 1627, that left to the people only the alternative of becoming Catholics or leaving the country. Notwithstanding the rigorous persecution, which lasted for more than a hundred years, several thousand Protestants maintained themselves secretly both in Bohemia and Moravia; but to-day ninety-six per cent. of the Bohemians and ninety-five per cent. of the Moravians are connected with the Church of Rome.

In the southern provinces of Austria the Reformation likewise spread at an early period. Luther's writings were eagerly read in Vienna as early as 1520. In 1528 more than one half the nobility of the archduchy of Austria were evangelical. The Estates demanded freedom of religion in 1542 at Innspruck, in 1548 at Augsburg, and in 1556 at Vienna, and bishop Naunea, of Vienna, intended to resign because the government tolerated the appointment of Lutheran professors at the University of Vienna. Under Maximilian the Estates called the Lutheran theologian David Chytrseus to Vienna to compile a Book of Religions and a Church Agenda, and their use was sanctioned by Maximilian after long reluctance. Lower Austria was at once almost wholly won over to Protestantism; but the numerous and bitter doctrinal controversies of the Protestants made it easy for the Jesuits to  enforce a counter-reformation. Gradually stringent laws demanded here, as in Bohemia, either a return to the Catholic religion or emigration; but how generally the people continued to be secretly attached to Protestantism became apparent when the victorious Hungarians and Transylvanians compelled the government, in 1606, to promise religious toleration. Whole towns at once returned to Protestantism, and in 1610 the emperor Matthias had to recognise the equal rights of the churches. The reviving hopes of Protestantism were, however, cruelly destroyed by the Thirty Years' War, which led to the utter extirpation of the Protestant congregations. In Austria, as in all other countries, the Reformers paid a special attention to the promotion of education; and for the ignorant South Slavic tribes in particular, where Primus Truber displayed a remarkable literary and reformatory activity, the Reformation promised to be the beginning of a national literature and of an aera of civilization. With the suppression of the Reformation, the Slavs relapsed into the utmost ignorance. from which only now an efficient system of State education is gradually extricating them. How thoroughly Protestantism has been eradicated in these provinces, in most of whicli it constituted at one time a majority of the population, may be seen from the fact that at present there are hardly any Protestants in Carinthia and the Tyrol, and that they are only one per cent. of the population in Stvria, two in Upper and Lower Austria, five in Carinthia, and fifteen in Silesia.

The number of Hungarian students at Wittenberg at the time when Luther began his reformation was so great that his reformatory views became at once widely known in Hungary, and found many friends. As early as 1518 several adherents of the Reformation were burned. The diet of 1523 passed a decree that all Lutherans and their patrons should be seized and burned. But the number of Protestants was already considerable: in Hermannstadt they had in 1523 the upper-hand; a new bloody law passed in 1524 remained ineffective, — and in 1525 the five royal cities declared in favor of the Reformation. The civil war which followed the death of king Louis II, who fell in the battle of Mohacs in 1526, was favorable to the progress of Protestantism. Although both rivals for the throne — archduke Ferdinand of Austria and John of Zapolya, voyvode of Transylvania — issued laws of persecution, they were unable to carry them out. The number of influential preach,ers rapidly increased. As the first preacher, Thomas Preussner, of Kasmark (about 1520), is mentioned; among the most distinguished were Matthias Devay (called Lutherus Ungaricus),  Leonhard Stockel, who drew up the Confessio Pentapolitana, which the free cities of Upper Hungary in 1549 presented to the king, and John Honter, who had studied in Basle and worked in his native city, Kronstadt, as a preacher and at a printing-press. In 1529 Hermannstadt expelled all priests and monks, and Kronstadt soon followed this example. The episcopal sees which became vacant after the battle of Mohacs were partly not filled, and partly came into the hands of friends of the Reformation. Several bishops, as Kechery of Veszprim, Thurczo of Neutra, and Andrew Dudith, who had attended the Council of Trent, openly became Protestants; and even the primate of Gran, Nicholas Olah, approved Stockel's Confession of Faith. The widow of king Louis II, to whom Luther wrote a letter and dedicated his translation of the Psalms, appointed an evangelical court preacher. Neither Ferdinand, who by the peace of 1538 was confirmed in the possession of the throne, nor John of Zapolya, who was to retain during his lifetime the royal title, Transylvania, and a portion of Upper Hungary, regarded it as safe to adopt stringent measures against the Protestants. The widow of John, Isabella, who, after John's death, endeavored to retain her husband's possessions, with the aid of the Turks, for her son John Sigismund, favored the Protestants; and in that part of the country which was subject to the Turks the Reformation advanced without any obstruction. Thus the Reformation obtained a decided ascendency in all Hungary and Transylvania.

At one time only three families of magnates were Catholic; the archiepiscopal see of Gral remained vacant for twenty years; the whole Saxon population of Transylvania, at the Synod of Medves (1544), adopted the Confession of Augsburg, which for a long time remained a bond of union for all the Protestants of Hungary and Transylvania. Among the Magyars, however, Calvinism finally obtained the ascendency, and in 1566 all the Hungarian Reformed churches signed the Helvetic Confession. In Transylvania; in 1564, a Lutheran superintendent was appointed for the Saxons, and a Reformed for Magyars and Szeklers. In 1571 religious freedom was also extended to the Unitarians; and from this time Transylvania has always had four religions recognised by the State (religiones receptoe). In Hungary the Jesuits succeeded in arresting the further progress of Protestantism, and in instigating new and bloody persecutions. Repeatedly the Protestant princes of Transylvania, aided by the Hungarian Protestants, compelled the kings by force of arms to confirm anew the religious freedom of Protestantism; but each time these promises were immediately broken. In 1634 the majority of the Hungarian Diet had again become Catholic, and from that  time persecutions naturally became all the more oppressive. Though, in spite of all these persecutions, the Protestants maintained themselves, they constitute at present only a minority of the population — about twenty- three per cent. in Hungary proper, and twenty-four per cent. in Transylvania.

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

The success of the Reformation in these two fiefs encouraged its friends in Poland proper. King Sigismund, who died in 1548, was opposed to Protestantism, but unable to arrest its progress. His son, Sigismund Augustus, favored the Reformation, entered into negotiations with Calvin, and granted religious liberty to the cities of Dantzic, Thorn, and Elbing. Notwithstanding the utmost efforts made by the national Catholic party, with bishop Hosius at its head, the Diet of Petrikow, in 1565, demanded a national council for the express purpose of introducing priestly marriage, the Lord's supper under both kinds, and other reforms. In 1583 an edict of  religious toleration was passed, but in the next year Hosius caused the adoption of the decrees of the Council of Trent by the diet, and in 1565 the Jesuits who were called by him established their first college. The progress of the counter-reformation which now set in was greatly aided by the divisions existing among the Protestants. The Reformed effected a national organization in 1547; the Lutherans in 1565. The Bohemians retained their separate Church constitution, and the Unitarians, who had able leaders in Laelius Socinus, Blandrata, and Occhino, became likewise numerous. In 1570 the Reformed, Lutherans, and Bohemians agreed at the Synod of Sandomir upon a general confession to which all three could subscribe, but which left room for the retention by each Church of its doctrinal peculiarities. This Protestant union proved sufficiently strong to secure in 1573 the adoption of a general religious treaty, which guaranteed equal rights to Catholics and Protestants. A strong reaction against Protestantism began under king Stephen Bathori (1586 to 1587). His successor, Sigismund III, by conferring offices and dignities exclusively upon Catholics, induced many nobles to renounce Protestantism. In 1717 the erection of new Protestant churches was forbidden, and in 1733 the Protestants were excluded from all public offices. The increasing persecution of all non-Catholics led finally to the interference of Prussia and Russia, and to the partition of Poland.

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

1. In Italy the revival of the classical studies and the observation of the corrupt condition of the ruling Church had diffused among the educated and literary classes a widespread contempt not only of the Catholic Church, but of Christianity in general. The friends of a reformation of the Church had. however, organized societies in Rome, Venice, and other cities, and the writings of the German and Swiss Reformers met therefore with a great deal of sympathy in all parts of Italy. One party of Italian reformers, which counted among its members several cardinals, as Contarini and Pole, was averse to a separation from the Church, and hoped for an evangelical regeneration of the old Church. Another party came out in favor of a thorough reformation, first in Ferrara (under the protection of the duchess Renata, a French princess), then in Modena and many other cities. A prominent centre of reformatory movements was subsequently in the city of Naples, where the Spanish nobleman Juan Valdez displayed a remarkable activity, and where two of the greatest preachers of Italy — Bernardino Occhino, the general of the Capuchins, and the learned  Augustinian Peter Martyr Vermigli — were gained for the Reformation. Translations of the principal writings of German and Swiss Reformers, mostly under assumed names, found a wide circulation, and the Italian reformers themselves published a large number of writings, the most celebrated of which is the work entitled On the Benefit of Christ. Under Paul III the evangelical Catholics, like Contarini and his friends, had for a time a leading influence upon the government of the Church; but in 1542 a decided reaction began when the pope, by the advice of cardinal Caraffa, who had formerly been a friend of Contarini, appointed an inquisition for the suppression of Protestantism. Many of the leading friends of the Reformation fled to foreign countries; among them Occhino,Vermigli, Vergerio (bishop of Capo d' Istria), and Caraccioli, a nephew of cardinal Caraffa. When Caraffa became pope, under the name of Paul IV, the persecution extended also to the Catholics of evangelical sentiments, including a number of cardinals and bishops. Under Paul V an Index Librorum Prohibitorum led to the suppression of all literature friendly to Protestantism. Protestantism in Italy, as in other countries, had been divided into Lutheranism and Calvinism, with a prevailing inclination to the latter; and Anti-Trinitarian followers of Servetus had likewise become numerous, although they had to keep their opinions secret. The division of the Protestants weakened their power of resistance, and before the end of the century the Inquisition had destroyed all vestiges of Protestant communities. Among the distinguished martyrs of the Reformation were Carnesecchi and Palearius; two Waldensian congregations in Calabria were rooted out in a terrible massacre.

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

3. France, during the Middle Ages, had often taken a leading part in opposing the claims of the papacy, and in asserting the superiority of  general councils over the pope; but it had shown no sympathy with a thorough reform of doctrine. When Luther's views became known in France, they were condemned (1521) by the Sorbonne. One of the French bishops, Guillaume Brionnet, took, however, an active interest in the reformation of the Church. He called to his aid men like Lefevre, Farel (who was at that time regent of the college of cardinal Le Moine at Paris), Roussel, and others; but when the charge of heresy was raised against him, he cut loose from his Reformed friends, and in 1523 pronounced against Luther. When Parliament was appealed to for the suppression of Protestantism, it lent at once its arm to the clergy for bloody persecution. In 1524 Jean le Clerc, of Meaux, the first martyr of the Reformation, was executed in Metz. In 1529 a great sensation wuas aroused by the hanging and burning of Louis de Berquin, a royal councillor and zealous adherent of the Reformation, whose writings and translations had previously (1523) been condemned by the Sorbonne. Francis I was an admirer of Erasmus, and by nature averse to any decisive attitude in religious affairs: he was, moreover, quick in detecting the advantages which an alliance between the Protestant princes of Germany and the ruler of France against the Catholic emperor of Germany might have for him and for France. On the other hand, he was afraid of disturbing the religious unity of France, and desirous of securing the pope's aid in his war against the German emperor. Thus his course in the progress of the religious controversies was wavering and undecided. At his court, and even in his family, both parties were represented, the chief patron of the Reformation being his sister Margaret, queen of Navarre. While the persecution of the Lutherans went forward, and, in January, 1535, several of the Reformed were executed in Paris in a barbarous way, Francis assured the Protestant princes of Germany that he was really in favor of a religious reformation, and that only some fanatics were punished in France. Of considerable interest are the negotiations which took place between Francis and Melancthon. The king became acquainted with Melancthon in consequence of a memorial which the latter addressed in 1531 to Guillaume Bellay, and in which he explained the essential points of the Reformation, and how they might be reconciled with the Catholic doctrine. Melancthon's Loci Communes pleased the king much. In 1535 John Sturm, then professor in Paris, invited Melancthon to France. Melancthon answered cordially, and was then formally invited by the king himself, by cardinal Bellay, Sturm, and Guillaume Bellay. Luther was in favor of accepting the invitation, but the elector sharply refused to give him permission. Melancthon therefore did not go, but in August of the  same year his Consiliumn, with many alterations, was presented to the Sorbonne for their decision, in the form of a confession of faith, and it was declared by them to be thoroughly objectionable. The king, nevertheless, announced in December to the Protestant princes assembled at Smalkald that he had formed a favorable opinion of the articles of Melancthon. Soon, however, the king, chiefly through the influence of cardinal Tournon, ceased to manifest any sympathy with the cause of the Reformation. With it the connection of Frenchmen with the Lutheran Reformation seems to have come to an end, until, at a later period, the conquest of German territories gave to France a considerable number of Lutheran congregations.

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

The main reformatory movement of France, which has played a conspicuous part in its ecclesiastical as well as political history, attaches itself to the name of John Calvin. He was a native of France, and became thoroughly imbued with reformatory ideas while studying ‘at Bourges and Paris. He had to flee in 1533, spent a short time at the court of the queen of Navarre, returned to Paris, but had to flee again to Switzerland in 1534, when he wrote his Institutes, in the preface of which he exposes the injustice of the king. From Basle he went to Geneva, where, with the exception of a few years which he spent in Strasburg, which was then a German city, he remained until the end of his life, as the author and recognised leader of one of the two great divisions of the Reformation of  the 16th century. Though he was not allowed to return to France, Geneva became the hearth and home from which the Reformation in France itself was constantly receiving new food. In the latter years of the reign of Francis the persecution of the Reformed increased in severity; and especially the Waldenses in Merindol and Cabrieres, in Provence, suffered from a most horrible persecution, which in 1545 ended in a general massacre. Notwithstanding the persecution, the number of the Reformed grew steadily; it was very large even at the death of Francis I, in 1547, and rapidly increased during the reign of Henry II. Regular congregations began to be formed in the large cities in 1555, and in 1559 a general synod held at Paris agreed upon a confession of faith and a Church order. (For the further history of the Reformed Church, SEE FRANCE.)

The subsequent history of the Reformed, to whom soon the name of Huguenots was generally applied, is closely connected with the political history of France. They were forced in self-defence to act no less as a political than an ecclesiastical party. While the Catholics adhered to the fanatical Guises, the Protestants looked for protection to the Bourbons. In 1570 they received in the Peace of St. Germain equal rights, and several fortresses' as a guarantee of the peace; but two years later (1572), St. Bartholomew's Eve was the beginning of the most terrible ordeal through which they passed in their entire history, more than 30,000 of them being massacred during one month. King Henry III was driven by the arrogance of the Guises into the ranks of the Huguenots, and was soon after assassinated by the Dominican Clement. Then the first Protestant, Henry of Navarre, ascended the French throne. To save the Protestant cause, he submitted externally to the Catholic Church; but to his former coreligionists he preserved his sympathy and secured equal rights in the Edict of Nantes. During the reigns of the following kings the Huguenots again passed through a series of severe persecutions: under Louis XIV the Edict of Nantes was revoked, and a large number of families compelled to emigrate, and to settle in foreign countries. The French Revolution at last began for them the sera of religious freedom.

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

While the large majority of the millions which in the 16th century rose up against and separated from the Church of Rome rallied around three large centres, it was but natural that many, in the search of a pure Christianity, arrived at different results. Some of these dissenters never succeeded in  forming sects; others became numerous, and have, in the course of time, assumed large dimensions. To the latter class belong the Baptists, the Anti- Trinitarians, the Friends, and many others. All of these have long had to. struggle for toleration, because Protestant governments united with the Catholic in persecuting and suppressing them. More recently, however, the principle of religious liberty has gradually come to be recognised in nearly all Christian countries, and enabled individuals as well as sects to carry out the great principles which lay at the bottom of the Reformation of the 16th century to the best of their understanding, and to worship God according to the dictates of their own conscience. About the middle of the present century (1845), an attempt was made to unite in one association, called the Evangelical Alliance, Christians belonging to all denominations collectively called evangelical, and to represent, on a larger scale than had ever been attempted before, the unity of all these churches in the more important articles of faith, notwithstanding their separation by external organization. A list of nine articles was drawn up, to which, it was thought, all Christians wishing to be regarded as evangelical might be expected to assent. In the list of these articles are included the inspiration of the Bible, the Trinity, the utter depravity of human nature, justification by faith alone, the eternal blessedness of the righteous and the eternal punishment of the wicked, the divine institution of the Christian ministry. According to this programme, it could and did become a rallying-point for Lutherans, Reformed, and Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Moravians, the evangelical or Low-Church party of the Anglican churches, and a number of minor denominations. It was objected to by the so-called high and strict Church parties among Anglicans and Lutherans, by Unitarians and Universalists, by the Friends, by the Annihilationists, and by all Anti- Trinitarians and Rationalists.

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

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

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

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

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

XIV. Literature. — A great many works which are sources for the history of the Reformation have been mentioned in the articles on the Reformers and on particular churches. The following list contains works which more specially treat of the history of the Reformation: Sleidani De Statu Religionis et Reipublicoe, Carolo V Ceosare, Commentarii (Strasburg, 1555; Engl. transl. by Bohun, Lond. 1689); Sculteti Annalium Evangelii passim per Europam Decimo Sexto Salutis Partce Sceculo Renovati Decas let II [embracing the time from 1516 to 1536] (Heidelb. 1618); Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation (Lond. 1679 sq.); Gerdes, Introductio in Hist. Evangelii Sec. XVI passim per Europanum Renovati (Groning. 1744-52, tom. iv); Hagelbach, Vorlesungen uber das Wesen undd Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland und der Schweiz (Leips. 1834-43, 6 vols.; Engl. transl. by Evelina Moore, Edinb. 1878 sq.); Clausen, Populare Vortraye uber die Reormation (Leips. 1837); D'Aubigne, Histoire de la Reformation au XVIieme Siecle (Paris, 1835-53, 5 vols.; Engl. transl. N. Y. 1843 sq.); and the supplementary Histoire de la Reformation au temps de Calvin (Paris, 1862 sq. 8 vols.; Engl. transl. N.Y. 1862-79); Beansobre, Hist. de la Reform. ‘(1785); Neudecker, Gesch. der Reform. (Leips. 1843), and Gesch. des Protest. (ibid. 1844, 2 vols.); Dillinger, Die Reform. (1846- 48, 3 vols.); Gaillard, Hist. of the Reform. (N.Y. 1847); Guericke, Gesch.  der Reform.(Berlin, 1855); Stebbing, Hist. of the Reform. (Lond. 1850); Waddington, Hist. of the Reform, (ibid. 1841); Hardwick, Hist. of the Ch. during the Reform. (Camb. 1856); Soames, Hist. of the Reform. (Lond. 1826); Fisher, Hist. of the Reform. (N. Y. 1873). On the doctrinal history of the Reformed churches, see Dorner, Gesch. der Prot. Theologie (1867, Engl. transl. 1871); and Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (N. Y. 1877, 3 vols.). (A. J. S.)

## Reformation Rights[[@Headword:Reformation Rights]]

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

## Reformation, Festival Of The[[@Headword:Reformation, Festival Of The]]

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

## Reformed (Dutch) Church[[@Headword:Reformed (Dutch) Church]]

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

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

II. Reformed Church in Holland. — The Reformed Church of the Netherlands was a legitimate outgrowth from the great Reformation of the 16th century. The conflict for civil and religious liberty in the Low Countries was preceded by the labors of those “Reformers before the Reformation,” Wessel Gansevoort and Rudolph Agricola. Both of these illustrious scholars and teachers were natives of Groningen. They were students of the Bible, who, fifty years before Martin Luther, came to a clear knowledge of the great doctrines of the faith with which he shook the world. But it was not until many years after he had taken his position that he saw the writings of Gansevoort, and then he felt constrained to make the fact public, lest his enemies should use their agreement of views to his own disadvantage. Gansevoort was an eminent teacher at Heidelberg, Louvain, Paris, Rome, and at last, as head of a celebrated school, in his native Groningen, where he died in 1489. Agricola was professor in the University of Heidelberg, and was noted for his classical and scientific attainments, and especially for his skill in the use of the Greek New Test. The labors of these great and good men mightily prepared the Way for the civil and religious conflict which followed under Charles V and his son Philip II of Spain. Evangelical truth struck its roots deep down into the hearts of the people. Confessors and martyrs for Christ were never wanting for the persecutions of the government and the Inquisition.

The poor people called their churches “the Churches of the Netherlands under the Cross.” They worshipped privately for many years, in scattered little assemblies, until they crystallized into a regular ecclesiastical organization. The ban of the empire and the curse of the Romish Church could not keep down the rising spirit of the heroic believers in Christ alid liberty. Every new act of tyranny fanned the sacred flame. Popular field-preachers, like Herman Strijker and Jan Arentsen, gathered thousands of people beneath the open sky to listen to their powerful eloquence. The whole country was stirred to its depths. The hymns of Beza and Clement Marot, translated from the French, rang out the pious enthusiasm of the multitudes. Babes were brought for baptism, and alms were collected for the poor. At length three pastors were set apart to the ministry of the Church in Amsterdam, deacons and deaconesses were appointed to distribute alms to the needy saints, and churches were organized. In 1563 the Synod of Antwerp was held, which adopted the Belgic Confession, and laid the foundations of that  noble Church to which subsequent synods only gave more permanent shape. Her scholars and theologians, her schools and universities, her pure faith and holy living, her active zeal and martyr spirit, gave the Reformed Church of Holland the leading position among the sister churches of the Continent. Her catholic feeling and religious liberty made her a refuge for the persecuted of other lands. The Waldenses and the Huguenots, the Scotch Covenanters and the English Puritans, found a welcome at her altars; and John Robinson and the voyagers of the Mayflower learned in Holland some of the best lessons which they brought with them to Plymouth Rock.

III. History of the Reformed Church in America. —

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

The first minister of the Gospel who came to this country from Holland was the Rev. Jonas Michaelius, a graduate of the University of Leyden, and afterwards a missionary in San Salvador and Guinea. He preached in New Amsterdam from 1628 to 1633, and then returned to Holland. SEE MICHAELIUS. In the spring of the same year his successor, the Rev. Everardus Bogardus, arrived, bringing with him the first schoolmaster, Adam Roelandsen, who organized the parochial school of the Collegiate  Reformed Dutch Church. This school is still in existence, without a break in its, succession of nearly two hundred and fifty years. It is sustained by the Collegiate Church, and has always been “an instrument of much good to the Church and to the community.” A history of it has been published in a small volume by its present principal, Mr. Dunshee. This intimate connection of the Church and the school wmas characteristic of the early Reformed churches, and it antedates the claim of priority made for the New England Puritans by several years. The upper room in Francis Molemaker's horse-mill was relinquished as a place of worship upon the arrival of dominie Bogardus in 1633, and a plain, frail wooden church- building and a parsonage were erected near what is now Old Slip, on the East River.

In 1642, at the suggestion of the famous navigator David Petersen de Vries, funds were raised for the erection of a stone edifice within the fort (now the Battery), where the people worshipped until the church was finished in Garden Street in 1693. A church was planted in the colony of Rensellaerswvck (Albany) under the patronage of Kilian van Rensellaer, a pearl-merchant from Amsterdam, who founded a colony upon the large tract of land of which he was the first patron. In 1642 he secured the services of the Rev. Johannes Megapolensis, whose call states that “By the state of navigation in the East and West Indies a door is opened through the special providence of God, also in the New Netherlands, for the preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ for the salvation of men, as good fruits have been already witnessed there through God's mercy.” He was also the first Protestant missionary to the Indians in this country, preceding the labors of John Eliot near Boston by three or four years. SEE MEGAPOLENSIS. His successors Dellius and Lydius did the same good work.

2. First Period. — “The Dutch rule in Manhattan lasted fifty years from the establishment of the first tradingstation. The Church had been organized about thirty years. The city of New Amsterdam, at the date of the surrender, contained only 1500 inhabitants; and there were but five Reformed churches in the whole province — New York, Albany, Flatbush and Flatlands, Esopus (or Kingston), and Breuckelen (Brooklyn). There were six ministers the two Megapolenses, Drisius, Schaats, Polhemus, and Blom.” They were men of thorough education, and, as far as we can learn, diligenit in the ministry. There were also a church at Bergen, which was the first of any denomination in New Jersey organized in 1660, and one at New Amstel, Del., which subsequently dropped out of the connection. The  Hollanders numbered, at the timre of the surrender, about 10,000 souls. This first period of the Church was necessarily one of very small beginnings. The churches were planted in the wilderness. They encountered all the difficulties of new colonies — surrounded by savage tribes, separated by long distances from each other, and dependent entirely upon Holland for their clergy and school-teachers. Civil affairs were sometimes unhappily mixed up with religious interests, and the growth was slow indeed.

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

In 1709 a large body of Germans from the Palatinate, fleeing from religious persecution, settled upon Livingston Manor, in Schoharie County, N. Y., and in the valley of the Mohawk. Among them were many Swiss, who sought the same shelter in the New World. Unable to obtain help from the Church in their fatherland, and living beside their Dutch neighbors, they naturally sought and received assistance from them. The Classis of Amsterdam, at the request of the Church of the Palatinate, agreed to aid the Germans upon condition that they would adhere to the Heidelberg Catechism, the Palatinate Confession of Faith, the Canons of the Synod of Dort, and the Rules of Church Government of Dort. Ministers were sent over. A coetus or American Classis was formed by the direction and under the jurisdiction of the Synod of Holland, which charged the Classis of Amsterdam with the supervision of the affairs of the German Church in America, which then extended among the German settlements in Pennsylvania, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, New Jersey, and New York. This relation subsisted forty-six years, until 1793, when the coetus asserted its independence of the Church in Holland. SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH IN AMERICA.

In Schoharie and Columbia counties, and in the valley of the Mohawk, the German and Hollandish elements have, to a great degree, united in the Reformed churches. 4. The third period in this history dates from the first effort of the Dutch churches to secure an independent organization — 1737 to 1792. Their entire dependence upon the Church in Holland for ministers, their growth in numbers and their distance from the mother country, the necessities of a new country, and the lack of facilities for educating their clergy, the delays, expense, and anxieties occasioned by the necessity of sending young men to Holland for training and ordination, and other good reasons growing out of their position and the ecclesiastical restrictions of the Classis of Amsterdam, led to the organization of a coetus, or ecclesiastical association, in New York in 1737. A plan was carefully framed, submitted to the churches, and sent to Holland for approval by the classis. This plan embraced a yearly meeting of clerical and lay delegates for the transaction of ecclesiastical business only, to promote the welfare of the churches, and in entire subordination to the Classis of Amsterdam. But nine years passed away before that body gave its sanction. The first meeting of the coetus  was held in September, 1747, and the first German coetus in the same month.

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

In 1766 John H, Livingston, then a young man, arrived in Holland to study for the ministry at the Unieversity of Utrecht. His heart was filled with anxiety for the churches at home, whose dissensions he had witnessed and deplored. With great wisdom he embraced every opportunity to spread information and take counsel with leading men in Holland respecting the state of things in America. He prepared a plan of union, secured the assent of the ecclesiastical authorities, and returned to New York as pastor of the Church in that city, in 1770, with his olive-branch. In October, 1771, a convention was held in New York, at which there were present twenty-two ministers and twenty-five elders, from thirty-four churches. The plan of  union was presented by Dr. Livingston, discussed in a friendly manner, with a sincere desire for peace, ratified by that body, and transmitted to Holland for final approval by the Classis of Amsterdam. In 1772 their favorable answer was received, dated Jan. 14 in that year. (A translation is printed in full in Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 11, 12.) This practically ended the long strife. A general synod was organized, with five classes. The power of licensing and ordaining ministers was granted to the new and independent body, and the way was thus peacefully prepared for the formal and final organization. The articles of union were only intended as a temporary scaffolding for the erection of a more permanent ecclesiastical structure. In 1788 the doctrinal symbols of the Church, and the articles of Church government used in Holland, were translated by a committee of the synod. In 1792 the whole work was reviewed by the synod, adapted to the wants of the Church in this land, and adopted as the constitution of the Reformed Dutch Church. At this time there were one hundred and thirty churches and fifty ministers. During the whole period of strife ninety new churches were organized, and eighty-eight ministers began their labors among them. Before the first attempts at independent organization, for forty years prior to 1730, the average growth in ministers and churches was only seven of each per decade. During the next sixty years, the average per decade arose to seventeen. These facts tell the story of the differing policies of the coetus and conferentie.

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

5. Causes of Slow Growth. — It has often been a matter of surprise to persons unacquainted with these and other facts that this oldest Presbyterian Church organization in this country has been of such slow growth. The reasons are self-evident. The Dutch rule in New Amsterdam lasted only about thirty years; and when it ceased, the population of the city was but 1500. The English Episcopal Church rose almost to the power of a state establishment. “The Presbyterians of Ireland and Scotland, for a hundred and twenty-five years, were practically excluded by the continued use of the Dutch language from the Church assemblies of the Reformed, and they established their own churches nearly half a century before an  English word was heard in a Dutch church.” The introduction of English preaching by the Rev. Dr. Laidlie, who was called by the Church of New York for this purpose, was the result of a long strife, and the commencement of a longer struggle against the use of this restrictive tongue. The damage to the Church from this cause alone was almost incalculable, keeping multitudes away from its sanctuaries, and driving many of the younger families into the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. The first English sermon was preached in the church in New York in 1764 by Dr. Laidlie. The dependence of the American churches upon the mother Church in Holland for more than a hundred and fifty years also produced its natural results in dwarfing their growth and diminishing their strength. They were mere attachments to a foreign body, without ecclesiastical organization on the spot, save by a consistory, with no powers of legislation, licensure, or ordination, with no college or theological seminary to supply a new ministry, distracted by internal troubles, and bound hand and foot by Old-World alliances, prejudices, and powers. The only wonder is that the Reformed Church maintained its separate existence, and that it achieved its independence at last. After the articles of union were adopted in 1772, the Revolutionary War added greatly to the embarrassments of the Church. Many ministers were obliged to leave their flocks for years. Church edifices were sometimes used for British cavalry stables and riding- schools, and military prisons; and the fairest portions of the goodly heritage were occupied by the opposing armies. After peace was declared, the Church grew slowly but surely, and laid the foundations of her educational and benevolent institutions upon a broad and enduring basis. The tenacity of the Dutch character is abundantly illustrated in the extreme difficulty with which this Church has been induced to break off its old traditional relationships and attachments to its foreign origin. It never has yielded one of them until it was compelled to do so by long conflicts.

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

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

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

“1. Ministers of the Word. “

2. Teachers of theology. “

3. Elders. “

4. Deacons.”

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

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

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

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

2. Teachers of theology, or professors in the theological seminary, are to be appointed only by the General Synod-the office is for life, or during good behavior” and to that synod a professor of theology shall always be amenable for his doctrine, mode of teaching, and moral conduct.” He is also required to sign a constitutional formula expressing fidelity to the Church and her theological standards, etc. And, to complete the independence and personal responsibility of the professor to the General Synod, it is:provided (art. 3:§ 4), that “no professor, while in office, shall have the pastoral charge of any congregation, or be a member of any ecclesiastical assembly or judicatory; but, as a minister of the Gospel, may  preach and, administer, or assist ii administering, the sacraments in any congregation, with the consent of the minister or consistory.” Six months' notice of intention to resign his office must be sent to the president of the General Synod before it can be accepted by that body. Most of these provisions respecting teachers of theology are peculiar to the Reformed Church. Their practical effect has been excellent.

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

VI. Judicatories. — These are:

1. The Consistory.

2. The Classis.

3. The Particular Synod.

4. The General Synod.

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

In another important respect the consistory of the Reformed Church differs from the session of the Presbyterian Church. In the latter the elders are chosen for life, and thus make a permanent body of officers. In the Reformed Church elders and deacons are elected by the male communicants for two years. The term of one half of the consistory expires each year; they are eligible for immediate re-election if it is deemed desirable to retain their services, and this often occurs. This principle of  rotation in office has its obvious and great advantages, harmonizing with our republican system of government in Church and State, bringing gradually into active service all the best available talent ot each congregation, and permitting such changes as may be demanded for the welfare of the Church and congregation without giving needless offence to any who may pass out of office.

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

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

1. Are the doctrines of the Gospel preached in your congregation in their purity, agreeably to the Word of God, the Confession of Faith, and the Catechisms of our Church?

2. Is the Heidelberg Catechism regularly explained, agreeably to the Constitution of the Reformed Church?

3. Are the catechising of the childlren and the instruction of the youth faitihfully attended to?

4. Is family visitation faithfully performed?

5. Is the 5th section, 2d article, 2d chapter of the Constitution of our Church (which relates to oversight and discipline of Church members) carefully obeyed?

6. Is the temporal contract between ministers and people fulfilled in your congregation?

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

3. The Particular Synod dates back to the year 1794. Previous to that time the only ecclesiastical bodies were the consistory, classis, and synod, or, as they were denominated. the Particular and General bodies. These met annually. The first synodal assembly was only provisional; it possessed and exercised the right to examine students of theology for licensure until the year 1800. This function was afterwards devolved upon the classes alone. The Particular Synod is a court of appeal in judicial cases which are carried up from the classes. It has power to form new classes, to transfer congregations from one classis to another, and has a general supervisory power over its classes. It also confirms the nominations of the classes for delegates to the General Synod. It meets annually, and is composed of four ministers and four elders from each classis. The four Particular svnods now existing are those of New York, organized in 1800, composed of nine classes; Albany, organized in 1800. composed of ten classes; Chicago, organized in 1856, composed of five classes; New Brunswick, organized in 1869, composed of nine classes. At the session of the General Synod held in 1869 the Particular synods were reorganized upon the basis of a plan which is intended to increase their previously limited powers, and to bring  them into more systematic and direct contact with the spiritual interests and benevolent agencies of the Church. See Minutes of Gen. Synod, 1869, p. 626, 633.

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

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

VII. Usages. —

1. Mode of Worship. — All the Reformed churches of the Continent adopted liturgies for the observance of public worship, including the offices for the administration of sacraments, the ordination of ministers, elders, and deacons, and for the infliction of discipline in excommunication, etc. The Scottish Reformer John Knox prepared a liturgy for the Church of Scotland which was used for some time, but which was ultimately swept away by the same anti-ritualistic storm in which Puritans and Presbyterians were driven to the opposite extreme of bold simplicity in public worship. The liturgy of the Reformed Church of Holland — with the omission only of a prayer in the marriage service and an article on the consolation of the sick — is accurately given in the English translation, which is now in use in the Reformed Church of America. It is “precisely what it was in 1619, and substantially as when first adopted in 1568 by the Synod of Wesel.” Like all the Reformed liturgies, it is based on that of John Calvin. But its shape was given chiefly by John Alasco, the popular pastor of the Reformed Church in London, which numbered, under his ministry, over three thousand members, who were refugees from persecution in their native land. This Church still exists. Alasco also prepared a new liturgy, using his old one and that of Strasburg, a translation of which, from the French, was published by Pollanus, Calvin's successor, who founded a Church at Glastonbury, England. It was written in Latin, and then, in 1551. translated into Dutch by John Uytenhove, an elder of the Church in London. The liturgy of the Reformed Church in the Netherlands was prepared by Peter Dathenus, an eminent minister, who, when driven from Holland by persecution, settled with some of his fellow-exiles in the Palatinate at Frankenthal, near Heidelberg. He first translated the Heidelberg Catechism into the Holland language, and also the psalms of Beza and Marot from  their French originals. He dedicated the volume containing these symbols (psalms, catechism, and liturgy) “to all the churches and ministers of Jesus Christ sitting and mourning under the tyranny of antichrist.” Subsequently, the “Form for Adult Baptism,” and the “Consolation of the Sick and Dying,” and the “Compendium of the Christian Religion,” a condensation of the Heidelberg Catechism — which was in place of another brief catechism for persons who intended to unite with the Church, were issued. In 1574 the Synod of Dordrecht directed the liturgy to be used in all the churches. For a full account see Eutaxia, or the Presbyterian Liturgies, ch. xi; and Prof. Demarest's History and Ecclesiastical Characteristics of the Ref. Ch. ch. 8.

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

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

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

VIII. Institutions. —

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

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

The grammar-school, which is as old as the college, occupies a large and appropriate building opposite the college grounds. The college faculty embraces a president, vice-president, eleven professors, and an assistant professor. The buildings include the main college edifice; Van Nest Hall, in which are the rooms of the literary societies and lecture-rooms; Geological Hall, which contains an armory, the museum of geology, mineralogy, and natural history, and the chemical laboratory; the Kirkpatrick Chapel, a large and handsome Gothic building erected in 1873, in which also is the library of the college; the Schenck  Observatory; and the president's house. There are no dormitories belonging to the college. The library is of great value, although not adequate to the wants of the institution. The museum is extensive and contains many rare curiosities and specimens. Valuable prizes are given at each commencement to successful competitors in oratory, composition, classics, mathematics, mineralogy, spelling, English grammar, modern history, mental and moral philosophy, and for the best essay on Christian missions.

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

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

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

The building was speedily erected — three stories in height, 120 feet long — and contains a small chapel, double rooms for sleeping and study purposes, to accommodate about sixty students; lecture-rooms for the professors, rector's residence, and refectory. It  stands in the midst of seven acres of land, which were also donated for the purpose by Messrs. James Neilson, David Bishop, and Charles P. Dayton, and Francis and Wessell Wessells. The site is commanding. Three professors' houses have been built upon it, and another one, directly opposite, has been bought and presented to the General Synod by Messrs. James Suydam and Gardner A. Sage, of New York, at a cost of $18,000. Mrs. Hertzog also left by will $10,000 to be invested, the interest of which is to keep the hall in repair. By the munificence of its friends the building has been thoroughly refitted and furnished in the best manner to make it a pleasant Christian home for the students. In 1873 the James Suydam Hall was opened for use. This large, substantial, and costly building, containing a chapel, lecturerooms, museum, and gymnasium, was the gift of the late James Suydam of New York, who laid its cornerstone but did not live to see it completed. Mr. Suydam also endowed the professorship of didactic and polemic theology which bears his name, in the sum of $60,000; and these, with various gifts and legacies to the theological seminary and other specific Church purposes, amount to more than $250,000. This was in addition to other bequests to the American Bible and Tract societies; and the seminary and the Bible-Society were also made his equal residuary legatees. A bronze statue of Mr. Suydam, somewhat larger than life size, the gift of friends, was unveiled on the day of dedication of the hall. The Gardner A. Sage library building is the gift of the generous founder whose name it bears, and who superintended its erection and has provided for its maintenance and support. It is perfectly fire-proof, and combines every modern arrangement for heating, ventilation, light, and security from dust and other annoyances. It has room for about 100,000 volumes. The library at present numbers over 30,000 volumes, to which additions have been constantlv made by donations, and principally from a fund of $53,763, of which a balance of about $15,000 remains unexpended. The selection of books is confided to a competent committee of the General Synod, in co- operation with the theological professors. The library has a very complete Biblical critical apparatus, including facsimiles of the Sinaitic, Vatican, and other MSS.; the Acta Sanctorum (Bollandist), 60 vols.; Migne's Patrology, 320 vols., embracing all the fathers, Greek and Latin; and many of the best and rarest editions of standard works imported from Europe.

The permanent endowment of the seminary, which is still in progress, now amounts to over $200,000, besides the real property held for its uses. There are four professors, and thirty-two students now in its classes, while  the hall is filled with other young men of the college and preparatory school who are on their way to the ministry. The course of instruction is thorough, and embraces the usual departments of theological study in similar institutions, with the addition of those subjects which are specially related to the Reformed Church, such as the Confession of Faith, Canons of Dort, Heidelberg Catechism, the ecclesiastical polity, and the constitutional law of the denomination. The whole number of graduates from its establishment in 1810 to 1879 is 609. The government of the seminary is vested in the faculty and in a Board of Superintendents, which is chosen by the General Synod and meets annually. A standing committee of the synod has the charge of its temporal affairs.

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

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

4. Foreign Missions. — From her earliest days, her ministers gave special care to the evangelization of the heathen Indians. During the existence of the United Foreign Missionary Society, she statedly contributed to its funds; and when that organization was dissolved, and its stations transferred to the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, she continued her efforts in connection with it. In 1832 the General Synod appointed its own Board of Foreign Missions, proposing to organize missions of their own Church to be conducted through the medium of its prudential committee. In 1836 the first band of missionaries went out to seek a settlement in Northern India, but subsequently located in the island of Borneo. After working a long while harmoniously in this relation, prompted by a desire to accomplish the utmost that might be gained by an  independent denominational effort, it was thought most desirable to sever the connection existing between their society and that of the American Board. This was accordingly done in 1858. The number of members is twenty-four — one half being laymen, and one third elected annually by the General Synod. A number of missionaries at several times, under the auspices of the board, have been sent out to China, India, and Japan. Chief among the servants of the Church in the foreign field were the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of the Madras Mission; the Rev. David Abeel, D.D., the first American missionary to China; and the Rev. Dr. Cornelius V. A. Van Dyck, the translator of the Arabic Bible, who, although in the employ of the American Board of Conmmissioners for Foreign Missions, yet retains his relation to the Reformed Church, from which he went out as a missionary physician. The Mission to the Dyaks in Borneo was given up in 1849, some of the missionaries having been transferred to Amoy in China, and the others returned to America.

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

The Arcot Mission in India was organized in 1854, being composed of the sons of the celebrated missionary the Rev. John Scudder, M.D., of Madras, with their families. The Classis of Arcot was formed in 1854, with the clerical missionaries and three native elders. According to the report of 1877, the classis is composed of twenty churches, with a membership of 1755 communicants. With them are connected 86 stations and out-stations, the whole number of regular attendants upon the means of grace being 4398. Contributions for religious and benevolent purposes in 1889  amounted to $756 in gold. There are 8 missionaries and 6 assistants in this important field of labor, with 2 native pastors and 21 catechists, 26 Bible- readers, 28 teachers, and 19 colpor teurs. There are 4 seminaries for males and females, a preparandi school for training native catechists and pastors, and 97 day-schools with 2503 scholars. The missionaries and native helpers make frequent tours into the surrounding country. The statistics of this work for 1889 were, 18,006 sermons preached to 395,979 hearers, and 14,000 books and tracts dis tributed. The press is used freely to print the Scriptures, catechisms, and practical, religious, and educational works. The hospital and medical dispensary at Arcot has received the highest official praise from lord Napier, the governor-general, and an increased allowance from the government. The number of patients treated in 1889 was 6358, an average of 17 per day. A medical class of young natives is connected with it. The Gospel is daily preached to all comers, and portions of the Scriptures, tracts, and good books are offered to all who can read. A simple and brief story of Christ's love to fallen man is carried away by every patient on the printed ticket given: to him on his first application, and which he must show at each subsequent visit.

The Japan Mission originated at a monthly concert for prayer for missions held in Feb., 1859, in the South Reformed Church, New York, when one elder offered to give $800 per year to support a missionary in Japan, another made a similar promise, and the Church pledged itself for a third like sum. On May 7, 1859, the Board of Foreign Missions sent out three missionaries — Rev. Samuel R. Brown, M.D. (who had been a missionary in China for several years), Rev. Guido F. Verbeck, and D. Simmons, M.D., with their wives, and Miss Caroline E. Adriance — who reached Kanagawa Nov. 1 of that year. Rev. James H. Ballagh was sent out in 1862, and Rev. Henry Stout in 1868. Dr. Simmons and wife resigned in 1860, and Miss Adriance went to Amoy, where she became an assistant missionary, and died in 1863. She always bore her own expenses as a volunteer missionary. The missionaries engaged chiefly at Yokohama, Nagasaki, and Tokio in teaching the government schools, translating the Word of God, circulating the Scriptures, tracts, and books in Chinese, and instructing inquirers in the way of salvation. Mr. Ballagh began a Japanese religious service in 1866, the average attendance being about twenty persons. The first two native converts, Wakasa, a nobleman, and Ayabe, his younger brother, were baptized by the Rev. G. F. Verbeck, May 20,1866, the day of Pentecost, at his residence in Yokohama. Wakasa's  attention was first drawn to Christianity by a copy of the New Test. in English, which some Japanese picked up out of the water in the bay of Nagasaki, and which was probably lost overboard from an American or English ship. He did not rest unltil, five or six years after, he procured a Chinese translation of it, which he eagerly read. Thus this “bread cast upon the waters” was found “after many days” in the soul of the first Japanese convert to Christianity. In March, 1872, the first native Christian Church was organized by the Rev. James H. Ballagh at Yokohama with eleven members. In 1877 it had 145 communicants. The edifice in which it worships cost about $6000, of which the first thousand was given by the native Christians of Honolulu, Sandwich Islands. It seats about 450 persons. In 1889 there were 2 stations and 19 out-stations, and preaching- places with communicants enrolled to the number of 1969 belonging to this mission. The entire native contributions amounted to $8324.70. The mission has been very successful in the last three years.

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

In addition to these Oriental Missions, the board has also co-operated with other missionary boards in the plan of Indian agencies under the government of the United States. The tribes assigned to it are the Pimas, Maricopas, and Papagoes; the Mohaves on the Colorado River Reserve;  and the Apaches on the White Mountain Reserve, numbering in all about 9000 souls.

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

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

5. Home Missions. — The Board of Domestic Missions consists of twenty- four members, half of whom are lavmen, and one third are elected annually by the General Synod. It was reorganized in 1849, with a corresponding secretary exclusively devoted to its service. Previous to this, for a number of years, the duties of that office were performed voluntarily by settled pastors. All the Reformed churches were on missionary ground until the independent organization of the denomination was secured in 1771. Soon after this event, ministers and elders were occasionally sent out upon tours of exploration among destitute populations to preach the Gospel, and to establish mission stations and churches. As the result of these labors, a few new churches were organized — one in Virginia, six in Kentucky, six in Lower Canada, and elsewhere in the regions of the Delaware and Susquehanna rivers, and Central New York. It was then determined to concentrate efforts nearer home, and the distant churches — some of which yet live in other denominations — were left alone. In 1822 the “Missionary Society of the Reformed Dutch Church” was organized in the city of New York.

A Northern Board, located at Albany, was appointed by the Synod in 1828 to act under the society located at New York, and a new impetus was given to the work. In 1831 a new Board of Missions was constituted for the whole Church, all the mission work being confided to its care of which the present board is the, lineal successor. It was incorporated in 1867, and now holds its own funds. The Church Building Fund and the Sabbath-school interests of the denomination, excepting publications, are confided to its care. More than half of the churches of the  denomination owe their existence to the fostering care of this board. In the West, nearly the whole of the English churches of the Particular Synod of Chicago have grown up under its benign influence. The Holland churches have been mostly self-sustaining. During the year ending June, 1878, this board aided 102 churches, of which fifty-eight were at the East, forty-two in the West, and two in the South. The number of families in the Mission churches was 6787 and 8896 Church members, of whom 1040 were received during the year. There were 134 Sabbath-schools, with 11,339 scholars. The income from all sources for the missionary operationis was $35,130.32. Since 1832 more than three hundred churches have been organized — about half of these in the single decade of 1850-60 — and many of these under the auspices of this board. Thousands of Hollanders, most of whom are in this denomination, have settled in Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, and adjoining states during the last thirty years. These have formed an important element in the missionary growth and extension of the Church in the North-west. Of its nearly 79,000 members, about 11,000 are Hollanders. 6. The Board of Education, which was organized as a voluntary society in the city of New York in 1828, was adopted by the General Synod in 1832. It consists of twenty-four members, who are elected for three years each, one third of whom are elected annually. It has the immediate care of all the beneficiaries and educational interests of the Reformed Church, including such beneficiaries as receive aid from the Van Benschoten and Knox funds, which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College.

Every beneficiary must be a member in good and regular standing in the Reformed Church, and must also have been a member of some Protestant Church for one year previous to making his application for aid. He must be recommended to the board by the pastor and consistory of the Church, and by the classis to which said Church belongs, after sustaining a satisfactory examination as to his need of assistance, and physical, mental, and spiritual qualifications for study and for the holy ministry. Every precaution is taken against the introduction or continuation of improper candidates. Repayment of all money received from the board is required from those who do not complete their course of ministerial preparation, unless they are, in the judgment of the board, providentially hindered. The board will accept from all beneficiaries after their licensure two years' service under the care of the Board of Domestic Missions, as a full satisfaction for all aid rendered to them by the Board of Education. This is a wise provision, which has secured many excellent young laborers in the home missionary field. All the students are considered as tnder the pastoral  care of the corresponding secretary. In 1865 the powers of the board were enlarged to enable it to co-operate with the various classes in the establishment of academies and classical schools within their bounds. The board became incorporated in 1870, to enable it to hold legal possession of its funds and to secure others that may be devised to it by will. In addition to the Knox Fund ($2000), the Van Benschoten Fund ($20,313.57), the Smock Fund ($500), the Mandeville Fund ($2000), and the Voorhees Fund ($26,000), which are held by the trustees of Rutgers College, and the interest of which is paid out to beneficiaries of this board, it holds twentyfive scholarships, ranging from $1700 to $10,000, malking in all a capital of over $120,000, besides the annual Church collections and private donations, amounting in 1877-78 to $11,299.74 — all for the education of young men for the ministry. It also holds certain trust funds for Hope College, and receives moneys for parochial schools which are under its care. The total income for the year ending June 1, 1878, was $33,508, and the total number of youlang men under its care for the same period was eighty-three.

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

7. The Board of Publication was organized in 1855 by authority of the General Synod. It consists of twelve ministers and twelve laymen, one third of whom are elected annually by the Synod. To it are “intrusted, with such directions as may from time to time be given by the General Synod, the superintendence of all the publications of the Reformed Church, and the circulation of such works pertaining to the history, government, doctrines, and religious literature of said Church and of other evangelical denominations as shall be properly approved.” It has a corresponding secretary and general agent, and a depository located in the city of New York. Its printing and binding are done by contract. It publishes a semi- monthly newspaper called the Sower and Gospel Field, which is the accredited organ of all the boards of the Church. The catalogue of its books and tracts, for denominational and general uses, is large, and constantly receiving new additions. Sales are made at a moderate profit. Gratuitous distributions and liberal discounts are made to weak churches, poor Sunday-schools, and for missionary purposes. During the civil war in the United States, it sent forth large gratuitous supplies into the armies of  the Union; and since the cessation of hostilities it has done a good and large work of benevolent circulation in the South, particularly among the freedmen. In India it has published the Heidelberg Catechism in Tamil during the year ending June, 1870; and a supply of its elementary books for Sabbath-school and general instriction has been asked for and sent to Japan for use in the government schools utnder the care of the missionaries of the Reformed Church. The total assets of the board, June 1, 1878, were reported to the Synod as $12,343.64. Receipts for the year, $9,102.39.

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

9. The Disabled Ministers' Fund, which reaches a class who cannot avail themselves of the Widows', or Relief, Fund, was organized in 1855, under the title of the Sustentation Fund. It is also in trust of the Board of Direction of Corporation. Its moneys are to be kept invested, and to be “used for the support of disabled ministers and the families of deceased ministers. when such may be in need.” Applications for a aid are made through and recommended by the classes to which the applicants belong. Contributions which are donated specifically for principal are so used; all  other contributions go to the yearly disbursements, and any surplus that remains is carried to principal and placed at interest upon first-class securities. Aged and infirm ministers are thus assisted, and also the needy families of deceased clergymen. The amount of this fund reported June 1, 1878, was $19,614.85, of which $14,222 was appropriated to its beneficiaries.

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

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

“Our Church has been distinguished bv a steady and united adherence to her standards and order, andl at the same timne by a kind and friendly relation to other evangelical denominations. She has enjoyed peace within her own bosom, while agitating questions have troubled, and even rent, other churches. She has borne a full proportionate share in contributions to Christian benevolent institutions, such as the American Bible Society, the American  Tract Society, and others. She is desirous and anxious, in a sense of privilegae and responsibility, to employ greater efforts for increasing the degree and extent of her influence in doing all she can for the spread of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. Her pacific character, her freedom from the ultraisms of the day, her evangelical principles, the peculiar features of her government and order, and the attitude in which she has been found by the side of other evangelical denominations, all tend to commend her to the favorable regard of all the friends of evangelical truth who desire the ‘peace and prosperity' of the Church of Christ.”

X. Statistics. —

1. Numbers and Funds. — In June, 1878, the Reformed Church embraced 4 particular synods, 33 classes, 505 churches, 542 ministers. 6 candidates for the ministry, 43,490 families, 78,666 communicants, of whom were received during the previous year 3940 in confession and 1966 by certificates; baptisms of infants, 3874; of adults, 1044; catechumens, 24,445; Sabbath-school scholars, 80,109; contributions for religious and benevolent purposes, $203,103; for congregational purposes, $788.222. In July, 1889, there were returned 546 churches, 566 ministers. 88,812 communicants.

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

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

1. Theological and Exegetical. — John H. Livingston, D.D., late Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology, Lectures on Theology; an Analysis by Rev. Ava Neal (1 vol. 12mo, out of print); James S. Cannon, D.D., Professor of Church History and Government and Pastoral Theology, Lectures on Pastoral Theoloqy (1 vol. 8vo, 616 pp.), an exhaustive work; Alexander McClelland, D.D., Professor of Biblical Criticism and Sacred Languages, Canon and Interpretation of Scripture (1 vol. 12mo, 336 pp.); John T. Demarest, D.D., Commentaries on the 1James , 2 d Epistles of Peter (2 vols. 8vo); John T. Demarest, D.D., and William R. Gordon, D.D., Christocracy (1 vol. 12mo); other works by W. R. Gordon, D.D.: Child's  Guide in Reading the Scriptures, 132 pp.; Supreme Godhood of Christ, 188 pp.; Particular Providence Illustrated by the Life of Joseph, 492 pp.; A Three-fold Test of Modern Spiritualism, 408 pp.; The Church of God and her Sacramennts, 208 pp.; A. R.Van Nest, D.D., Life and Letters of George W. Bethune, D.D. (1869, 1 vol. crown 8vo); Geo. W. Bethune, D.D., Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism (2 vols. crown 8vo); other works by the same author: Sermons (1 vol.); Orations and Addresses (1 vol.); Poems (1 vol.); History of a Penitent, being an exposition of Psalms 130 (1 vol.); Early Lost, Early Saved (1 vol.); Fruit of the Spirit (1 vol.); Rev. John Van der Kemp, Sermons on the Heidelberg Catechism (2 vols. 8vo, out of print); The Vedder Lectures, 1874, 1875, 1876, 1877. Among the American contributors to Schaff's edition of Lange's Biblical Commentary are Prof. Tayler Lewis, LL.D. (Genesis, Job, Ecclesiastes), M. B. Riddle, D.D. (Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians), T. W. Chambers, D.D. (Amos, Zechariah), John Forsyth, D.D., LL.D. (Joel), and C. D. Hartranft, D.D. (Numbers). A critical edition or version of the Heidelberg Catechism is now in process of preparation by a Committee of Synod, of which a tentative copy, with a historical introduction, was published in Minutes of General Synod, 1878, p. 185-222. See also list of works issued by the Board of Publication, including three vols. of Tracts and many miscellaneous books illustrating the history, polity, theology, and usages of the Reformed Church. Besides these are a number for general circulation, and not denominational. The New Brunswick Review, edited by the late Prof. John Proudfit, D.D., reached only a few numbers; the Evangelical Quarterly Review, edited by Rev. Joseph F. Berg, D.D., late professor of didactic and polemic theology, extended over about two complete volumes. Both of these reviews are valuable contributions to the literature of the Church.

2. Historical and Biographical. Brodhead, History of New York (2 vols.); Colonial History of New York (3 vols.); Documentary History of New York (4 vols.); David D. Demarest, D.D., Professor of Church Government and Pastoral Theology, History and Characteristics of the Reformned Protestant Dutch Church (1 vol. 12mo, 221 pp.); Benjamin C. Taylor, D.D., Annals of the Classis and Township of Bergen (1 vol. 12mo, 479 pp.); Sprague, Annals of the Refourmed Dutch Church, vol. 9 with historical introduction; Rev. E. T. Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church in America (1 vol. 8vo; 2d ed. revised and enlarged, 1879), an invaluable work; Alex. Gulinn, D.D., Memoirs of Rev. John H. Livingston,  D.D. (1 vol. 12mo); Magazine of the Refornmed Dutch Church (1827, 4 vols.), containing a valuable series of articles by the late Rev. John B. Romeyn, D.D., on the history of the Reformed Church in Holland and in this country; Rev. John A. Todd, D.D., Memoirs of Rev. Peter Labagh, D.D. (1 vol. 12mo); E. P. Rogers, D.D., Historical Discourses on the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church in Albany (1858, 1 vol. 8vo, 120 pp.); Thomas De Witt, D.D., Refornmed Dutch Chuzrch in New York (1857, 1 vol. 8vo, 100 pp.); One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in New Brunswick, N. J., memorial volume, Richard H. Steele, D.D., pastor (1867, 1 vol. 8vo, 222 pp.); Francis M. Kip, D.D., One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of the Reformed Church in Fishkill, N. Y. (1866, 64 pp.); Minutes of the General Synod, 1771-1870; Constitution and Digest of Acts of General Synod (revised, 1874); articles published in the Christian Intelligencer by Thomas De Witt, D.D., mostly from original documents procured by loan from the Classis of Amsterdam, Holland, and others from John R. Brodhead, Esq., — the historian of New York; W. Carlos Martyn, The Dutch Reformation (Amer. Tract Society, N.Y., 1870, 1 vol. 12mo); Eutaxia. or the Presbyterian Liturgies, by a Presbyterian Clergyman (New York, M. W. Dodd, 1855, 259 pp. ); Rey. George R. Williamson, Life of David Abeel, D.D.; Rev. J. B. Waterbury, Life of Rev. John Scudder, I.D.; Works of Dr. Scudder and Dr. Abeel; Von Alpen, History of the He delberg Catechism, translated by Prof. J. F. Berg, D.D. (Phila. 1854, 1 vol. 8vo). Dr. Berg also published sev:eral volumes on prophecy, the Second Advent, Church and State, etc.; Centennial Discourses, a series of twenty-two sermons delivered in the year 1876 by order of the General Synod, intended to set forth the relations of the Reformed Church to liberty and to faith and education, and other topics appropriate to the Centennial year of the republic (8vo, 601 pp.). Quarter- Millennial Anniversary of the Reformed Protestant Dutch Church of the City of New York, 1628-1878 (1879, 8vo, 104 pp.). (W.J.R.T.)

## Reformed Baptists[[@Headword:Reformed Baptists]]

             SEE CAMPBELLITES.

## Reformed Churches[[@Headword:Reformed Churches]]

             the name usually given to all the churches of the Reformation. In a conventional sense, it is used to designate those Protestant churches in which the Calvinistic doctrines, and still more the Calvinistic polity, prevail, in contradistinction to the Lutheran (q.v.). The influence of Calvin proved more powerful than that of Zwingli, which, however, no doubt considerably modified the views prevalent in many of these churches. The Reformed churches are very generally known on the continent of Europe as the Calvinistic churches, while the name Protestant Church is in some  countries almost equivalent to that of Lutheran. One chief distinction of all the Reformed churches is their doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, characterized by the utter rejection not only of transubstantiation. but of consubstantiation; and it was on this point mainly that the'controversy between the Lutherans and the Reformed was long carried on. SEE LORDS SUPPER.

They are also unanimous in their rejection of the use of images and of many ceremonies which the Lutherans have thought it proper to retain. Among the Reformed churches are those both of England and Scotland (notwithstanding the Episcopalian government of the former and the Presbyterianism of the latter), the Protestant Church of France, that of Holland and the Netherlands, many German churches, the once flourishing Protestant Church of Poland, etc., with those in America and elsewhere which have sprung from them. SEE PROTESTANTISM; SEE REFORMATION.

## Reformed Episcopal Church[[@Headword:Reformed Episcopal Church]]

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

I. History. — This ecclesiastical organization took its rise in the city of New York December 2, 1873. The Rt. Rev. George David Cummins, D.D., assistant bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Kentucky, separated from that Church, in a letter to presiding bishop Smith  dated November 10, 1873. Within one month from that date, the Reformed Episcopal Church was organized, with Dr. Cummins as its first bishop. Bishop, Cummins was born December 11, 1822. He was related on the maternal side to the celebrated bishop Asbury, of the Methodist Episcopal Chutrch, but was of Episcopal descent on both sides. He was graduated at Dickinson College, Carlisle, in 1841, in the nineteenth year of his age. In the year 1843 he became connected with the Episcopal Church, and in 1845 was ordained to the diaconate by bishop Alfred Lee, of the diocese of Delaware. After a ministry of great eloquence, power, and success in different prominent fields of labor during twelve years, he was consecrated to the episcopate as assistant bishop of the diocese of Kentucky in 1866. During October, 1873, the Evangelical Alliance met in New York city. Bishop Cummins was in attendance, and on the eighth day of that mouth delivered an address on the subject Roman and Reformed Doctrines on the Subject of Justification, Contrasted. On the 12th, Sunday, the bishop participated in a joint communion in the Presbyterian Church of which Dr. John Hall is the pastor, delivering an address and administering the cup. The storm of adverse criticism that followed this act served to mature and intensify the conviction that had been gathering form and volume before in the bishop's mind, that the Church he had loved and served so well had fully and finally drifted from its old evangelical and catholic position. It was about this time, just at what point we do not know, that the thought of a separation from the old Communion arose, and ripened into fixed purpose. The first outward movement looking towards the organization of a separate Communion took place October 30. An account of the meeting then held is here given in the language of a prominent clergyvnan: — Rev. Dr. B. B. Leacock — who was present and participated in its deliberations:

“By invitation of bishop Cummins, five clergymen and five laymen were brought together at the residence of Mr. John A. Dake, of New York city. The bishop startled them by announcing his determination of withdrawinsfrom the Protestant Episcopal Church. When urged to reconsider his decision, he promptly stated that this was not debatable ground — that it was a question between himself and God, and as such he had settled it, and that his determination was unalterable, he then said that his object inl calling us together was to advise as to his future. There were two propositioins before him. He had been invited to go to Mexico, and give himself to the work of the organization and building-up of the Church of Jesus.  Should he do this? or should he remain in this country, and here exercise his ministry and his episcopal office? Those who felt fiee to speak advised his remaining in this country by all means, and then and there he determined that this country should be the ‘sphere of labor' to which he would transfer his ‘work and office.' Steps were taken before the adjournment of this meeting looking towards placing in the hands of the printer the book which the bishop refers to in his letter of resignation, written Nov. 10 — ‘I propose to return to that Prayer-book sanctioned by William White.' We may regard this meeting as the first movement, outside of bishop Cummins himself, towards the formation of the Reformed Episcopal Church.” November 10, the bishop addressed a letter to bishop Smith, his superior in the diocese of Kentucky, and the presiding bishop of the general Church, resigning his position as a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church. On the 12th of November he paid an unannounced visit to the Rev. Marshall B. Smith, at Passaic, N. J., seeking rest and quiet of mind. Mr. Smith had withdrawn from the same church, for the same causes, and connected himself with the ministry of the “Reformed Church of America” in the year 1869. During this visit, without any prearrangement, he was met by the Rev. Mason Gallagher, who had also withdrawn from the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1871, and Col. Benjamin Aycrigg, a prominent layman of that church in New Jersey, who had withdrawn October 30, 1873. These gentlemen testify that, in the deeply serious and interesting interview, which was greatly protracted, there was, in the beginning, no foreshadowing of its practical issue. They cannot recall the precise point in the conversation where the thought of concerted action took shape. Under what they fully believe Divine guidance, that thought did rise, take form and body, and grow into purpose, until, ili the form dictated by the bishop, the call for a meeting of clergymen and laymen of like mind was written and issued. It was in these words, inserted here as important history: “NEW YORK, Nov. 15, 1873.

“DEAR BROTHER, — The Lord has put into the hearts of some of his servants who are, or have been, in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the purpose of restoring the old truths of their fathers, and of returniug to the use of the Prayer-book of 17S5, set forth by the  General Convention of that year, under the especial guidance of the venerable William White, D.D., afterwards the first bishop of the same church in this country. The chief features of that Prayer-book, as distinguished from the one now in use, are the following: 1. The word ‘priest' does not appear in the book, and there is no countenance whatever to the errors of sacerdotalism. 2. The Baptismal Offices, the Confirmation Office, the Catechism, and the Order ‘or the Administration of the Lord's Supper contain no sanction of the errors of baptismal regeneration, the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the elements of the communion and of a sacrifice offered by a priest in that sacred feast. These are the main features that render the Prayer-book of 1785 a thoroughly scriptural liturgy, such as all evangelical Christians who desire liturgical worship can use with a good conscience. On Tuesday, the second day of December, 1873, a meeting will be held in Association Hall, corner of Twenty-third street and Fourth avenue, in the city of New York, at 10 o'clock A.M., to organize an Episcopal Church on the basis of the Prayerbook of 1785 — a basis broad enough to embrace all who hold ‘the faith once delivered to the saints,' as that faith is maintained by the Reformed churches of Christendom; with no exclusive and unchurching dogmas towards Christian brethren who differ firom them in their views of polity and Church order. This meeting you are cordially and affectionately invited to attend. The purpose of the meeting is to organize, and not to discuss the expediency of organizing. A verbatim reprint of the Prayer-book of 1785 is in press, and will be issued during the month of December. May the Lord guide you and us by his Holy Spirit. “GEORGE DAVID CUMMINS.”

That meeting was held on the day appointed, and the “Reformed Episcopal Church” organized with eight clergymen and twenty laymen, all of whom were at the time. or had been, ministers or laymen in the Protestant Episcopal Church and actively identified with the Evangelical or “‘Low- Church” party in that Church, no one being allowed to vote but those who had signed the call. The Rev. Charles Edward Cheney, of Chicago, was elected bishop, his consecration to the office taking place later in the same month.  In justification of this action, writers in the interest of the Reformed Episcopal Church point to the actual state of the Evangelical school or party in the Protestant Episcopal communion. The errors and excesses of the Tractarian school had been in process of development for a period of nearly forty years. Often and thoroughly confuted on the ground of scriptural argument, they had grown to such widespread influence and strength as to be fast absorbing all the vital forces of the Church. They had become proscriptive, and, by legislative enactment and judicial trials, were repressing evangelical life and energy. Efforts had been made to procure the condemnation and expulsion of these errors from the Church. The results were of so partial and inadequate a character as to encourage rather than check the reactionary movement towards mediaeval error and superstition. Then efforts were made to secure revision of the Prayer-book, but only with humiliating failure. Petition after petition to the General Convention was treated with scarcely concealed contempt. Even the poor relief of liberty to use alternate phrases in the Baptismal Offices was unceremoniously denied to a numerously signed petition. In these efforts to obtain relief many participated who are not as yet in the Reformed Episcopal Church, but whose action shows how deeply and earnestly men who loved the pure truth of the Gospel then felt on the subject. Thus, at a meeting in Chicago, June 16 and 17, 1869, among others who strongly advocated revision of the Prayer-book was Rev. Dr. Andrews, of Virginia, one of the ablest presbyters of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and a member of the General Convention. Rev. Dr. Richard Newton, the present rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Philadelphia, introduced the following resolutions:

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

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

These resolutions were unanimously adopted. But neither these nor any other efforts to obtain redress were of any avail. An imperious and haughty majority bound and held every conscience, and the Church followed the sacramentarian drift unchecked. Those who organized the Reformed  Episcopal Church were convinced, by a long course of stubborn facts, that the cause dear to them, as the cause of the true Gospel of Christ, was at stake; that they must either sacrifice the truth or go outside of the old organization to defend and propagate it. Conviction and conscience led them to their action.

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

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

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

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

II. Doctrines and Usages. —

1. Speaking generally, the doctrines of the Reformed Episcopal Church may be identified as those of Orthodox and Evangelical Protestantism. The men who organized the Church were of that class of clergymen and laymen in the old Protestant Episcopal Church who had been largely associated with the Christians of other Protestant Churches, and harmonized with them in belief and practice. In their choice and adjustment of doctrinal standards, they could but give expression to this agreement. When they set forth in the “Declaration of Principles” the belief that “the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments are the Word of God, and the sole Rule of faith and practice,” thus making the Bible the only ultimate fountain of authority in the settlement of religious questions; and when they revised the old Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, not changing their  substance, but making them more distinctive, and adapting them to present phases of life and thought, they but put the Church squarely on the great platform of Evangelical Christianity. This Church, if not broader, is somewhat less particular in its doctrinal basis than some of its sister Communions. Thus, like the old Episcopal Church, it holds in its bosom, and freely tolerates, clergymen of the Calvinistic and Arminian schools of thought. The eighteenth “Article of Religion,” entitled “Of Election, Predestination, and Free Will,” runs thus: “While the Scriptures distinctly set forth the election, predestination, and calling of the people of God unto eternal life, as Christ saith, ‘All that the Father giveth me shall come to me,' they no less positively affirm man's free agency and responsibility, and that salvation is freely offered to all through Christ. This Church, accordingly, simply affirms these doctrines as the Word of God sets them forth, and submits them to the individual judgment of its members, as taught by the Holy Spirit; strictly charging them that God commandeth all men everywhere to repent, and that we can be saved only by faith in Jesus Christ.” This is the only distinct effort we are aware of to unite in one article of religion the two hemispheres of truth that he, one on the side of divine sovereignty, the other on the side of man's freedom and responsibility. How far this effort has been successful, the judgment of Christian men must decide. One result of it, however, is evident. The gelneral course of conviction among the clergy of this Church runs nearer the line of separation on these high ranges of doctrine than in most other Communions. The freedom to differ rather constrains to harmony than ministers to license. With but little disposition to censorious criticism, its ministers of either tendency of doctrinal thought find a fair field for united and harmonious action in extending and building up the kingdom of Christ.

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

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

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

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

This system of government by canon law is a safeguard against the spread of error. Where the churches of an ecclesiastical organization are independent, or only connected by certain rules of association having no other than moral force, there is apt to be less jealousy and less exciting  debate in the meetings of association, because the tendency of opinion and the results of controversy cannot crystallize into forms that bind under penalty. But this very fact is apt to lead to looseness of conviction and a light estimate of the responsibility of a teacher. And when error is taught, because the teacher cannot be arraigned under binding law, he cannot be hindered from spreading it to the full extent of his talents and influence. Under a system of canon law such as governs the Reformed Episcopal Church, such a result, with ordinary faithfulness on the part of those appointed to administer it, is impossible. Not only is dereliction in either doctrine or life liable to strict discipline, but the persons by whom and the processes in which such discipline is to be administered are prescribed, and the duty actually imposed upon the administrator. If soundness of doctrine can be enforced and innocency of life secured in a Church, such a system would seem to present the best means to the end.

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

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

The diaconate in this Church is a subordinate order. In theory the deacon is the helper of the presbyter; in practice his position is, thus far, only a sort of preparatory school for the presbyterate. Just what the office will become in the growth and development of the Church as it passes further into history canl hardly be foreseen. Perhaps its relation to the general ministry will not differ greatly from that which prevails in the old Protestant Episcopal Church. This historic ministry is prized, not because of any belief in the notion of an “apostolic succession” in the ministry either as a doctrine or a fact, but partly because the historic element in a Church is always important, since Christianity itself is a historical religion, and partly because the peculiar mission of this Church is in the line of the English Reformation. In the vital and historical connection of its ministry with that of the English Reformers the Reformed Episcopal Church llas the basis for its development and work. The ministry thus constituted, identical with that of the English Church, gives the Church a vantage-ground where it can stand on an acknowledged equality with the old communion, while it is purified from its errors, and is free to recognise the ministry of other  Evangelical Churches as equally valid with its own. It thus stands in the gap, never heretofore bridged, between Episcopal and Presbyterian churches. It has the ministry of both. It may be destined to be the medium of reconciliation between them, as it does not arrogate superiority to the one, and lacks nothing the other justly claims.

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

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

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

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

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

These statements in regard to doctrines, orders, worship, discipline, and general usages are little more than an expansion of the original declaration  of principles adopted at the organization of the Church, Dec. 2,1873, which is given as a comprehensive summary:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Fifth, That regeneration is inseparably connected with baptism.

III. Statistics. — The statistics of this Church thus early in its history are necessarily few and simple. If, however, they are carefully noted, they will,  it is believed, indicate wider extension and more rapid growth than have marked most other ecclesiastical bodies in the beginning of their history.

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

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

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

2. Literary Institutions. — Of these the Reformed Episcopal Church can, as yet, boast but one, and that only in the infancy of what it is hoped will, in due time of maturity, be a vigorous and influential life. The University: of the West is at present organized substantially on the plan of the London University. Non-resident professors prepare questions on which students are required to stand rigid examinations by written answers. In this university scheme, only the Martin College of Theology is thus far in organized working order. This has taken precedence to meet the wants of the Church in the education of its ministry. The times demand a ministry not only of thorough scholastic attainments, but well taught in theology in connection with the peculiarities of the Church they are to labor in. The  Church seeks to compass this end by subjecting all students in theology to a uniform system of questions in all departments of theological learning. The present plan may be modified when a sufficient endowment fund shall have been secured to meet the requirements of a local institution. Through the munificent liberality of a gentleman of the State of New York, Edward Martin, Esq., the Church is in possession of landed estate in the suburbs of Chicago of large present and much larger prospective value. On this property the authorities of the university propose, eventually, to erect suitable buildings for the several colleges as they shall, from time to time, take form. It is their purpose, as the ability of the Church increases, to spare no pains to make the institution worthy of the Church and of the country.

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

## Reformed German Church[[@Headword:Reformed German Church]]

             SEE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

## Reformed Methodist Church[[@Headword:Reformed Methodist Church]]

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

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

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

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

## Reformed Presbyterian Church[[@Headword:Reformed Presbyterian Church]]

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

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

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

3. They consider the Church and the State as the two leading departments of Christ's visible kingdom on earth, or, as Merle d'Aubigne has  designated them, the two poles of human society. In this view they labor much for the purity and power of the two great ordinances, the Gospel ministry and the civil magistracy; both being equally of God, both being under the sgvereignty of Christ, and each, in its sphere, to be regulated, in a Christian land, by the written law. Where this law is either entirely disregarded Or flagrantly violated, they refuse to take any part either in Church or State.

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

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

(a) setting forth the whole truth of God, keeping nothing back;

(b) applying that truth to the parties addressed;

(c) pointing out the contrary evils. Following out this idea, Covenanters have, besides their Confession

(d), a Testimony specifying the evils of the time.

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

(1.) In all the Constitution there is no recognition of God, the Sovereign of the world and Source of all authority and power. Justice Bayard and other  authors labor earnestly in offering apologies for this defect; but all these apologies are set aside by the Declaration of Independence, in the simple fact that the Supreme is repeatedly acknowledged in that memorable document as nature's God, as the Creator, as Divine Providence, and as the Judge of the world; as One on whose protection the nascent empire could exercise a “firm reliance” while struggling for existence. When independence was achieved and a prosperous career fairly entered, his name is lopped off in the new Constitution; and, although the document has been repeatedly amended, the place for his name is still left a blank. In fact, Benjamin Franklin could not succeed in having prayer offered in the convention that framed the Federal Constitution. We think this is the first nation known to history that has set up a government without acknowledging any deity whatever. True it is that many of their deities were not worth the honor, while we as a nation have refused to honor “the God in whose hand our life is, and whose are all our ways.” That he should be acknowledged in the Constitution and obeyed in the administration is shown by the following, among other considerations:

(a.) He is not only the Creator of men, but he is the Author of national blessings. He gave the nation its existence at the first, and holds the entire control of all its destinies.

(b.) Civil government is one of his institutions for the good of men and for his own glory among men. Not only did he direct the people of Israel to set up judges and officers, but in the New Test. he recognises such officers as his ministers, and their power as his ordinance. He claims obedience to them as his representatives, and that honor shall be given to them for his sake, while he tells all nations that there is no authority unless it be of God (Rom 13:1-7; 2Pe 2:13-17; Tit 3:1). All Christians are agreed that civil government set up on moral principles is the “ordinance of God.” This implies, requires even, an acknowledgment of him in the Constitution as well as elsewhere.

(c.) There are many very solemn services in the exercise of civil rule. Take one of many: A fellow-mortal is charged with murder, and must be dealt with, whether he be a citizen or not. This dealing is a solemn affair in the sight of God:

(i) whether we let him loose on society;

(ii) whether we hang him up by the neck until he is dead;

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Covenanters claim the universal application of the divine law to all the institutions of men, and to the man in all his relations — the Church, the family, the civil, military, commercial, financial legislative, judicial, social,  and all possible connections of man with man. They take no stock in street- car or railroad companies, or any institutions which desecrate the Sabbath or otherwise trench on any of the ten commandments. They have always excluded freemasons from their fellowship.

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

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

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

10. Besides their adherence to the Scottish covenants, they hold that covenanting is an ordinance of the New Test. as well as of the Old. This they find held forth in prophecy (Isa 19:18-21; Isa 44:5; Isa 42:4; Jer 1:5) and exemplified in the apostolic Church (2Co 8:5).

11. They hold strictly close communion, on a doctrinal as well as practical basis, according to Act 2:42; 2Th 3:6. (R. H.)

## Reformed Wesleyans[[@Headword:Reformed Wesleyans]]

             SEE WESLEYANS.

## Reformed, True, Church[[@Headword:Reformed, True, Church]]

             SEE TRUE REFORMED CHURCH.

## Reformers[[@Headword:Reformers]]

             SEE CAMPBELLITES.

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

             is a term usually applied in a religious sense to those who were most prominent in bringing about the great reformation of the 16th century, The principal of these were Wycliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Melanchthon, (Ecolampadius, Bucer, Beza, Cranmer, Latimer, Ridley, and  John Knox. There are also many others who are fairly entitled to be called reformers.

## Reformers, Wesleyan[[@Headword:Reformers, Wesleyan]]

             SEE UNITED FREE CHURCH; SEE METHODISTS.

## Refrigerium[[@Headword:Refrigerium]]

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

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

Paradise being in the Scriptures, especially in the New Test. (Mat 22:2; Mat 25:10, etc.; Rev 19:7, etc.), often compared to a banquet, it was but natural that refreshment should be used in a figurative sense for the heavenly banquet: “LJustus... si morte preoccupatus fuerit, in refrigerio erit.” The following passage of the Act 3:20 is also understood of the refreshment at the Lord's table: “Cum venerint tempora refrigerii a conspectu Domini.” Tertullian (De Idol. 43) employs the same image in describing the felicity of Lazarus, who, driven away, while living, from the  table of the rich man, sits down, after his death, with Abraham, to the eternal banquet: “Lazarus apud inferos in sinu Abrahae refrigerium consecutus.” This same refrigerium is the favor which the faithful wife implores for her dead husband: “Pro anima ejus orat, et refrigerium adpostulat” (De Monogam. 10). St. Perpetua saw her brother Dinocrates in that place of refreshment: “Video Dinocratem refrigerantem” (Act. cap. 8). The prayer mentioned above, from the sacramentary of St. Gelasius, and which is still recited in the Roman Catholic Church, seems literally to request for the faithful soul a seat at the heavenly table (“refrigerii sedem”).

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

## Refuge[[@Headword:Refuge]]

             SEE ASYLUM; SEE CHURCH.

## Refuge, Cities Of[[@Headword:Refuge, Cities Of]]

             SEE CITY OF REFUGE.

## Refugee[[@Headword:Refugee]]

             (Fr. refugie), a name given to persons who have fled from religious or political persecution in their own country and taken refuge in another. The term was first applied to those Protestants who found an asylum in Britain and elsewhere at two different periods, first during the Flemish persecutions under the duke of Alva in 1567, and afterwards, in 1685, when Louis XIV of France revoked the Edict of Nantes and drove so many of the Huguenots (q.v.) into involuntary exile. Of the numerous French artisans who settied in England on this last occasion, the most part Anglicized their names, as by substituting Young for “Le Jeune,” Taylor for “Tellier,” etc., so that their posterity can now hardly be recognised as of foreign origin. According to Lower (Patronymica Britannica), De Preux became Deprose, and “Richard Despair, a pool man,” buried at East Grimstead, was, in the orthography of his forefathers, Despard. There were also refugee families of a higher class, some of whose descendants and representatives came to occupy a place in the peerage. The Bouveries, earls of Radnor, are descended from a French refugee family. The refugee family of Blaquiere was raised to the Irish peerage; and Charles Shaw Lefevre (lord Eversley) is the representative of a family of Irish refugees. The military employment offered in Ireland after 1688 maintained a considerable number of foreign Protestants. General Frederick Armand de Schomberg was raised by William III to the peerage, becoming eventually duke of Schomberg. A Huguenot officer of hardly less celebrity was Henry Massue (marquis de Ruvigny), created by William III earl of Galway. Lord Ligonier was also of a noble Huguenot family, and England has had at least one refugee bishop in Dr. Majendie, bishop of Chester, and afterwards of Bangor. Among other refugees of note may be enumerated Sir John Houblon, lord mayor of London in 1695, one branch of whose family was represented by the late lord Palmerston; Elias Bouherau, or Boireau,, D.D., whose descendant was created a baronet as Sir Richard Borough of Baselden Park, Berkshire; as well as Martineaus, Bosanquets, and Papillons, whose descendants have attained more or less eminence in the country of their adoption. The first French Revolution brought numerous political refugees to England, and Great Britain is noted throughout Europe for affording a ready asylum to refugees of all classes, both  political and religious. See Weiss, History of the French Protestant Refugees, from the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes to the Present Time, translated by Hardman (Lond. 1854); Burns, History of the French, Walloon, Dutch, and other Foreign Protestant Refugees settled in England (Lond. 1846); Smiles, The Huguenots, their Settlements, Industries, etc. in England, Ireland, and America (N. Y. 1868).

## Regale[[@Headword:Regale]]

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

## Regalia[[@Headword:Regalia]]

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

The contest grew  out of the interpretation of French canon law which gives the right to the kings of France to enjoy the revenues of all bishoprics during their vacancy, and also to present to their prebends and all other their dignities without cure of souls. Such presentations might be made whether the dignity were vacant both dejure and de facto, as by death, or only either dejure, as if the incumbent were convicted of a crime or had accepted another dignity, or de facto, as if the regale should open after the presentation of an incumbent, but before he had taken possession. The regale lasted till a new admission to the bishopric was fully completed by taking the oath of allegiance, when a mandate was issued by the Chambre des Comptes to the commissary of the regale to restore the revenues. This right'had one or two singular privileges: it occurred not only on a vacancy, but also when a bishop was made a cardinal, and lasted till he repeated the oath of allegiance; it lasted thirty years as regarded patronage, so that if the king should leave a dignity vacant and the new bishop fill it up, the king might appoint a fresh incumbent at any time within this date; it was absolutely in the king's discretion, and subject to ino other constitutions whatever. The regale was at different times deprived of much of its original extent: certain bishoprics, as those of Languedoc, Provence, and Dauphine, claimed entire exemption; and though a decision of Parliament pronounced. at one time that the right extended over the whole kingdom, this was afterwards quashed, and the question remained undecided. Abbeys which were formerly subject to the regale were discharged, and an attempt to replace them under it quite failed. Finally all right to the revenues was resigned by Louis XIII and that of patronage was retained. See Commentaire de M. Dupuy sur le Traite des Libertes de M. Pithon, 1, 146. SEE SUPREMACY, PAPAL.

## Regalia Petri[[@Headword:Regalia Petri]]

             (the royalties of Peter) are regarded by Roman Catholics as belonging to the pope in his capacity of sovereign monarch of the universal Church. This claim to royal prerogative is founded on canon law, and has been asserted by the popes with more or less stringency since the 7th century. Among these claims ,are the following: "To be superior to the whole Church, and to its representative, a general council; to call general councils at his pleasure, all bishops being obliged to attend his summons; to preside in general synods, so as to propose matter for discussion; to promote, obstruct, or overrule the debates; to confirm or invalidate their decisions; to define points of doctrine; to decide controversies authoritatively, so that none may contest or dissent from his judgment; to enact, establish, abrogate, suspend, or dispense with ecclesiastical laws and canons; to relax or do away with ecclesiastical censures by indulgences, pardons, etc.; to dispense with the obligations of promises, vows, oaths, legal obligations, etc.; to be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity; to constitute, confirm, judge, censure, suspend, depose, remove, restore, and reconcile bishops; to exempt colleges and monasteries from the jurisdiction of their bishops and ordinary, superiors; to judge all persons in spiritual causes by calling them to his presence, delegating judges, and reserving to himself a final, irrevocable judgment; to receive appeals from all ecclesiastical judicatories, and reverse or confirm their sentences; to be accountable to no one for his acts; to erect, transfer, and abolish episcopal sees; to exact oaths of obedience from the clergy; to found religious orders; to summon and commission soldiers by crusade to fight against infidels or persecute heretics."

## Regals[[@Headword:Regals]]

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

## Regem[[@Headword:Regem]]

             (Heb. id. רֶגֶם, friend; Sept. ῾Ρεγέμ v. r. ῾Ραγέμ), the first named of six sons of Jahdai (q.v.), apparently of the family of Caleb (1Ch 2:47). B.C. post 1658.

## Regem-melech[[@Headword:Regem-melech]]

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

.

## Regeneratio[[@Headword:Regeneratio]]

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

## Regeneration[[@Headword:Regeneration]]

             (παλιγγενεσία, Tit 3:5, a being born again), that work of the Holy Spirit by. which we experience a change of heart. It is expressed in  Scripture by being born anew (Joh 3:7, “from above”); being quickened (Eph 2:1); by Christ being found in the heart (Gal 4:19); a new creation (2Co 5:17); a renewing of the mind (Rom 12:2); the washing, i.e. the purifing of regeneration (Tit 3:5); a resurrection from the dead (Eph 2:6); a putting off the old man, and a putting on the new man (Eph 4:22-24). And the subjects of this change are represented as begotten of God (Joh 1:13; 1Pe 1:3); begotten of the Spirit (Joh 3:8); begotten of water, even of the Spirit (Joh 3:5); new creatures (Gal 6:15); and partakers of the divine nature (2Pe 1:4). The efficient cause of regeneration is the divine spirit. Man is not the author of the regeneration (Joh 1:12-13; Joh 3:4; Eph 2:8; Eph 2:10); the instrumental cause is the word of God (Jam 1:18; 1Pe 1:23; 1Co 4:15).

The change in regeneration consists in the recovery of the moral image of God upon the heart; that is, so as to love him supremely and serve him ultimately as our highest end. Regeneration consists in the implantation of the .principle of love to God, which obtains the ascendency and habitually prevails over its opposite. Although the inspired writers use various terms and modes of speech to describe this change of mind, styling it conversion, regeneration, a new creation, etc., yet it is all effected by the word of truth or the Gospel of salvation gaining an entrance into the mind through divine teaching, so as to possess the understanding, subdue the will, and reign in the affections. In a word, it is faith working by love that constitutes the new creature or regenerate man (Gal 5:6; 1Jn 5:1-5). Regeneration, then, is the recovery of the moral image of God, and consequently of spiritual life, to a soul previously dead in trespasses and sins. It is the work of the Holy Spirit, opening the eyes of the mind, and enabling the sincere penitent to believe the Gospel and receive Christ as his only Saviour. This gracious work is in accordance both with the character of the Holy Spirit and with the constitution of man; hence, by it no violence is done to any physical, intellectual, or moral law or mode of action in human nature. The change is produced in the will, or heart, that is, in the moral, and not the natural, faculties of the soul. As depravity is wholly in the will and heart, the source and seat of all moral action, the divine operation consists in renewing the heart, and communicating a change of views, with a relish for the things of the Spirit. As justification places us in a new relation to God, so regeneration produces in us a new state of mind. In the case of children dying in infancy, they, of course, need regeneration to fit them for the eternal world. And there can be no difficulty in conceiving that they are  regenerated by the Holy Spirit, in virtue of Christ's death, in the same sense in which they are depraved, in consequence of Adam's transgression; the disposition to sin is removed, the disposition to holiness is implanted, and thus their salvation is secured. The evidences of regeneration are conviction of sin, holy sorrow, deep humility, knowledge, faith, repentance, love, and devotedness to God's glory. The properties of it are these:

1. It is a receptive work, and herein it differs from conversion. In regeneration we receive from God; in conversion we are active and turn to him.

2. It is a powerful work of God's grace (Eph 3:8).

3. It is an instantaneous act, for there can be no medium between life and death; and here it differs from sanctification, which is progressive.

4. It is a complete act, and perfect in its kind; a change of the whole man (2Co 5:17).

5. It is a great and important act, both as to its author and effects (Eph 2:4-5).

6. It is an internal act, not consisting in bare, outward forms (Eze 36:26-27).

7. Visible as to its effects (1Jn 3:14).

8. Delightful (1Pe 1:8).

9. Necessary (Joh 3:3). SEE CONVERSION; SEE NEW BIRTH. Our Lord in one instance (Mat 19:28) uses the term regeneration for the resurrection state. Accordingly, Dr. Campbell translates it “the renovation,” and remarks that the relation is here to the general state of things in the future world, where all things will become new. SEE NEW CREATION; SEE RESTITUTION.

## Regeneration By Water[[@Headword:Regeneration By Water]]

             In our Lord's discourse to Nicodemus (John 3) occurs this remarkable statement: “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” This coupling of water-baptism with spiritual regeneration as an essential condition to Christian privilege has  occasioned considerable difficulty to expositors, controversialists, and pious inquirers. A view of the entire context is important as a preliminary to the just interpretation of this passage.

Nicodemus sought a private interview with Jesus, evidently for the sincere purpose of information as to the Great Teacher's doctrine. Waiving all complimentary prefaces, Jesus at once propounds the one essential condition of discipleship — namely, the new birth. Nicodemus finds two difficulties in this — first, in his age, and, secondly; in the physical paradox itself. The latter perplexity evidently arose from his understanding the requirement in a literal sense. It is not so clear whether the former difficulty is but the same expressed in another form or an entirely different one — namely, the hardship of demanding a religious change in a person of such a confirmed standing as himself. In favor of the latter view are adduced the traditionary allusions to the baptism of proselytes to Judaism (which, however, do not very certainly establish that custom, or, at least, its special significance), and especially the baptism by John (which excited no surprise, showing that its significance was readily understood); but there is little or no evidence that these or any similar Judaic lustrations were currently designated by the peculiar terms here employed, γεννηθῆναι ἄνωθεν, born from above, or born again. SEE PROSELYTE.

But, however this may have been, it is plain that Nicodemus was chiefly stumbled by the apparent necessity of understanding the words of Jesus in a strictly literal or physical sense. Hence our Lord explains that not a fleshly, but a spiritual, birth is meant, and he repeats this distinction in varied form (the “water” and “Spirit” of Joh 3:5 respectively corresponding to and being further interpreted by “flesh” and “Spirit” in Joh 3:6). This serves to show that the expression “born of water” (γεννηθῆναι ἐξ ὕδατος) has reference, not to a spiritual purification, but to a physical ablution; that is, to personal baptism, such as Nicodemus was already familiar with, and such as was to be instituted by Christ himself. (We discard as precarious and offensive an interpretation which we have heard propounded of this expression as referring to the semen virile, based upon the alleged use of מִיַםin that sense in Isa 48:1; for that signification is not well established anywhere, even in Hebrew, much less in the Aramaic, which it is assumed that Christ here spoke, and certainly not in the Greek by which the conversation is represented.) The only real difficulty to us in the passage arises from the conjunction of baptism and regeneration as being both requisite in the case; thus giving apparent  countenance to the dogma of baptismal regeneration, or, at least, to the doctrine that baptism is essential to a Christian's acceptance with God. This difficulty is relieved by the following considerations drawn from the passage itself and from others parallel with it:

1. The principal stress is laid by Christ upon the second part of the requirement — namely, the spiritual birth. This is evident from the omission of all reference to baptism in Isa 48:6; Isa 48:8.

2. The language of Isa 48:5 can, at most, only mean that baptism and regeneration are both essential, but not necessarily in the same sense or to the same degree; certainly not that they are identical, nor that one implies the other. The phraseology positively forbids such a confusion of the two.

3. The association herb of baptism with a spiritual change is no more emphatic than in several other passages similarly laying down the conditions of Christianity — e.g. “Teach all nations, baptizing them” (Mat 28:19); “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved” (Mar 16:16; but note the omission in the clause following, “He that believeth not shall be damned”); “Repent and be baptized every one of you” (Act 2:38); “Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins” (22:16).

4. Our Lord himself dispensed with baptism in the admission of at least one member into his kingdom, namely, the dying thief (Luk 23:42-43).

5. Christ certainly does mean to attach importance to water-baptism as an initiative rite into his Church or kingdom. The body of believers exists under two aspects, the visible and the invisible — the outward or nominal, and the inward or real. Baptism is as imperative a mark of admission to the former as spiritual new birth is to entrance into the latter. In order to full recognition as a member of both, the two acts are truly essential. This doctrine, which orthodox ecclesiastics have always maintained, is thus strictly in accordance with the tenor of the text in question.

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

## Regensburg[[@Headword:Regensburg]]

             SEE RATISBON.

## Reggio, Isaac Samuel[[@Headword:Reggio, Isaac Samuel]]

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

## Regina Coeli[[@Headword:Regina Coeli]]

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

## Reginald (1)[[@Headword:Reginald (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was a Norwegian, and bishop of the Isles about 1181. Sec Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 298.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was consecrated bishop of the Isles in 1217. He died about 1225. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 299.

## Regino[[@Headword:Regino]]

             born at Altrip on the Rhine, near Spires, was a monk in the monastery of Priim, and elected abbot there in 892. In 899 lie resigned his position and went to Treves, where archbishop Ratbod made him head of the monastery of St. Martin. Regino died in 915. He is the author of, Libri duo de Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis et Religione Christiana (best edition by Wasserschleben, Leipsic, 1840): — De Harmonica Institutione (printed in Coussemaker's Scriptores de Musica Medii Avi, Paris, 1867, 2:1-73). But his greatest work is the Chronicon, the first world's history written in Germany, comprising the time from the birth of Christ to the year 906. The best edition of the Chronicon is found in Monumenta Sacra, 1:536-612 (Germ. transl. by Dummler, in Geschichtschreiber der deutschen Vorzeit, Berlin, 1857, volume 14, part 30). See Wattenbach, Deutsche Geschichtsquellen (4th ed. Berlin, 1877), 1:211-214, 297 sq.; Ermisch, Die Chronik des Regino bis 813 (Gottingen, 1872); Plitt-Herzog, Real- Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Region-round-about[[@Headword:Region-round-about]]

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

## Regionarii[[@Headword:Regionarii]]

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

## Regis, Jean Baptiste De[[@Headword:Regis, Jean Baptiste De]]

             a French Jesuit and geographer, was born at Istres, in Provence, about 1665, and was sent as a missionary to China about 1700. His scientific attainments gained him a place at court and the favor of the emperor Hang- he, who, in 1707, placed him at the head of a commission of Jesuits to  make a survey and draw up a map of the Chinese empire. His labors were interrupted in 1724 when the emperor Yung-ching proscribed the Christian religion. He wrote a full history of his labors, a condensation of which may be found in Du Halde's Description de la Chine. He translated into Latin the Yih-kinq, edited by Julius Mohl (Stuttgart and Tubingen, 1834, 2 vols.). The MS. is in the National Library, Paris.

## Regis, Jean Francois[[@Headword:Regis, Jean Francois]]

             a French Jesuit, was born January 31, 1597, at Font-Couverte, Narbonne. In 1616 he joined his order, and intended to go as missionary to Canada. Being, however, denied this by his superiors, he devoted himself entirely to missionary work at home and in churches, chapels, hospitals, prisons, and, in fact, everywhere he preached and exhorted. Regis died January 31, 1640, and was canonized by Clement XII, June 16, 1737. See Danbenton, Vie de Francois Reis; Petit-Didier, Les Saints Enleves et Restitues aux Jesuites; Monlezun, Histoire de l'Eglise de Notre-Dame du Puy (1854); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Registers[[@Headword:Registers]]

             SEE DIPTYCHS.

## Registers Of Ordination[[@Headword:Registers Of Ordination]]

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

## Registers Parish[[@Headword:Registers Parish]]

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

## Regium Donum[[@Headword:Regium Donum]]

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

## Regium Donum, Irish[[@Headword:Regium Donum, Irish]]

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

1. The General Assembly, comprising the two bodies formerly known as the Synod of Ulster and the Synod of Seceders.

2. The Secession Synod.

3. The Remonistrants, or Unitarian Synod of Ulster.

4. The Presbytery of Antrim.

5. The Synod of Munster, Unitarian.

6. The Presbytery of Munster, orthodox.

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

## Regius[[@Headword:Regius]]

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

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

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

In appearance, Regius was a man of medium height and spare and delicate figure, easy and yet resolute in his bearing, and characterized by an air of intelligence and moral earnestness. His writings breathe the same Christian  spirit which belonged to his personality. They number ninety-seven different works, which were published at Nuremberg in 1562, the German in four parts, and the Latin in three. His exegetical works deserve attention on account of their practical aim, and the thoroughness and skill with which the sense of Scripture is developed in them; and, in addition, the following are worthy of note: Formulae quaedam caute et citra Scandalum Loquendi de Prcecipuis Christianoe Doctrinoe Locis (1535), which has almost reached the position of a symbolical book: — Catechismus Minor (1536), and Catechismus Major (1537), which are peculiar in that the questions are placed in the mouth of the pupil, and the answers are assigned to the teacher: — Erkldrung der wolf Artikel des christlichen Glaubens (1523 ); and others, among them several books on Church discipline, which have been often reprinted.

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

## Regius Codex[[@Headword:Regius Codex]]

             SEE PARIS MANUSCRIPT.

## Regnum[[@Headword:Regnum]]

             a name for the tiara or diadem of the popes, encircled with three crowns. It is (says Innocent III. cir. 1200) the imperial crown, representing the pope's power as plenary and absolute over all the faithful. According to some authors, Hormisdas first wore a crown which had been sent to him as a mark of fealty by the emperor Anastasius, to whom Clovis had presented it in 550, while some refer it to a gift of Constantine to pope Sylvester. At the entrance of a church the pope, when borne on his litter, laid aside the regnum and put on a precious mitre, but resumed the former when he left  the building. Paul II made a new regnum, and enriched it with precious stones, when its use had long lain dormant. At first it was a tall round or conical cap, ending in a round ball, and wreathed with a single gold crown, representing regal and temporal power. It is mentioned in the 11th century. In the 9th century, on mosaics, Nicholas I is represented wearing two circles, the lower labelled “The crown of the kingdom, from God's hand,” and the upper inscribed “The crown of empire, from St. Peter's hand.” Boniface VIII (1294-1303) added a second or spiritual crown, while Benedict XII (1334), others say John XII or Urban V, contributed the third coronet of sacerdotal sovereignty, and about that time the ornament assumed an oval form, and was no longer straight-sided. The patriarch of Constantinople wears two crowns on the tiara. On putting on the tiara, the cardinal-deacon says to the pope, “Receive the tiara, adorned with three crowns, and know that thou art father of kings and princes, the ruler of the world.” The crowns represent the three realms of heaven, earth, and purgatory, according to Baur; but as Jewel explains it, the three divisions of the earth — Europe, Asia, and Africa. Pope Adrian VI's effigy at Viterbo has no crowns on the tiara. SEE TIARA.

## Regula Fidei[[@Headword:Regula Fidei]]

             SEE FAITH, RULE OF.

## Regular Canons[[@Headword:Regular Canons]]

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

## Regular Clerks[[@Headword:Regular Clerks]]

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

## Regulars Or Regulares[[@Headword:Regulars Or Regulares]]

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

## Rehabiah[[@Headword:Rehabiah]]

             (Heb. Rechabyah', רְחִבְיָה, enlarged by Jehovah; also, in the prolonged form, Rechabya'hu, רְחִבְיָהוּ, 1Ch 24:21; 1Ch 26:25; Sept. ῾Ρααβιά or ῾Ρααβίας, v. r. ῾Ραβιά or ῾Ραβίας), the only son of Eliezer, son of Moses; himself the father of many sons (1Ch 23:17), of whom the eldest was Isshiah (1Ch 24:21) or Jeshaiah (1Ch 26:25). B.C. post 1618.

## Rehearse[[@Headword:Rehearse]]

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

## Rehfuss, Carl[[@Headword:Rehfuss, Carl]]

             Dr., a Jewish rabbi, was born Feb. 9, 1792, at Altdorf, in Breisgau. When fifteen years of age he went to Yverdun, in Switzerland, to attend the lectures at the Pestalozzi Institution there. He then entered the lyceum at Rastatt, and after due preparation was enabled to attend the lectures at the  Heidelberg University, where he was promoted, Aug. 25, 1834, as doctor of philosophy. Having completed his studies, he was appointed preacher of the Jewish congregation at Heidelberg, where he died, Feb. 18, 1842. He translated into German the ס חחיים, a Jewish ritual used for the sick, etc. (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1834). Besides, he published a number of school- books. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:142 sq.; Kayserling, Bibliothek judischer Kanzzelredner, i, 358 sq.; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Handbuch, p. 115; Zunz, Die Monatstage des Kalendejiahres (Berlin, 1872; Engl. transl. by Rev. B. Pick in the Jewish Messenger, N. Y. 1874-75); Allgemeine Zeitung des Judenthums, 1842, p. 248. (B. P.)

## Rehhoff, Johann Andreas[[@Headword:Rehhoff, Johann Andreas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Tondern, August 24, 1809. He studied at Kiel and Berlin, was for some time archdeacon at his native place, and in 1837 provost and first pastor at Apenrade. In 1851 Rehhoff was called to Hamburg as pastor primarius of St. Michael. In 1870 he was senior of the Hamburg ministerium, resigned in 1879 his pastorate, and died at Kiel, January 9, 1883. Rehhoff published some homiletical works, for which see Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; also Zutm Gedachtniss an Dr. Johann A. Rehhold (Hamburg, 1883). (B.P.)

## Rehkopf, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Rehkopf, Johann Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Leipsic, January 20, 1733. He studied at the university of his native place, was in 1761 deacon at Zwickau, in 1764 archdeacon at Reichenbach, in 1769 doctor and professor of theology at Helmstadt, in 1778 superintendent at Dresden, and died March 15, 1789. He published, Vitas Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum (Leipsic, 1757-59): — De Zwickaviensibus Litterarum Orientalium Studio Claris (1763): — Janua Hebraeas Linguae Veteris Testamenti Olim Adornata a Reneccio (1769): — De Trinitate (1770): — Michae et Mathaei in Loco Natali Messiae Consensus (1772): — De Vate Scripturae Sacrae (eod.): — Legatus Fecialis ad Malach. 3 (1773): — De Persona Jesu Christi Scripturarum Novi Testamenti Expositio (1775), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rehob[[@Headword:Rehob]]

             (Heb. Rechob', רְחֹב[twice רְחוֹב, 2Sa 10:8; Neh 10:11], a street, from its width; Sept. ῾Ραάβ v. r. ῾Ροώβ, etc.), the name of two men and also of three places in the north of Palestine.

1. The father of the Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom David smote at the Euphrates (2Sa 8:3; 2Sa 8:12). B.C. ante 1043. Josephus (Ant. 7:5, 1) calls him Araiis (Α᾿ράος), and the old Latin version Arachus. The name possibly had some connection with the district of Syria called Rehob, or Beth-rehob (2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8).

2. A Levite who sealed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:11). B.C. 410.

3. The northern limit of the exploration of the spies who explored Canaan (Num 13:21). It is specified as being “as men come unto Hamath,” or, as the phrase is elsewhere rendered, “at the entrance of Hamath,” i.e. at the commencement of the territory of that name, by which in the early books of the Bible the great valley of Lebanon, the Bika'ah of the prophets, and the Bfuka'a of the modern Arabs, seems to be roughly designated. This, and the consideration of the improbability that the spies went farther than the upper end of the Jordan valley, seems to fix the position of Rehob as not far from Tell el-Kady and Banias. This is conifirmed by the statement of Jdg 18:28, that Laish or Dan (Tell el- Kady) was “in the valley that is by Beth-rehob.” Dr. Robinson (Later Bib. Res. p. 371) proposes to identify it with Hunin, an ancient fortress in the mountains north-west of the plain of Huleh, the upper district of the Jordan valley. But since the names Ruheib, of a valley, and Deir-Rabba, of an Arab ruin, are found near Bhnias, Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 391)  prefers that vicinity. There is no reason to doubt that this Rehob or Beth- rehob was identical with the place mentioned under both names in 2Sa 10:6; 2Sa 10:8, in connection with Maacah, which was also in the upper district of the Huleh. SEE BETH-REHOB.

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

5. Asher contained another Rehob (Jos 19:30).

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

## Rehoboam[[@Headword:Rehoboam]]

             (Heb. Rechabdmn, רְחִבְעָם, enlarger of the people [see Exo 34:24, and comp. the name Εὐρύδημος]; Sept. ῾Ροβοάμ; Josephus, ῾Ροβόαμος, Ant. 8:8,1), the only son of Solomon, by the Ammonitish princess Naamah (1Ki 14:21; 1Ki 14:31), and his successor (1Ki 11:43). — Rehoboam's mother is distinguished by the title “the (not ‘an,' as in the A.V.) Ammonite.” She was therefore one of the foreign women whom Solomon took into his establishment (11:1). In the Sept. (1Ki 12:24, answering to 1Ki 14:31 of the Hebrew text) she is stated to have been the “daughter of Ana (i.e. Hanun) the son of Nahash.” If this is a translation of a statement which once formed part of the Hebrew text, and may be taken as authentic history, it follows that the Ammonitish war into  which Hanun's insults had provoked David was terminated by a realliance. Rehoboam was born B.C. 1014, when Solomon was but twenty years old, and as yet unanointed to the throne. His reign was noted for the great political schism which he occasioned, and which continuled to the end of both lines of monarchy. From the earliest period of Jewish history we perceive symptoms that the confederation of thettribes was but imperfectly cemented. The powerful Ephraim could never brook a position of inferiority. Throughout the book of Judges (Jdg 8:1; Jdg 12:1) the Ephraimites show a spirit of resentful jealousy when any enterprise. is undertaken without their concurrence and active participation. From them had sprung Joshua, and afterwards (by his place of birth) Samuel might be considered theirs; and though the tribe of Benjamin gave to Israel its first king, yet it was allied by hereditary ties to the house of Joseph, and by geographical position to the territory of Ephraim, so that up to David's accession the leadership was practically in the hands of the latter tribe. SEE EPHRAIM, TRIBE OF.

But Judah always threatened to be a formidable rival. During the earlier history, partly from the physical structure and situation of its territory (Stanley, Syr. and Palest. p. 162), which secluded it from Palestine just as Palestine by its geographical character was secluded from the world, it had stood very much aloof from the nation SEE JUDAH, TRIBE OF, and even after Saul's death, apparently without waiting to consult their brethren, “the men of Judah came and anointed David king over the house of Judah” (2Sa 2:4), while the other tribes adhered to Saul's family, thereby anticipating the final disruption which was afterwards to rend the nation permanently into two kingdoms. But after seven years of disaster a reconciliation was forced upon the contending parties; David was acknowledged as king of Israel, and soon after, by fixing his court at Jerusalem and bringing the tabernacle there, he transferred from Ephraim the greatness which had attached to Shechem as the ancient capital and to Shiloh as the seat of the national worship. In spite of this he seems to have enjoyed great personal popularity among the Ephraimites, and to have treated many of them with special favor (1Ch 12:30; 1Ch 27:10; 1Ch 27:14), yet this roused the jealousy of Judah, and probably led to the revolt of Absalom (q.v.). Even after that perilous crisis was passed, the old rivalry broke out afresh and almost led to another insurrection (2Sa 20:1, etc. [comp. Psa 78:60; Psa 78:67, etc., in illustration of these remarks]). Solomon's reign, from its severe taxes and other oppressions, aggravated the disecntent, and latterly, from its irreligious character, alienated the prophets and provoked the displeasure  of God. When Solomon's strong hand was withdrawn, the crisis came (B.C. 973). Rehoboam selected Shechem as the place of his coronation, probably as an act of concession to the Ephraimites, and perhaps in deference to the suggestions of those old and wise counsellors of his father whose advice he afterwards unhappily rejected. From the present Hebrew text of 1 Kings 12 the exact details of the transactions at Shechem are involved in a little uncertainty. The general facts, indeed, are clear. The people demanded a remission of the severe burdens imposed by Solomon, and Rehoboam promised them an answer in three days, during which time he consulted first his father's counsellors, and then the young men “that were grown up with him and which stood before him,” whose answer shows how greatly during Solomon's later years the character of the Jewish court had degenerated. Rejecting the advice of the elders to conciliate the people at the beginning of his reign, and so make them “his servants forever,” he returned as his reply, in the true spirit of an Eastern despot, the frantic bravado of his contemporaries, “My little finger shall be thicker than my father's loins. . . I will add to your yoke; my father hath chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions” (i.e. scourges furnished with sharp points; so in Latin, scorpio, according to Isidore Origg. v, 27], is “virga nodosa et aculeata, quia arcuato vulnere in corpus infligitur?' [Facciolati, s.v.]). Thereupon arose the formidable song of insurrection, heard once before when the tribes quarrelled after David's return from the war with Absalom:

“What portion have we in David?

What inheritance in Jesse's son?

To your tents, O Israel?

Now see to thy own house, O David!”

Rehoboam sent Adoram or Adoniram, who had been chief receiver of the tribute during the reigns of his father and his grandfather (1Ki 4:6; 2Sa 20:24), to reduce the rebels to reason, but he was stoned to death by them, whereupon the king and his attendants fled in hot haste to Jerusalem. So far all is plain, but there is a doubt as to the part which Jeroboam took in these transactions. According to 1Ki 12:3 he was summoned by the Ephraimites from Egypt (to which country he had fled from the anger of Solomon) to be their spokesman at Rehoboam's coronation, and actually made the speech in which a remission of burdens was requested. There is no real contradiction to this when we read in 1Ki 12:20 of the same chapter that after the success of the insurrection and  Rehoboam's flight, “when all Israel heard that Jeroboam was come again, they sent and called him unto the congregation and made him king.” We find in the Sept. a long supplement to this, 12th chapter, possibly ancient, containing-fuller details of Jeroboam's biography than the Hebrew. SEE JEROBOAM. In this we read that after Solomon's death he returned to his native place, Sarira in Ephraim, which he fortified, and lived there quietly, watching the turn of events until the long-expected rebellion broke out, when the Ephraimites heard (doubtless through his own agency) that he had returned, and invited him to Shechem to assume the crown. From the same supplementary narrative of the Sept. we might infer that more than a year must have elapsed between Solomon's death and Rehoboam's visit to Shechem, for, on receiving the news of the former event, Jeroboam requested from the king of Egypt leave to return to his native country. This the king tried to prevent by giving him his sisterin-law in marriage; but on the birth of his child Abijah, Jeroboam renewed his request, which was then granted. It is probable that during this year the discontent of the northern tribes was making itself more and more manifest, and that this led to Rehoboam's visit and intended inauguration. The comparative chronology of the reigns determines them both as beginning in this year.

On Rehoboam's return to Jerusalem he assembled an army of 180,000 men from the two faithful tribes of Judah and Benjamin (the latter transferred from the side of Joseph to that of Judah in consequence of the position of David's capital within its borders), in the hope of reconquering Israel. The expedition, however, was forbidden by the prophet Shemaiah, who assured them that the separation of the kingdoms was in accordance with God's will (1Ki 12:24). Still, during Rehoboam's lifetime peaceful relations between Israel and Judah were never restored (2Ch 12:15; 1Ki 14:30). Rehoboam now occupied himself in strengthening the territories which remained to him by building a number of fortresses of which the names are given in 2Ch 11:6-10, forming a girdle of “fenced cities” round Jerusalem. The pure worship of God was maintained in Judah, and the Levites and many pious Israelites from the North, vexed at the calf-idolatry introduced by Jeroboam at Dan and Bethel, in imitation of the Egyptian worship of Mnevis, came and settled in the southern kingdom and added to its power. But Rehoboam did not check the introduction of heathen abominations into his capital. The lascivious worship of Ashtoreth was allowed to exist by the side of the true  religion (an inheritance of evil doubtless left by Solomon), “images” (of Baal and his fellow-divinities) were set up, and the worst immoralities were tolerated (1Ki 14:22-24). These evils were punished and put down by the terrible calamity of an Egyptian invasion. Shortly before this time a change in the ruling house had occurred in Egypt. The twenty-first dynasty of Tanites, whose last king, Pisham or Psusennes, had been a close ally of Solomon (3:1; 7:8; 9:16; 10:28, 29), was succeeded by the twenty-second of Bubastites, whose first sovereign, Shishak (Sheshonk, Sesonchis, Sovuarmci), was himself connected, as we have seen, with Jeroboam. That he was incited by him to attack Judah is very probable. At all events, in the fifth year of Rehoboam's reign the country was invaded by a host of Egyptians and other African nations, numbering 1200 chariots, 60,000 cavalry, and a vast miscellaneous multitude of infantry (B.C. 969).

The line of fortresses which protected Jerusalem to the west and south was forced, Jerusalem itself was taken, and Rehoboam had to purchase an ignominious peace by delivering up all the treasures with which Solomon had adorned the Temple and palace, including his golden shields, 200 of the larger and 300 of the smaller size (10:16, 17), which were carried before him when he visited the Temple in state. We are told that after the Egyptians had retired, his vain and foolish successor comforted himself by substituting shields of brass, which were solemnly borne before him in procession by the body- guard, as if nothing had been changed since his father's time (Ewald: Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 3:348, 464). Shishak's success is commemorated by sculptures discovered bv Champollion on the outside of the great temple at Karnak, where among a long list of captured towns and provinces occurs the name Judah Malkah (kingdom of Judah). It is said that the features of the captives in these sculptures are unmistakably Jewish (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 2, 376, and Bamton Lectures, p. 126; Bunsen, Egypt, 3:242). After this great humiliation tle moral condition of Judah seems to have improved (2Ch 12:12), and the rest of Rehoboam's life to have been unmarked by any events of importance. He died B.C. 956, after a reign of seventeen years, having ascended the throne at the age of forty-one (1Ki 14:21 : 2Ch 12:13). In the addition to the Sept. already mentioned (inserted after 1Ki 12:24) we read that he was sixteen years old at his accession-a misstatement probably founded on a wrong interpretation of 2Ch 13:7 where he is called “young” (i. e new to his work, inexperienced) and “tender- hearted” (רִךְאּלֵבָב, wanting in resolution and spirit). He had eighteen wives, sixty concubines, twenty-eight sons, and sixty daughters. The wisest  thing recorded of him in Scripture is that he refused to waste away his sons' energies in the wretched existence of an Eastern zenana, in which we may infer, from his helplessness at the age of forty-one, that he had himself been educated, but dispersed them in command of the new fortresses which he had built about the country. Of his wives, Mahalath, Abihail, and Maachah were all of the royal house of Jesse. Maachah he loved best of all, and to her son Abijah he bequeathed his kingdom. See Kiesling, Hist. Rehabeami (Jena, 1753). SEE JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

## Rehoboth[[@Headword:Rehoboth]]

             [many Reho'both] (Heb. Rechoboth', רְחֹבוֹה [once רְהֹבֹת, Gen 10:11], wide places, i.e. streets, as in Pro 1:20, etc.), the name of three places.

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

‘Because now Jehovah hath made room for us

And we shall increase in the land.í”

The name was intended to indicate the fact that th patriarch had at length got space to rest in. Most of the ancient versions translate the word, though it mus evidently be regarded as a proper name. Isaac has left the valley of Gerar and its turbulent Inhabitant before he dug the well which le thu4 commemorates (Gen 26:22). From it he, in time, “went up” to Beershebf (Gen 26:23), an expression which is always used of motion towards the land of promise. The position of Geram has not been definitely ascertained, but it seems to havs lain a few miles to the south of Gaza and nearly due east of Beersheba. In this direction, therefore, if anywhere, the wells Sitnah, Esek, and Rehoboth should be searched for. The ancient Jewish tradition confines the events of this part of Isaac's life to a much narrower circle. The wells of the patriarchs were shown near Ashkelon in the time of Origen, Antoninus Martyr, and Eusebius (Reland, Paloest. p. 589); the Samaritan version identifies Gerar with Ashkelon; Josephus (Ant. i, 12, 1)  calls it “Gerar of Palestine,” i.e. of Philistia. It is a remarkable fact that the name clings to the spot still. In the wilderness of et-Tih, about twenty-three miles south-west of Beersheba, is a wady called er-Ruhaibeh, in which and on the adjoining heights are remains of antiquity thus described by Robinson: “In the valley itself is the ruin of a small rough building with a dome, built in the manner of a mosque. On the right of the path is a confused heap of hewn stones, the remains of a square building of some size, perhaps a tower. On the acclivity of the eastern hill we found traces of wells, a deep cistern, or rather cavern, and a fine circular threshing-floor, evidently antique. But on ascending the hill on the left of the valley we were astonished to find ourselves amid the ruins of an ancient city. Here is a level track of ten or twelve acres in extent entirely and thickly covered over with confused heaps of stones, with just enough of their former order remaining to show the foundations and form of the houses, and the course of some of the streets. The houses were mostly small, all solidly built of bluish limestone, squared and often hewn on the exterior surface. Many of the dwellings had each its cistern, cut in the solid rock; and these still remained quite entire. Once, as we judged upon the spot, this must have been a city of not less than twelve or fifteen thousand inhabitants” (Bib. Res. i, 106). This identification is adopted by Rowlands (in Williams, Holy City, i, 465), Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 343), Stewart (Tent and Khan, p. 343), and Bonar (Desert of Sinai, p. 316). Dr. Robinson could not find the well itself. Dr. Stewart found it “regularly built, twelve feet in circumference,” but “completely filled up.” Mr. Rowlands describes it as “an ancient well of living and good water.”

2. REHOBOTH THE CITY (Heb. Rechoboth' ‘Ir, עַיר רְחֹבֹת, i.e. Rehoboth City; Sept. ῾Ροωβὼθ πόλις v. r. ῾Ροωβώς; Vulg.platece civitates), one of the four cities built by Asshur, or by Nimrod in Asshur, according as this difficult passage is translated. The four were Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah (Gen 10:11). It has been supposed by recent commentators that these four constituted one great city. They argue that the first name, Nineveh, is the chief, and that the other three are subordinate. “He built Nineveh, with (taking not as a copulative, but as the sign of subordination) Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah.” From this it would follow that the four places formed a large composite city, or range of towns, to which the general name “Nineveh” was given (see Keil and Delitzsch, ad loc.). This appears to put too great a strain upon the passage; and it is better, because  more natural, to take them as distinct places. They were most probe ably not far distant from each other; and as Nineveh and Calah stood on the Tigris, the others may be looked for there also. The Samaritan seems to understand Sittace in South Assyria, which was thence called Sittacene (Ptolemy, 6:1, 2), and is different from the Mesopotamian Sittace near the Tigris (Xenoph. Anab. it ii, 4, .13; comp. Mannert, Geogr. v, ii, 383 sq.), oun the d site of the modern Old Bagdad. Ephrem has Adiabewe, a well- known district of Assyria; but not, as Michaelis supposes (Spicil. i, 243), also a city. Schulthess (Parad. a p. 117) refers it to the Euphrates, and considers it the same as Rehoboth Han-nahar (No. 3, below). In that case we must understand Assyria in a wide sense, as the Assyrian empire, which is improbable. Bochart gives a far-fetched supposition, resting on conjectural etymology (Phaleg, 4:21). Jerome, both in the Vule gate and in his Questiones ad Genesim (probably from Jewish sources), considers Rehoboth-ir as referring to Nineveh, and as meaning the “streets of the city.” The readings of the Targums of Jonathan, Jerusalem, and rabbi Joseph on Genesis and 1 Chronicles, viz. Platiah,-Platiuttha, are probably only transcriptions of the Greek s word πλατεῖαι, which; as found in the well-known ancient city Plataea, is the exact equivalent of Rehoboth. The name of Rahabeh is still attached to two places in the region of the ancient Mesopotamia. They lie, the one on the western and the other on the eastern bank of the Euphrates, a few miles below the confluence of the Khabtir. Both are said to contain extensive ancient remains. That on the eastern bank bears the affix of malik, or royal, and this Bunsen (Bibelwerk) and Kalisch (Genesis, p. 261) propose as the representative of Rehoboth. Its distance from Kalah-Sherghat and Nimrud (nearly 200 miles) is perhaps an obstacle to this identification. Sir H. Rawlinson (Athenaeum, April 15, 1854) suggests Selemiyah in the immediate neighborhood of Kalah, “where there are still extensive ruins of the Assyrian period,” but no subsequent discoveries appear to have confirmed this suggestion.

3. REHOBOTH BY THE RIVER (Heb. Rechoboth' hanNahar', רְחֹבוֹת הִנָּהִר, i. Rechoboth of the River; Sept. ῾Ροωβὼθ [Iv. r. ῾Ρωβὼθ] ἡ παρὰ πόταμον; Vulg. de fluvio Roboth, or Rohohoth, quc juxta anenem sita est), the city of a certain Saul or Shaul, one of the early kings of the Edomites (Gen 36:37; 1Ch 1:48). The affix “the river” fixes the situation of Rehoboth as on the Euphrates, emphatically “the river” to the inhabitants of Western Asia (see Gen 31:21; Gen 15:18; Deuteronomy i, 7; Exo 23:31). The Targum of Onkelos adds,  “Rehoboth, which is on the Phrat.” There is no reason to suppose that the limits of Edom ever extended to the Euphrates, and therefore the occurrence of the name in the lists of kings of Edom is possibly a trace of an Assyrian incursion of the same nature as that of Chedorlaomer and Amraphel. At all events, the kings of Edom were not all natives of that country. Schultens in his note (Index Geogr. in Vit. Salad. s.v. “Rahaba”) identifies it with Rehoboth of Gen 36:37; and this is the view of Bochart (Opp. i, 225), Winer, Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 1281), and others; but as the Euphrates was far distant from the site of Nineveh, there is a strong probability against this opinion. Rahabak is mentioned by Abulfeda. In his day there was a small village on the site. The name still remains attached to two spots on the Euphrates — the one, simply Rahabeh, on the right bank, eight miles below the junction of the Khabur and about three miles west of the river; the other four or five miles farther down on the left bank. The latter is said to be called Pahabeh-malik, i.e. “royal” (Kalisch, Kaplali), and is on this ground identified by the Jewish commentators with the city of Saul. The existence of the: second locality, however, rests but on slender foundation. It is shown on the map in Layard's Nineveh and Babylon, and is mentioned by the two Jewish authorities named above; but it does not appear on the map of colonel Chesney. The other locality is unquestionably authentic. Chesney says, “On the right bank of the Euphrates, at the north- western extremity of the plain of Shinar, and three and a half miles south- west of the town of Mavadin, are extensive ruins around a castle still bearing the name of Rehoboth” (1, 119; 2, 222).

## Rehum[[@Headword:Rehum]]

             (Heb. and Chald. Rechum', רְחוּם, compassionate; Sept. ῾Ρεούμ, but in Neh 3:17 ῾Ραούμ), the name of five men.

1. One of the “children of the province” who returned from the Babylonian captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezr 2:2). B.C. 536. In the parallel passage (Neh 7:7) he is called NEHUM.

2. One of the priests who returned from Babylon at the same time (Neh 12:3). B.C. 536. In a subsequent verse (Neh 12:15) he seems to be called HARIM SEE HARIM (q.v.).

3. A Persian officer in Samaria, joint author with Shimshai of a letter which turned Artaxerxes against the building-plans of the Jews (Ezra 4:8; 9, 17, 23). B.C. 535. “He was perhaps a kind of lieutenant-governor of the  province under the king of Persia, holding apparently the same office as Tatnai, who is described in Ezr 5:6 as taking part in a similar transaction, and is there called ‘the governor on this side the river.' The Chaldee title, בְּעֵלאּטְעֵם, bel-te4m, literally ‘lord of decree,' is left untranslated in the Sept. Βαλτάμ and the Vulg. Beelteem; and the rendering ‘chancellor' in the A.V. appears to have been derived from Kimchi and others, who explain it, in consequence of its connection with ‘scribe,' by the Hebrew word which is usually rendered ‘recorder.' This appears to have been the view taken by the author of 1Es 2:25, ὁ γράφων τὰ προσπίπτοντα, and by Josephus (Ant. 11:2, 1), ὁ πάντα τὰ πραττόμενα γράφων. The former of these seems to be a gloss, for the Chaldee title is also represented by Βεελτέθμος “

4. A Levite, son of Bani, and one of the builders of the wall of Jerusalem under Nehemiah (Neh 3:17). B.C. 445.

5. One of the chief Israelites who signed the covenant with Nehemiah (Neh 10:25). B.C. 410.

## Rei[[@Headword:Rei]]

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

## Reich[[@Headword:Reich]]

             GEORG, a German doctor of theology, was born in 1813, and died Oct. 1, 1862, as pastor of Reicheisheim, in Hesse. He wrote, Die Afferstehung des Urerrin als Heilsthatsache, with special reference to Schleiermacher (Darmstadt, 1845): Die Lehrfortbildung in der evangelisch- protestantischen Kirche, auf adm Grund den augsburgischen Confession (Hamburg ans Gotha, 1847) — Die evangelisch- lutherische Kirche im  Grossherzogthum Ressen (Stuttgart, 1855). See Zuchold Bibl. Theol. ii, 1043, 2355, 1369. (B. P.)

## Reichardt, John Christian[[@Headword:Reichardt, John Christian]]

             a minister of the Episcopal Church, vas born at Ruhrort, on the Rhine, in 1803. He was educated first at the public school in his native place, and afterwards pursued his studies at the gymnasium at Duisburg. Feeling a desire to devote himself to missionary work, he was recommended to the missionary society at Barmen, which received him, and he was sent by it to the excellent Janicke's Missionary Institution at Berlin. Janicke had no funds at command to enable him to send forth missionaries, but the missionary societies in England, in Holland, and elsewhere were thankful to avail themselves of those who had been trained by the venerable pastor in Berlin. In the year 1824 the London Society for Propagating the Gospel among the Jews appointed Mr. Reichardt for the mission in Poland, in connection with Mr. Becker, a former pupil of father Janicke. During 1825 and 1826 he travelled extensively through Poland; from 1827 to 1830 he was engaged in frequent missionary journeys in Holland and Bavaria, and in 1831 he was active, together with the late Rev. M. S. (afterwards bishop) Alexander, in preaching the Gospel to the Jews in London and the principal towns of England. From that time his permanent residence was at London, in prosecution of the missionary work in behalf of his society. In October, 1857, Mr. Reichardt left England on a special mission to Jerusalem, where he also remained for a time. After his return from Jerusalem, his time and efforts were mainly directed to the work of the society in England, with occasional visits to various missionary stations. His main work, however, was the revision of the text of the Hebrew New Test., which was printed and published several times, and in correcting for the press multiplied editions of the Old Test., which the London Society, as well as the British Bible Society. published. He also took part in the training of candidates for missionary employment, and, after he was permitted to labor until his death, March 31, 1873. In connection with his missionary work, he published a number of pamphlets, which have been translated by his fellow-laborers into Dutch, French, etc., viz. משיח בן דויד, or Proofs that Jesus of Nazareth is the Son of David (Lond. 1851, and often): — - משיח צמח ה, or Proofs that the Messiah, the Son of David, is also the Son of God (ibid. 1851, and often): — ה אחד שמע ישראל ה אלהינו, The Scriptural Doctrine of the God of Israel (ibid.  1851, and often):: — - שתי הבריתות, The Two Covenants, or Mosaism and Christianity (2d ed. ibid. 1857): — -Investitigaion of the Prophet Joel with Special Reference to the Coming Crisis (ibid. 1867). See Jewish Intelligencer (Lond.), 1851, p. 427 sq.; 1867, p. 34 sq.; May, 1873; Dibre Emeth, oder Stimme der Wahrheit (Breslau, 1873), p. 97 sq.; Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffing (1873), 10:228 sq.; Fiirst, Bibl. Jud. 3:143; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. ii, 1044. (B. P.)

## Reiche, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Reiche, Johann Georg]]

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

## Reichel, Gustav Theodor[[@Headword:Reichel, Gustav Theodor]]

             a Moravian minister, was born December 15, 1808, at Berthelsdorf, Saxony. In 1852 he was made a presbyter, and labored for some years at Sarepta, when, in 1857, he was made a member of the executive board of the Unitas Fratrum. For nearly twenty-four years he devoted his entire energy to the service of his Church, and his rich experience was of great value to the executive board, whose president he died, January 28, 1882, at Herrnhut. (B.P.)

## Reichel, John Frederick[[@Headword:Reichel, John Frederick]]

             a distinguished bishop of the Moravian Church, was born at Leuba, in Altenburg, Germany, May 16, 1731. His father and grandfather were both Protestant clergymen, and the latter was expelled from Bohemia on account of his faith. Reichel studied theology at the University of Jena, and entered the ministry of the Lutheran Church, but after a service of only four years he joined the Moravian communion, for which he had always  had a strong predilection. He labored in various capacities and in various countries until 1769, when he was elected to the executive board of the Unitas Fratrum, known as the Unity's Elders' Conference. In this body he remained for forty years. until his death. After his consecration to the episcopacy in 1775, he undertook many official visitations, extending them as far as the East Indies and the Cape of Good Hope. The most remarkable was that which he held in America in the midst of the Revolutionary War, from 1778 to 11782. He visited nearly all the Moravian churches of this country, in many of which the war had caused unfortunate agitations and strife, and succeeded in restoring peace. He died at Berthelsdorf, in Saxony, Nov. 17, 1809. (E. de S.)

## Reichhelm, Carl August Wilhelm[[@Headword:Reichhelm, Carl August Wilhelm]]

             a Reformed theologian of Germany, was born January 20, 1817, at Bromberg, and studied at Berlin, where he was assistant preacher at the cathedral for some time. In 1842 he was appointed; military preacher at Frankfort-on-the-Oder, in 1849 superintendent at Belzig, in 1853 first preacher of the Reformed Church at Frankfort, and died December 6, 1879, member of consistory. He published, Sinai, Predigten uber das Gesetz (Belzig, 1855): — Christus, die rechte Speise und der rechte Frank (Frankfurt, 1857), sermons on the fourth and fifth chapters of John. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reichlin, Meldegg, Carl Alexander Von[[@Headword:Reichlin, Meldegg, Carl Alexander Von]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born of Catholic parentage, at Gravenau, Bavaria, February 21, 1804. For some time professor at the  gymnasium, and afterwards of the University of Freiburg, he joined the evangelical Church, February 19, 1832, was in 1840 appointed professor at Heidelberg, and died in 1857. He was the author of, Die Theologie des Magier Manes, etc. (Frankfort, 1825): — Geschichte des Christenthums, incomplete (Freiburg, 1831): — Die mosaische Geschichte vum brennenden Dornbusche (Exo 3:1-4) erklart (1831): — Heinrich E.G. Paulus und seine Zeit (Stuttgart, 1853, 2 volumes), the best biography of the famous Heidelberg rationalist. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:119, 543, 642. (B.P.)

## Reid, Adam[[@Headword:Reid, Adam]]

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

## Reid, James Seaton, D.D[[@Headword:Reid, James Seaton, D.D]]

             an eminent minister of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, was a native of Lurgan, and the twenty-first child of his parents. He was ordained minister of Donegon, July 20, 1819, from which place he removed to Carrickfergus in 1823. In 1827 he was unanimously chosen moderator of the Synod of Ulster, and in 1830 was appointed its clerk. In 1838 he was chosen professor of ecclesiastical history of the Belfast Institution. In April 1841, he was nominated for the chair of ecclesiastical and civil history in the University of Glasgow, by the crown, which position he held until his death, March 26, 1851, in the fifty-third year of his age. He is the author of History of the Presbyterian. Church in Ireland (3 volumes 8vo). Dr. Reid spent about twenty years in collecting materials for the work, and putting it into print The first two volumes were published during his life. At his death he left, in MS., about seven chapters of the third volume. Dr. W.D. Killen was chosen to finish the work, which he did, and published the third and last volume in 1853. This work is a monument of historical research, and is valued not only for its ecclesiastical history, but also for reclaiming many civil facts which would otherwise have been lost.

## Reid, John Wilson[[@Headword:Reid, John Wilson]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cabarras Co., N. C., in 1807. He pursued his early studies amid many embarrassing circumstances. and his  literary and scientific studies chiefly under Dr. John Robinson, of North Carolina. In 1831 he removed to Georgia and opened a classical school, during which time he studied theology under the direction of S. K. Talmage, D.D., of Augusta, Ga., was licensed by Hopewell Presbytery in September, 1833, and soon after ordained by the same presbytery, and was subsequentIv connected with Olivet, South Liberty, Lincoliton, Double Branches, Salem, Woodstock, Bethany, and Lexington churches, and also as a general domestic missioniry agent. He died at his residence in Woodstock, Ga., July 11, 1867, Mr. Reid for about thirty years laboriously followed the occupation of teaching in connection with the exercise of his ministry. The village of Woodstock, Oglethorpe Co., Ga., was built up by the subject of this sketch and a few other gentlemen of wealth and intelligence, for the sake of social, educational, and religious privileges. For a few years Mr. Reid carried on simply a high-school; but his capacity, skill, and success in training young men rapidly increased his reputation: it was thought, therefore, advisable to secure still greater privileges by establishing a more regular organization. Consequently, quite a full literary, classical, and scientific curriculum was arranged in four divisions, and the school henceforth took the name of Philomathean Collegiate Institute. The change was made at the suggestion and by the aid of the Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, and the organization accomplished all that its friends expected. See Wilson, Presbyterian Historical Almanac, 1868, p. 365. (J. L. S.)

## Reid, Joseph[[@Headword:Reid, Joseph]]

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

## Reid, Numa Fletcher, D.D[[@Headword:Reid, Numa Fletcher, D.D]]

             a minister in the Methodist Episcopal Church South, son of Reverend James Reid, was born in Rockingham County, N.C., July 3, 1825. He was a boy of remarkable and unyielding integrity and filial affection; was educated at Emory and Henry College; began school-teaching in his eighteenth year at Thompsonville; in 1846 opened an academy at Wentworth, where he labored with great success for five years. He was licensed to preach in 1847, and travelled Wentworth Circuit two years as supply, and in 1851 entered the North Carolina Conference. His fields of  labor were: 1852-53, Tar River Circuit; 1854, Front Street, Wilmington; 1855-56, Raleigh Station; 1857, Greensboro' Station; 1858-59, presiding elder of Salisbury District; 1860-63, of Greensboro' District; 1864-67, of Raleigh District; 1868-71, of Greensboro' District; and in 1872 was again sent to Raleigh District, but ill health led him to exchange for, work or Greensboro' District, where he died, June 14, 1873. Dr. Reid was four times elected to the General Conference, and three times headed the list of delegates. In all the relations of life he was a model man. He was learned, logical, solicitous, and eminently successful. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1873, page 805.

## Reid, Robert[[@Headword:Reid, Robert]]

             a Scotch prelate, was born at Aikenhead, and was educated at St. Salvator's College. He was first sub-dean, in 1526 was nominated abbot of Kinloss, and in 1540 was made bishop of Orkney. He died at Dieppe, September 14, 1558. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 223.

## Reid, Thomas[[@Headword:Reid, Thomas]]

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

.

## Reid, William Shields[[@Headword:Reid, William Shields]]

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

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

             a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born in 1579 at Augsburg. He joined the Jesuits at Ingolstadt, taught theology and philosophy there and at Dillingen, and was in 1613 appointed courtpreacher to the apostate count-palatine, Wolfgang Wilhelm. In 1615 Reihing published at Cologne, Muri Civitatis Sanctiae etc., a kind of apology for his master's apostasy, which elicited rejoinders from the Lutheran theologians Balthasar Meisner and Matthias Hoe von Hoenegg, and from the Reformed theologian Bassecourt. Reihing, not satisfied with this apology, commenced to Romanize the Palatinate. But the careful study of the Bible, which he found necessary in order to dispute with the Protestants, had its influence. In the beginning of the year 1621 Reihing suddenly fled to Stuttgard, and joined the Evangelical Church November 23 of the same year. In 1622 he was made professor of theology at Tubingen, and died May 5, 1628. His writings are mostly polemical. See Oehler, in Mariott's Wahren- Protestanten, volume 3, 1854; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reily, James Ross[[@Headword:Reily, James Ross]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born in Meyerstown, Lebanon Co., Pa., Oct. 31, 1788. He began his theological studies with Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md., in 1809, was licensed in 1812, and became  pastor of churches in Lyken's Valley, Dauphin Co., Pa. In 1813 he was sent as an exploring missionary to North Carolina, after which he returned to his charge. He was called to Hagerstown, Md., in 1819; resigned in 1825, to accept the appointment of agent to go to Europe with a view of securing aid from the Reformed churches there for the endowment of the Theological Seminary ofthe German Reformed Church and collecting books for its library. In this he was successful, returning in November, 1826. He became pastor in York, Pa., in 1827. His health failing, he resigned in July, 1831. He now supported himself in a secular calling amid continued ill-health, and died March 18,1844. Mr. Reily was a man of great energy and originality, and withal somewhat eccentric; in the pulpit he was grave, earnest, and more than ordinarily eloquent. He preached in German and English.

## Reily, John[[@Headword:Reily, John]]

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

## Reimann, Jacob Freidrich[[@Headword:Reimann, Jacob Freidrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 22, 1668. He studied at different universities, was in 1692 rector at Osterwick, in 1693 at Halberstadt. In 1704 he was appointed pastor primarius at Ermsleben, in  the principality of Halberstadt, in 1714 cathedral preacher at Magdeburg, in 1717 superintendent: at Hildesheim, and died February 1, 1743. Reimann was a voluminous writer. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reimarus, Hermann Samuel[[@Headword:Reimarus, Hermann Samuel]]

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

## Reinaldus[[@Headword:Reinaldus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was a monk of Melrose when he was made bishop of the see of Ross in 1195. He died in 1213. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 185.

## Reinbeck, Johann Gustav[[@Headword:Reinbeck, Johann Gustav]]

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

## Reindl, Georg Karl Von[[@Headword:Reindl, Georg Karl Von]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born at Bamberg, November 3, 1803. For some time tutor of the Bavarian royal family, he was in 1847 appointed dean of the chapter of the episcopal diocese Munchen-Freising, and died at Munich, December 23, 1882. He wrote, Die Sendung des Propheten Jonas nach Niniveh (Bamberg, 1826): — Abriss der christlichen Kirchengeschichte fur Katholiken (1834): — Tempel der hauslichen Andacht (Ratisbon, 1841). (B.P.)

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

             a Lutheran divine, was born Jan. 22, 1668, at Grossmuhlingen, in Zerbst, and died Oct. 18,1752, at Weissenfels, where for about thirty years he had acted as rector of the academy. Reineccius was a voluminous writer, and his Dissertations, which he published as rector of Weissenfels, are still very valuable. Besides his edition of Lankisch's Concordantice Bibliorum Germanico-Hebraico-Graecoe (Lips. 1718), and of Vetus Testamentum Graecum ex Versione Septuaginta Interpretum, una cunt Libris Apocryphis, etc. (ibid. 173057), he published תורה נביאים וכתובים, i.e. Biblia Hebraica, ad Optimorum Codicum et Editionum Fidemn Recensita, etc. (ibid. 1725). In the preface we are told, as is already indicated in the title-page, that in editing this Bible MSS. have been perused, but their use is nowhere pointed out. An alphabetical table of the Parashioth and a table of the Haphtaroth are given at the end. The type is correct. A second edition of the Hebrew Bible was published in 1739, which is but a reprint of the first, repeating even its mistakes, and making still greater ones. A third edition was published in 1756, after Reineccius's death, by C. G. Pohl, who also wrote the preface, in which he speaks of the changes made by him. In 1793, Doderlein and Meissner published Reineccius's Bible Cum Variis Lectionibus ex Ingenti Codicum Copia a C. Kennicotto et J. B. de Rossi Collatorum, which is very valuable. It was republished by Knapp (Halle, 1818). Reineccius also wrote, Index Memorialis, quo Voces Hebraicoe et Chaldaicoe V. T. Omnnes, etc. (Lips. 1723, and often),  which is appended to some editions of his Hebrew Bible: — Manuale Biblicum ex Concordantiis Graecis Adornatum in quo Voces Graecoe Onnes in LXX Interpretum Versionze Bibliorum Graeca et in Apocryphis V. T., nec non in Textu Originali Graeco N.T. Occurrentes, etc. (ibid. 1734): — Biblia Sacra Quadrilinguia V. T. Hebr. giving the Hebrew, Greek (according to Grabe's text), the German of Luther, and Latin translation of Seb. Schmid, 3 vols., the three containing the Apocrypha in Greek, Latin, and German (ibid. 1751): — Janua Hebraico Linguae V. T. etc. (ibid. 1704; last ed. by Rehkopf, 1788). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:144 sq.; Rosenmuller, Handbuch fur die Literatur, i, 236 sq.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, i, 35, 39, 47, 120, 321, 527, 591; ii, 726; Theol. Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Carpzov, Critica Sacra (2d ed. 1748), p. 408, 425; Kitto, Cyclop. s.v. (B. P.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Salzwedel in 1571. He studied at Wittenberg, was for some time pastor at Tangermiinde, and in 1601 provost at Berlin. In 1609 he was called to Hamburg, and in 1611 was appointed inspector of the newly-founded gymnasium. Reineccius died in June, 1613. He wrote, Panoplia sive Amatura Theologica (Wittenberg, 1609): — Artificiuni Disputandi (eod.) — Clavis Sanctae Theologiae (Hamburg, 1611, 2 volumes): — Veteris ac Novi Testamenti Convenientia et Differentia (1612): — Calvinianorum Ortus, Cursus et Exitus (eod.). See Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop, s.v. (B.P.)

## Reinerding, Franz Heinrich[[@Headword:Reinerding, Franz Heinrich]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born September 16, 1814, at Damme, Oldenburg. He studied at Munster and at the "Collegium' Romanum" in Rome. In 1838 he was a doctor of philosophy, in 1840 he received holy orders, and in 1842 took the degree of a doctor of theology. For some time professor at the gymnasium in Vechta, Oldenburg, Rendering was in 1851 professor at Fulda, in 1858 at St. Cuthbert's College in Esh, England, in 1863 again at Fulda, and died February 25,  1880. He published, Der Papst und die Bibel (Munster, 1855): — Die Principien des kirchlichen Rechtes in Alfhebung der Mischehen (1853): — Clemens XIV. und die Afhbebung der Gesellschaft Jesu (Augsburg, 1854): — Der heilige Bonifacius als Apostel der Deutschen (1855): — Theologiae Fundamentalis Tractatus Duo (Munster, 1864): — Beitrage zur Liberius und Honorius frage (1865): — Gedanken uber die philosophischen Studien (Vienna, 1866). (B.P.)

## Reinhard, Franz Volkmar[[@Headword:Reinhard, Franz Volkmar]]

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

## Reinhard, Lorenz[[@Headword:Reinhard, Lorenz]]

             a German doctor of theology, was born Feb. 22,1700, at Hellingen, in Franconia. After the completion of his studies, he was first tutor and afterwards professor at the gymnasium in Hildburghausen. In 1727 he was called as deacon and professor of the gymnasium to Weimar, and in 1744 as superintendent to Buttstadt, where he died, Nov. 15,1752. He wrote, De Libro Sapientice non Canonico, etc. (Wittenb. 1719): — Die Theologie der Patriarchen vor und nach der Suindfluth, etc. (Hamb. 1737): — Observationes Philol. exeg. in Evangel. Marci Selectissimoe (Lips. 1737): — Breviar. Controversiar. cum Reformatis, una cum Breviario Controversiar. cum Arminianis (Weimar, 1735): — Chronotaxis Cantici Canticorum Salomonis, etc. (ibid. 1741): — Commentatio de Assapho,  etc. (ibid. 1742): — Erklarung und Zergliederung des Buches Hiob, etc. (Leips. 1749-50). See Winer, Handb. der theol. Literatur, i, 247, 35.3; ii, 727; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3:147. (B. 1.,)

## Reinhard, Michael Heinrich[[@Headword:Reinhard, Michael Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born October 18, 1676. He studied at Wittenberg, was in 1699 con-rector at Meissen, in 1700 rector at Hildburghausen, in 1713 preacher at Pretsch, in 1721 superintendent at Sondershausen, in 1730 court-preacher at Weissenfels, and died January 1, 1732. He published, De Confessione Tripolitama (Wittenberg, 1694): — De Cibis Hebraeorum Prohibitis (1697): — De Sepultura Animalium Hebraeis Usitata (eod.): — Elementa Linguae Hebraea (2d ed. Hildburghausen, 1719): — De Sacco et Cinere ex Antiquitate Hebraea (1698): — Ο᾿ργανοφαλάκιον Musicum Codicis Hebraei (eod.): — Pentas Conatuum Sacrorum (1709): — De Variantibus Novi Testamenti Lectionibus a Millio Alusque Collectis ad Matthew 1 (1711): — De Liturgia Ecclesiae Evangelicae, etc. (1721). See Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:8, 332; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Reinke, Laurentius[[@Headword:Reinke, Laurentius]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born February 6, 1797, at Langforden, Oldenburg. He studied at Munster and Bonn, took holy orders in 1822, and commenced his academical career at Munster in 1827. In 1831 he was professor, in 1834 doctor of theology, and in 1847 of philosophy, the latter degree being conferred on him "honoris causa." In 1852 Reinke was made capitular, in 1862 honorary member of the "Societe litteraire" of the Louvain University, in 1865 honorary member of the college of doctors of the Vienna theological faculty, and in 1866 "consultor congregationis de propaganda fide pro negotiis ritus orientalis." Reinke died June 4, 1879. He wrote, Exegesis Critica in Iesaiae cap. 52:13-53:12 (Munster, 1836): — Exegesis Critica in Iesaice cap. 2:2-4 (1838): — Die Weissagung von der Jungfrau und vom Immanuel (1848): — Ueber das  zukunftige gluckliche Loos des Stammes Juda (1849): — Beitrage zur Erklarung des alten Testaments (1851-72, 8 volumes): — Der Prophet Malachi (Giessen, 1856): — Die messianischen Psalmen (1857-58, 2 volumes): — Kurze Zusammenstellung aller Abweichungen vom hebr. Text in der Psalmenubersetzung der LXX. Und Vulgata, etc. (1858): — Die messianischen Weissagungen bei den grossen und kleinen Propheten des Alten Testaments (1859-62, 4 volumes): — Zur Kritik der alteren Versionen des Propheten Nahum (Miinster, 1867): — Der Prophet Haggai (1868): — Der Prophet Zephanja (eod.): — Dea Prophet Habakuk (1870): — Der Prophet Micha (1874). (B.P.)

## Reinmund, J.F., D.D[[@Headword:Reinmund, J.F., D.D]]

             a Lutheran minister, spent his boyhood and early manhood in Lancaster, Ohio, to which place he removed with his parents when thirteen years of age. His education, classical and theological; was secured at Wittenberg College. Findlay was the scene of his first pastoral labor. From Findlay he went to Lancaster, from which, after a successful pastorate, he removed, in 1868, to Springfield, where he was employed as superintendent of public schools. In 1873 he received and accepted a call to Lebanon, Pennsylvania. Dr. Reinmund was a member of the committee of the General Synod that revised the Hymn and Tune Book. In the hope of restoring his failing health he went to Jacksonville, Florida, but never returned. He died April 26, 1880. See Lutheran Observer, May 7, 1880.

## Reins[[@Headword:Reins]]

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

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

## Reischl, Wilhelm Carl[[@Headword:Reischl, Wilhelm Carl]]

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

## Reiser, Anton[[@Headword:Reiser, Anton]]

             a German theologian, was born at Augsburg, March 7, 1628. He was first preacher at Schemnitz, and in 1659 became pastor of the Lutheran church at Presburg. Having in 1672 espoused Calvinism, he was thrown into prison and at length banished. Eventually, however, he served as rector of the gymnasium at Augsburg, preacher at Oeringen, and after 1678 as pastor of the Church of St. James at Hamburg, where he died, April 27,  1686. He Was the author of a number of theological treatises, enumerated in Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Reiske, Johann[[@Headword:Reiske, Johann]]

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

## Reissmann, Johann Valentin Von[[@Headword:Reissmann, Johann Valentin Von]]

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

## Reiter, Ernst Anton[[@Headword:Reiter, Ernst Anton]]

             a Roman Catholic priest, was born in 1821 at Arnsberg. He received holy orders in 1846, and came in 1854 as missionary to the United States. In 1859 he was appointed-pastor of the German church of the Trinity at Boston, Mass., and died May 5, 1873, at Erie, Pa. He wrote a very important work on the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church of the United States, entitled Schenatismus der katholischen deutschen Geistlichkeit in den Ver. Staaten Nordamerikas (N. Y. 1869). See  Literarischer Handweiserfiur das katholische Deutschland, 1869, p. 465 sq.; 1873, p. 271. (B. P.)

## Reiter, William[[@Headword:Reiter, William]]

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

## Reithmayr, Franz Xaver[[@Headword:Reithmayr, Franz Xaver]]

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

## Rekem[[@Headword:Rekem]]

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

1. (Sept. ῾Ροκόμ; A.V. Rakem, the name being “in pause,” ר קֶם.) Brother of Ulam, and a descendant of Machir, the son of Manasseh, by his wife Maachah; .apparently a son of Sheresh (1Ch 7:16). B.C. ante 1619.

2. (Sept. ῾Ροκόμ v.r. ῾Ρεκόμ.) One of the five kings of the Midianites slain by the Israelites along with Balaam (Num 31:8; Jos 13:21). B.C. 1618.

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

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

## Rekemis[[@Headword:Rekemis]]

             thought by Tristram (Bible Places, page 122), to be the present village of Ain Karim, about four miles west of Jerusalem.

## Rekesh[[@Headword:Rekesh]]

             SEE HORSE.

## Reland, Adriaan[[@Headword:Reland, Adriaan]]

             a celebrated Orientalist, was born July 17, 1676, at Ryp, a village in Northern Holland, where his father was pastor. He early devoted himself to the study of Oriental languages under Leusden, with the aid of Henry Sicke. After staying six years for this purpose at Utrecht, he went to Leyden to finish his theological studies. He was soon afterwards offered a professor's chair at Linigen, but he preferred to return to his aged father. In 1699 he was made professor of philosophy and Oriental languages at Harderwivck, and two years afterwards was called to teach Oriental languages and ecclesiastical antiquities at Utrecht, a position which he filled to the end of his days, having in 1713 refused a professor's chair at Franeker, and in 1716 another at Leyden. He died of small-pox, Feb. 5, 1718. Reland is admitted to have been by far the greatest Orientalist of his  day, and his writings display exhaustive learning; the most painstaking accuracy, and sound judgment. He was also not lacking in imagination, as some of his earlier prolusions show. To these admirable qualities he added great affability of manners and a noble sweetness of character. Of his numerous writings we here mention only the most important: Analecta Rabbinica (Ultraj. 1702): — De Religione Mohammnedica (ibid.1705 andlater): — Dissertationes Miscellaneoe (ibid. 1707): — Antiquitates Veterum Hebraeorum (ibid. 1708): — De Numis Vet. Hebraeorum (ibid. 1709): — Palestina ex Monumentis Veteribus Illustrata (ibid. 1714), a work which in its way can never be superseded: — De Spoliis Templi (Traject. 1716): — Elenchus Philologicus (Ultraj. 1709). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Relic-case[[@Headword:Relic-case]]

             SEE RELIQUARY.

## Relics[[@Headword:Relics]]

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

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

Relics of saints were regarded as the palladia of cities, as St. Martin's body was carried out to the gates of Tours in 845 to repel a siege by the Danes. St. Werburgh's relics were borne in procession to quell a fire at Chester, and the canons bore them through the diocese to invite alms for the erection of Salisbury Cathedral. At Lichfield the bells were rung at their departure and return. In the 6th century the custom of swearing upon  relics, as later upon the Gospels, began. Relics were, and still are, preserved on the altars whereon mass is celebrated, a square hole being made in the middle of the altar large enough to receive the hand, and therein is deposited the relic, being first wrapped in red silk and enclosed in a leaden box. In Catholic countries these relics are popularly esteemed the most precious treasures of the churches, and in earlier times they had even a high marketable value, large sums having been often raised by necessitous princes by the sale or mortgage of pieces of the “true cross,” etc. Before the Reformation relics were in demand in Scotland, and their sale was a fertile source of revenue to the monks. They were forbidden to be brought into England by several statutes, and justices were empowered to search houses for them and to deface and destroy them when found. This folly has not been without learned and labored defence, antiquity and Scripture both having been appealed to in its support. Bellarmine cites the following passages: Exo 13:19; Deu 34:6; 2Ki 13:21; 2Ki 23:16-18; Isa 11:10; Mat 9:20-22; Act 5:12-15; Act 19:11-12. But there is no doubt that the worship of relics is an absurdity, without the guarantee of Scripture, directly contrary to the practice of the primitive Church, and irreconcilable with common-sense. Latin monographs uipon relics and relic-worship have been written by Cellarius (Helmst. 1656), Jung (Hanov. 1783), Kortholt (1680), Morellus (Rome, 1721), Steger (Leips. 1688), Batti (1655), Kiesling, Rambach (Hale, 1722). See Barnum, Romanism as It Is; Methodist Quar. Rev. Oct. 1866; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist.; Neander, Hist. of Christian Church.

## Relief Synod[[@Headword:Relief Synod]]

             (or CHURCH). SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCHES OF.

## Religion[[@Headword:Religion]]

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

Religion has been divided into natural and revealed. By natural religion is meant that knowledge, veneration, and love of God, and the practice of those duties to him, our fellow-creatures, and ourselves, which are  discoverable by the right exercise of our rational faculties, from considering the nature and perfections of God, and our relation to him and to one another. By revealed religion is understood that discovery which he has made to us of his mind and will in the Holy Scriptures. As respects natural religion, some doubt whether, properly speaking, there can be any such thing; since, through the fall. reason is so depraved that man, without revelation, is under the greatest darkness and misery, as may be easily seen by considering the history of those nations who are destitute of it, and who are given up to barbarism, ignorance, cruelty, and evils of every kind. So far as this, however, may be observed, the light of nature can give us no proper ideas of God, nor inform us what worship will be acceptable to him. It does not tell us how man became a fallen, sinful creature, as he is, nor how he can be recovered. It affords us no intelligence as to the immortality of the soul, the resurrection of the body, and a future state of happiness and misery. The apostle, indeed, observes that the Gentiles have the law written on their hearts, and are a law unto themselves; yet the greatest moralists among them were so blinded as to be guilty of, and actually to countenance, the greatest vices. Such a system, therefore, it is supposed, can hardly be said to be religious which leaves man in such uncertainty, ignorance, and impiety. SEE NATURAL THEOLOGY.

Revealed religion forms the correlate of natural religion, or the religion of reason. It is not the result of human investigation, but being the result of an extraordinary communication from God, is therefore infallible; whereas, on the contrary, all processes of human thought are more or less subjected to error. Hence we can explain why it is that religion gives itself out to be, not a product of the reason merely, not anything which originated from human inquiry and study, but a result of a divine revelation. The religious feeling is undoubtedly a propension of human nature; yet without a divine revelation the mind would sink in dark and perpetual disorder. Of the whole family of man, existing in all ages, and scattered over every quarter of the globe, there is not one well-authenticated exception to the fact that, moved by an inward impulse, and guided by revelation or tradition, man worships something which he believes to be endowed with the attributes of a superior being. Even the occasional gleamings of truth found in the various idolatrous systems are but the traditions of ancient revelations, more or less corrupted, which have descended from the first worshippers. Revealed religion comprehends, besides the doctrines of natural religion, many truths which were beyond the reach of human reason, though not contradictory thereto, and for a knowledge of which we are indebted directly to the Old  and New Testaments. While other religions had been variously accommodated to the peculiar countries in which they flourished, Christianity was so framed as to be adapted to the whole human family. It is the one thing needful for the elevation of our race, and is destined alike to universality and perpetuity.

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

## Religion, Philosophy Of[[@Headword:Religion, Philosophy Of]]

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

1, religion in general;

2, revealed religion;

3, the Christian religion;

4, the Christian Church.

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

## Religion, Primitive[[@Headword:Religion, Primitive]]

             Far in the distance, behind Buddhism, Brahminism, Zoroastrianism, Confucianism, and all the ten religions so graphically set forth by Freeman Clarke, there lies a primitive faith of great power, to which our attention is called in Heb 11:2 : “For by it the ancients obtained a good report.” To this primitive religion all the later forms of truth, of error, and of idolatry, with all the mixtures of good and evil pertaining to religions now ancient, owe their origin, whether we can or cannot trace the genealogy. The faith of all the patriarchs anterior to the call of Abraham may be reckoned to this early form of the knowledge, fear, Iove, and service of the  true God. How it came that descendants of Shem, of Ham, of Japhet, are soon found precipitated in ignorance, crime, and abominable idolatry, we are told in Rom 1:28 : “And even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind.” Thus they lost that faith in which they had been instructed by Noah during three centuries after the deluge. Some there were who held the truth in part long centuries after others had become utterly apostate. Abraham kept the straight course of truth, broadening, deepening, and accumulating strength, through Moses, David, Solomon, Ezra, John the Baptist, Christ himself, the apostles, Wycliffe, Luther, and the Reformed churches, to the present day. Deviations of more or less latitude from this line have been found in every age, as well as in our own, many of these deviations holding enough of the Gospel to secure for long periods the validity of their claim to a share of the primitive religion, bringing glory to God and salvation to men. To delineate briefly the relation of these to the main trunk is the object of this article.

I. Egyptian. — When Abraham went to Egypt to escape the famine (Gen 12:10), he found that the Lord held intercourse with Pharaoh, and, that Pharaoh aid his men had regard to the Lord's will, and rendered that obedience which is better than sacrifice. This fear of the Lord we find very happily developed in the time of Joseph, when he had interpreted Pharaoh's dreams. The king of Egypt not only believed the revelation, as from God, but he and his counsellors went to work to improve their opportunity. “The thing was good in the eyes of Pharaoh, and in the eyes of all his servants. And Pharaoh said to his servants, Can we find such a one as this is? a man in whom the Spirit of God is?” (Gen 41:38). It might be well for the nations now that are nominally Christian to take lessons from this king and his court. Whatever was the form of their religion, it is there recognised as valid for the welfare of the nation. And when Joseph, at a later date, bought up the land for Pharaoh, the land of the priests was reserved to them. When Joseph's father is introduced to Pharaoh, the king, after conversing with him, condescended to receive the blessing of Jacob, when it was well understood that “the less is blessed by the better.” It was not until another dynasty took possession of the throne — a king that knew not Joseph — that we hear in that court the haughty challenge, “Who is the Lord that I should obey his voice? I know not the Lord, neither will I let Israel go.” Under this new regime, Egypt was transformed into an apostasy, on which were executed the ten plagues;  and, finally, the king and his army were precipitated to the bottom of the sea. The sphinx of Egypt belongs to this ancient religion, and had nothing to do with the grovelling ideas of worshipping crocodiles and other crawling things. Even in Joseph's time, and no doubt in Abraham's, the ancient religion had declined, or the Egyptians would not have held “every shepherd” in abomination, as Moses was in danger of being stoned should he offer sacrifice in their land.

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

III. Canaanitish. — Another illustration of the primitive religion we have in Melchizedek and his people. He was king of Salem, priest of the Most High, and a very eminent type of the expected Deliverer. While Melchizedek lived, and others of the same faith, in sufficient numbers to have influence in the nation, it was announced to Abraham that the iniquity of the Amorites was “not yet full.” Some four hundred years were yet  allowed them to improve or misimprove their privileges. A very few, like Rahab of Jericho, were willing to obey the truth; but the seven nations, as such, had wholly apostatized to the grossest idolatry. It is possible, almost probable, that there was still some regard for the true religion among those known as Jebusites, although they did not surrender to Joshua. The following considerations are in their favor:

(a.) They were long spared after the other nationalities had been broken up. They held their capital till the time of David.

(b.) This capital was the ancient seat of Melchizekek, where we might expect the truth to be kept in families when the nation had given it up.

(c.) Araunah the Jebusite is honorably noted in the history of David, after their capital had surrendered.

(d.) At Araunah's threshingfloor the destroying angel suspended his work.

(e.) He made to David a noble offer — victims for the sacrifice, and wood to burn it from his farming implements.

(f.) He is living in Jerusalem, not as an idolater, but apparently like the people around him.

(g.) In 2Sa 24:23, the Hebrew reading is, “All these did king Araunah give to the king.” This would indicate that he was a lineal descendant of the royal line of Melchizedek, and was king of the Jebusites when they surrendered to David. At all events, he was possessor of the soil, though a conquered subject; and he readily fell in with the new religion, although it was an advance on that of his ancestors. For some such reasons; he readily sold the old homestead — the floor for fifty shekels of silver, the farm for six hundred shekels of gold.

IV. Mesopotamian. — Terah and his sons, Abram, Nahor, and Haran, in Ur of the Chaldees, were brought up in this. primitive religion; but it had become corrupted by idolatrous excrescences, and although they belonged to the witnessing line, they became involved in the idolatry, as we read (Jos 24:2), “They served other gods.” To preserve yet a faithful testimony, Abraham was called out of that land when he was about seventy years old, had the covenant of God renewed to him, and commenced a renovated service on the basis of the old faith, with new revelations. Abraham, after the death of his father, removed to Canaan, leaving a  residue at Haran, where he had resided five years. Thus freed from all family connections, except those under his own control, he carried down the true religion in its purity to Isaac and Jacob, with their adherents, all living as strangers in a foreign country. The ancient religion still received new developments of the coming Deliverer, super-added to all former revelations; nor was it a new religion, but a new edition of the old, that was given to Moses Meantime, the old religion retained, in the family of Nahor, some at least of the old corruptions. The teraphim, for example, Rachel wished to introduce into Jacob's family. Laban called these his gods; the Sept. calls them idols. On what terms of religious observance Jacob lived in Laban's family we have nothing specific; but after the parting we find that each had his own distinct religion. Laban swears by the God of Abraham and the God of Nahorthe God of their father. Jacob appeals to the God of Abraham, and the Fear of Isaac (Gen 31:42; Gen 31:53). The memorial pillar points to him who is the Rock of Ages, while the heap of gathered stones seems to indicate the Church's confession of imperishable truths, on which we all hold communion with one another and with God in his ordinances. How long this imperfectly organized Church continued in Padan-aram we have no indication, but we know that the Aramites were no friends to Israel in the days of the kings. A very interesting item on the religion of Bethuel's family is connected with the visit of Abraham's prime minister. The friends of Rebekah recognise Jehovah, the covenant God; and they give their farewell blessing in the name of the promised Deliverer: “Let thy seed possess the gate of those who hate him.” Excepting Luther, translators have made sad work with this verse (Gen 24:60).

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

V. Midianitish. — In those days we have brought up a most beautiful example of the ancient faith — Jethro, the prince and priest of Midian. It is true that the Midianites were descended from Abraham by Keturah; but their relations with Isaac and his descendants would not have kept up, and  did not keep up, the faith of Abraham in its advanced stages. All that they received directly from Abraham needed some kind of support after they were sent away from Isaac; this support could come only from the scattered fragments of primitive religion floating among their new associations, and collected into a focus by such a man as Jethro. So soon as he is off the stage, superannuated or dead, and his son Hobab has joined the camp of Moses, we find no more faith among the Midianites, nor any friendship for the people of the Lord.

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

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

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

VIII. Assyrian. — Late discoveries by Layard and Rawlinson have brought us into contact with the ancient Assyrians in much of their religion, as well as war and civil policy. Among the sculptures exhumed, none are more interesting than the winged quadrupeds finished off with a human head, or the human form with eagle's head and wings. These carry us back to the early cherubim, the forms of which must have been preserved by Noah and his sons. At first sight these Assyrian images may seem no more than mere idols — false gods; but that would not account for their close affinity with the living creatures of Ezekiel and the τεσσαρα ζῶα of John's Revelation. While no one of the Assyrian sculptures embodies the four principles of Ezekiel and John, yet two of them, taken together, do embody the four identical principles, and no more. The winged lion and the winged ox have the aspect of a man, lion, eagle, ox, and nothing besides. The reason for making them double arose from the difficulty of distinguishing the body of the ox from that of the lion in the same figure. Nor is it impossible that the Assyrians could have borrowed from Ezekiel; almost equally certain that they did not borrow from Moses. This leaves us the only course, that of authentic tradition from Noah and Shem, as they had the figures down from the garden of Eden. Whether these winged figures were worshipped by the Assyrians or not, it is of importance to notice that they were not the highest objects of adoration, for they are found bowing themselves before the Supreme, the symbol of Supreme Deity being a human form sitting in a winged circle or globe. While the  races of Shemites occupied one part of Mesopotamia and the Hamites another, they were sufficiently contiguous to afford the opportunity of corrupting one another in the matter of worship, as well as in the manner. We have already seen that the best family of the Shemites — Terah and his sons — had gone into idolatry in connection with the true worship, and needed reformation in the days of Abraham; we may safely infer that other Shemites, as well as the families of Ham, were more deeply involved, and went still further from the truth till the days of Sardanapalus, Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar. Whether in the Abrahamic line there was kept any physical type of the original, cherubim until renewed by Moses is nowhere recorded. Yet there are some hints worthy of our serious consideration. (a.) Rebekah went somewhere to inquire of the Lord and received a specific answer. May not this have come froi sacred utensils still in the custody of Abraham? (b.) Before Moses had set up the new tabernacle there was some kind of tabernacle in use (Exo 33:7). (c.) A sacred chest belonged to many of the ancient idolatries. Was it copied from a true original? (d.) In the higher rank of families the teraphim were long retained in connection with the true religion. Not only did Rachel import them from Laban's house, but Michal brought one into David's; and they are classed with recognised symbols in Hos 3:4. On the other side they are classed with idols, and were used by the king of Babylon for idolatrous purposes. May they not have been like the brazen serpent, at first a mere memorial of truth, afterwards turned into an object of false worship. SEE TERAPHIM.

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

On what foundation did the primitive faith rest its confidence?

1. The knowledge, fear, and reverence which Adam retained even after the fall. Let it be fairly admitted that Adam, by transgression, was lost — lost to all spiritual good accompanying salvation; that the first of all the commandments — love — was completely obliterated in his heart; that he was dead in trespasses and sins. Still the apostle tells us that where the law of love had been written there was still left τὸ ἔργον τοῦ νόμον  γραπτόν, the “work” of the law, which work is still written in the heart of even the heathen (Rom 2:14-15).This work he places largely in the domain of knowledge, and even conscience, yet it is not in any degree the law of love (1:32): “Who, knowing the judgment of God, that they who commit such things are worthy of death, not only do the same, but have pleasure in them that do them.” This by nature is our own moral state; yet, blessed be God, knowledge, memory, reason, conscience, have not been entirely destroyed, though conscience has been seared, and all the faculties greatly debilitated. Adam, on leaving the garden, still retained the sad remembrance of happiness in great variety, now lost, lost! lost!! Lost forever through the former channel. With all that he had lost, who is there among us that would not travel a long, long pilgrimage to hear him tell the beauty of the garden inside; the perfect satisfaction of everything he saw, heard, felt, while innocent; the nature of that holiness which is only now to be regained by incessant labor, suffering, and watching; unimpeded communion with God. Darwin himself, and the modern race of improved baboons, might envy the intellect which he retained even then. Acquaintance with God! Fellowship of the Spirit! Seeing him as he is! Social worship in the holy family! The first Sabbath-day!

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

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

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

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

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

5. The flaming sword kept before the mind of worshippers the Justice to be satisfied. Whether ws trace this to the sword of flame, the death of the victim, or the universal conscience, it is equally a portion of the primitive religion. The soul that sinneth deserves to die (Rom 1:32). And we  know no better symbol that could have been introduced to exhibit the wretchedness of those who are twice dead.

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

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

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

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

2. It was monotheistic: one Lord, one faith, one Spirit, one Mediator, one God and Father of all. The question whether the Persians borrowed from the Hebrews or the Hebrews from the Persians has no place here; the origin of both from one primitive source is sufficient to account for all the items of similarity, or even identity, in the two religions. So, also, we may reckon of the Hebrews and Egyptians, the Hebrews and the Greeks, and all affinities of this kind. While the primitive religion was monotheistic, there are many indications of a plurality of persons, as in Gen 1:1, where  a singular verb is joined with אֶלֹהַים, as in a thousand other instances. So, too, ch. 1:24 and 3:22.

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

But here, again, while the nations in separating from one another took, each one, some degree of respect for the Word revealed, or for some part of it, it was reserved to one nation only to preserve it pure and entire. “‘To the Jews were committed the oracles of God.” Other nations retained a glimmering tradition, a tetragrammaton, a holy phrase, of which they knew not the meaning and used it merely as a charm-a φυλακτήριον. How the true believer in every age and country appreciates the word, we may learn, if not by happy experience, by Psalms 119. Under these beams of the Sun of Righteousness, Enoch walked with God. Light and life and love are again restored. If we come to the particular doctrines of this primitive religion, we have many scattered hints of, say, acceptance with God, in the sacrifice of Abel; a higher life, in the translation of Enoch; retribution, in the conscience of Cain; calling on the name of the Lord, in the days of Enos; judgment combined with mercy, in the deluge and the cities of the plain; intercession, by Abraham; and from the same source, that the Judge of all the earth will do right; family government and instruction; covenant with God; precepts given to Noah; and many, very many, of the doctrine ofof Christianity. But what a vacuum we should have just here were it not for the book of Job! Wherever the patriarch may have lived, or in whatever age, besides the lesson of his own biographyv we have, in the speeches of himself and of his friends: a very full development of the patriarchal theology. Whether each particular doctrine of Watson's Institutes or Hodge's Outlines could be deduced from the book of Job, or whether each  expression in it is to be relied on as correct, we shall not here inquire; but certain it is that each chapter contains a mass of theological thought befitting our age as well as that in which it was delivered. It opens with the doctrine of holiness, without which no man shall see the Lord. Next we have God's blessing on all that Job possessed, as in Psa 107:38. Then his anxiety about his children — their liability to sin. We have the atonement in his offering sacrifices; particular atonement, “to the number of them all.” The humblest resignation when all was taken from him” Blessed be the name of the Lord.” The Kinsman — a living Redeemer, and his coming to the earth. The speciality of providence is iterated and reiterated. But, not to dwell on the more common doctrines, we find some of those which would be an attainment even in our own time. Civil-service reform is taught, or rather taken for granted, in ch. Psa 34:17-18; and national reform in all its depth comes in Psa 107:29-30 : “When he giveth quietness, who then can give trouble? and when he hideth his face, who then can behold him? whether it be done against a nation or against a man only: that the hypocrite reign not, lest the people be ensnared.” Let any one take up the book of Job under this aspect, and he will see how much of the Gospel there is in such passages as ch. Job 22:21-30; Job 33:14-30. Altogether, apart from the plot of the poem, there is wrought into the speeches a vast amount of the deep knowledge of God, not by the inspiration of the several speakers, but by their earnestness in using the floating capital which belonged to the patriarchal faith. The occasion was such as made an extraordinary call on their knowledge, and on their skill in using it.

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

It is not to be denied that the worship of mere nature furnished the element of these fallen religions. We have enough of that in Jeremiah 44 among the chosen people. But it is never to be admitted that any religion was ever originated by man, however it may have been manipulated “by art and man's device.” No historian can feelthat Mohammed, even with the assistance of the monk Sergius, originated Islam; his claim was to restore the ancient religion of the world. Mecca was a place of pilgrimage ages before he was born. All his revelations were ostensibly to restore and improve the primitive faith of Adam, of Abraham, and of Ishmael. A large amount of popery, even, is, independent of divine revelation, brought down  from ancient traditions much later than the primitive faith. Paul preached at Athens the service of God, who made the world and all things therein (as the people had been taught by their own poets); though he was still, in a great measure, the Unknown, and the apostle was esteemed a setter-forth of strange deities. While we rejoice in the abundance of our Scriptures, it is to be remembered that Adam, Seth, and Enos did not require so much as we do. They were born to a bright inheritance near the throne of their heavenly Father. “Adam who was the son of God.” Thus, while we have added line upon line as it was needed, the true religion is, like its Author, “the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.” (R. H.)

\* The particle אֵת here, however, is correctly rendered “front” in the English version. — ED.

## Religiosi[[@Headword:Religiosi]]

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

## Religious[[@Headword:Religious]]

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

## Religious Corporations[[@Headword:Religious Corporations]]

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

## Religious Education[[@Headword:Religious Education]]

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

(1.) That the habits of children only are to be regarded, and that, in time, principles will follow of course. Habits, without principles of piety, are nothing better than a citadel ungarrisoned and uncommanded.

(2.) That many of the subjects of religion are beyond the capacity of children, and that, therefore, to instruct them in Christianity is only to load their memories with words. Yet we do not defer other kinds of instruction till their nature and use can be completely understood by the pupil. But, in fact, the principles of religion are some of the most simple and intelligible which can be proposed to the human mind.

(3.) That to furnish children with religious ideas is to infuise into them prejudices. But we must be careful to discriminate between religious ideas and prejudices, for the latter is an unexamined opinion. And, further, by this very conduct we prejudice him against religion as something unworthy his concern, or beyond his comprehension. We do not so treat literature, politics, or science.

(4.) That the child will acquire in school and the public institutions of the Gospel an adequate sentiment and knowledge of religious truths. But if the love or natural interest of the parent in the child does not stimulate him to this duty, can it be expected that it will be voluntarily assumed by others? The institution of Sunday-schools does not diminish, in the least, the responsibility of those having charge of children to train them for God. SEE PEDAGOGICS.

## Religious Liberty[[@Headword:Religious Liberty]]

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

## Religious Societies[[@Headword:Religious Societies]]

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

## Reliquary[[@Headword:Reliquary]]

             a vessel for holding relics, and enclosilg, in the 13th century, three grains of incense in honor of the Holy Trinity. It usually took the form of the building in which it was kept, as at the Sainte-Chapelle in Paris and Nivelles at the end of that century. In the 14th century cathedrals adopted for their reliquaries the form of a church, while in chapels and parish churches preference was given to images of gold and silver. Sometimes they take the shape of a coffer, or a transparent bier carried by ecclesiastics; a case-like cruet, a rose, a quatrefoil, a canister in an angel's hand; horns, as at Canterbury; a triptych, like the triple entrance of a  church; a lantern tower and spire, etc. In some cases the church bearing the name of a saint has his monument, but in other cases the relics only were preserved in portable shrines. Sometimes the reliquary took the form of some popular saint, a chest, or an altar. At Chichester the relic-chest of St. Richard is of oak, contains a door which was opened when the relics were exposed, and a slit for the reception of offerings in the cross-bar below it. At first the reliquaries were portable, to form accessories of a procession. In 745, relics and the cross were carried in the Rogation processions in England. At Rome the “three relics” are exhibited on Good-Friday-the portion of the true cross, the blade of the spear that pierced the Redeemer's side, and the veronica (q.v.). About the beginning of the 13th century the reliquaries upon the altar took the form of the limb or bust, called a corset (or corselet). They were arranged on great festivals on the rood-beam or retable above the high-altar.

## Relly[[@Headword:Relly]]

             SEE RELLYANITES.

## Rellyanites[[@Headword:Rellyanites]]

             or RELLYAN UNIVERSALISTS, the followers of Mr. James Relly. He first commenced his ministerial character in connection with Mr. Whitefield, and was received with great popularity. Upon a change of his views he encountered reproach, and was pronounced by many as an enemy to godliness. He believed that Christ as a Mediator was so united to mankind that his actions were theirs, his obedience and sufferings theirs, and, consequently, that he has as fully restored the whole human race to the divine favor as if all had obeyed and suffered in their own persons and upon this persuasion he preached a finished salvation, called by the apostle Jude “the common salvation.” The Rellyanites are not observers of ordinances such as water baptism and the sacrament, but profess to believe only in one baptism, which they call all immersion of the mind or conscience into truth by the teaching of the Spirit of God; and by the same Spirit they are enabled to feed on Christ as the bread of life, professing that in and with Jesus they possess all things. They inculcate and maintain good works for necessary purposes, but contend that the principal and only work which ought to be attended to is the doing real good without religious ostentation; that to relieve the miseries and distresses of mankind according  to our ability is doing more real good than the superstitious observance of religious ceremonies. In general they appear to believe that there will be a resurrection to life and a resurrection to condemnation; that believers only will be among the formler, who as first-fruits, and kings and priests, will have part in the first resurrection, and shall reign with Christ in his kingdom of the millennium; that unbelievers who are after raised must wait the manifestation of the Saviour of the world under that condemnation of conscience which a mind in darkness and wrath must necessarily feel; that believers, called kings and priests, will be made the medium of communication to their condemned brethren, who, like Joseph to his brethren, though he spoke roughly to them, in reality overflowed with affection and tenderness; that ultimately every knee shall bow and every tongue confess that in the Lord they have righteousness and strength; and thus every enemy shall be subdued to the kingdom and glory of the Great Mediator. Relly was succeeded (in 1781) by an American preacher, Elhanan Winchester, who had been a Calvinistic Baptist, but the congregation in London was soon broken up. This movement by Relly was the first attempt to consolidate a sect of which Universalism should be the leading tenet. A Mr. Murray belonging to this society emigrated to America, and preached these sentiments at Boston and elsewhere. Mr. Relly published several works, the principal of which are, Union: — The Trial of Spirits: — Christian Liberty: — One Baptism: — The Salt of Sacrifice: — Antichrist Resisted: — Letters on Universal Salvation: — The Cherubimical Mystery. SEE UNIVERSALISTS.

## Rely, Jean De[[@Headword:Rely, Jean De]]

             a French preacher, was born about 1430. He was made doctor of theology at Arras, and became successively canon, chancellor, and archdeacon of Notre Dame at Paris, and rector of the university. In this capacity he drew up in 1461 the Remonstrances which the Parliament presented to Louis XI for the maintenance of the Pragmatic Sanction, written with remarkable energy of style, and often reprinted both in French and in Latin. In 1483 he was deputy to the States-General of Tours, and presented to Charles VIII the result of their deliberations. In 1490 he became canon of St. Martin of Tours, and in Dec., 1491, he was elected bishop of Angers. He accompanied Charles VIII to Italy, where he was charged with several duties near pope Alexander VI. Rely died at Saumur March 27, 1499. Besides the Breviary of St. Martin of Tours, he revised by royal  commission the translation of the historical books of the Bible by Guyart de Moulins (1495, fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Remaliah[[@Headword:Remaliah]]

             (Heb. Renmalyahu, רְמִלְיָהוּ, protected of Jehovah; Sept. ῾Ραμελίος or ῾Ρομελίος, v. r. ῾Ρομελία), the father of Pekah, king of Israel (2Ki 15:25; 2Ki 15:27; 2Ki 15:30; 2Ki 15:32; 2Ki 15:37; 2Ki 16:1; 2Ki 16:5; 2Ch 28:6), probably a man whose character was such as to make his name a reproach to his descendants (Isa 7:4-5; Isa 8:6). B.C. ante 756. SEE PEKAH.

## Rembrandt[[@Headword:Rembrandt]]

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

## Remeth[[@Headword:Remeth]]

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

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

             is regarded by Tristram and Conder as the present er-Rameh, five and a half miles north-west of Sebustieh, "a conspicuous village on a hilly knoll above the small plain, with a high central house. It is of moderate size, with olives below. The sides of the hill are steep" (Memoirs to the Ordnance Survey, 2:154).

## Remi[[@Headword:Remi]]

             SEE REMIGIUS.

## Remigius Of Auxerre[[@Headword:Remigius Of Auxerre]]

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

## Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Lyons[[@Headword:Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Lyons]]

             a celebrated French archbishop in the 9th century, and grand almoner to the emperor Lothaire, succeeded Amolo in the above see about the year 853 or 854. It;is supposed to be this St. Remigius who, in the name of the Church of Lyons, wrote an answer to the three letters of Hincmar of Rheims, and others, in which he defends St. Augustine's doctrine on grace and predestination. This answer may be found in the Vindicie Predestinationis et Gratice (1650, 2 vols. 4to), and in the library of th6e fathers. He presided at the Council of Valence in 855, and others of the same kind; and, after founding some pious institutions, he died Oct. 28, 875. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Rheims[[@Headword:Remigius, Or Remi (St.), Of Rheims]]

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

## Remigius, Or Remi Of Strasburg[[@Headword:Remigius, Or Remi Of Strasburg]]

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

## Reminiscere[[@Headword:Reminiscere]]

             (remember), a name sometimes given to the second Sunday in Lent, from the first word of the Jntroit, “Remember, O Lord, thy tender mercies,” etc. (Psa 25:6).

## Remling, Franz Xaver[[@Headword:Remling, Franz Xaver]]

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

## Remmon[[@Headword:Remmon]]

             (Jos 19:7). SEE RIMMON.

## Remmon-methoar[[@Headword:Remmon-methoar]]

             [some Metho'ar] (Jos 19:13). SEE RIMMON.

## Remoboth[[@Headword:Remoboth]]

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

## Remond (Or Raemond), Florimond De[[@Headword:Remond (Or Raemond), Florimond De]]

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

## Remonstrance[[@Headword:Remonstrance]]

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

## Remonstrance, Arminian[[@Headword:Remonstrance, Arminian]]

             This is a document drawn up by Uytenbogaert, and presented, in 1610, to the states of Holland, against the decrees of the Synod of Dort. It specifies  the five Calvinistic points of doctrine, and then in five articles states the Arminian positions. On this account it gives rise to what is known as the SEE QUINQUARTICULAR CONTROVERSY (q.v.). The Calvinistic party afterwards presented a Counter-Remonstrance. See Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, 3:545.

## Remonstrants[[@Headword:Remonstrants]]

             a name given to the ARMINIANS SEE ARMINIANS (q.v.) by reason of a remonstrance which, in 1610, they made to the States of Holland against the decree of the Synod of Dort, which condemned them as heretics. Episcopius and Grotius were at the head of the Remonstrants. The  Calvinists presented a counter-address, and were called Contra- remonstrants.

## Remphan[[@Headword:Remphan]]

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

Besides those divinities represented on the monuments of Egypt which have Egyptian forms or names, or both, others have foreign forms or names, or both. Of the latter, some appear to have been introduced at a very remote age. This is certainly the case with the principal divinity of Memphis, Ptah, the Egyptian Hephaestus. The name Ptah is from a Shemitic root, for it signifies ‘“ open,” and in Heb. we find the root פָּתִח, and its cognates, “he or it opened,” whereas there is no word related to it in Coptic. The figure of this divinity is that of a deformed pygmy, or  perhaps unborn child, and is unlike the usual representations of divinities on the monuments. In this case there can be no doubt that the introduction took place at an extremely early date, as the name of Ptah occurs in very old tombs in the necropolis of Memphis, and is found throughout the religious records. It is also to be noticed that this name is not traceable in the mythology of neighboring nations, unless, indeed, it corresponds to that of the Πάταικοι or Παταϊκοί, whose images, according to Herodotus, were the figure-heads of Phoenician ships (3:37). The foreign divinities that seem to be of later introduction are not found throughout the religious records, but only in single tablets, or are otherwise very rarely mentioned, and two out of their four names are immediately recognised to be non- Egyptian. They are Renpu, and the goddesses Ken, Anta, and Astarta. The first and second of these have foreign forms; the third and fourth have Egyptian forms: there would therefore seem to be an especially foreign character about the former two.

(1.) Renpu, pronounced Rempu (?), is represented as an Asiatic, with the full beard and apparently the general type of face given on the monuments to most nations east of Egypt, and to the Rebu or Libyans. This type is evidently that of the Shemites. His hair is bound with a fillet, which is ornamented in front with the head of an antelope.

(2.) Ken is represented perfectly naked, holding in both hands corn, and standing upon a lion. In the last particular the figure of a goddess at Maltheiyyeh, in Assyria, may be compared (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 212). From this occurrence of a similar representation, from her being naked and carrying corn, and from her being worshipped with Khem, we may suppose that Ken corresponded to the Syrian goddess, at least when the latter had the character of Venus. She is also called Ketesh, which is the name in hieroglyphics of the great Hittite town on the Orontes. This in the present case is probably a title, קְדֵשָׁהit can scarcely be the name of a town where she was worshipped, applied to her as personifying it.

(3.) Anata appears to be Anaitis. and her foreign character seems almost certain from her being jointly worshipped with Renpu and Ken.

(4.) Astarte is of course the Ash-toreth of Canaan. On a tablet in the British Museum the principal subject is a group representing Ken, having Khem on one side and Renpu on the other; beneath is an adoration of  Anata. On the half of another tablet Ken and Khem occur, and a dedication to Renpu and Ketesh.

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

The Israelites in Egypt, after Joseph's rule, appear to have fallen into a general, but doubtless not universal, practice of idolatry. This is only twice distinctly stated and once alluded to (Jos 24:14; Eze 20:7-8; Eze 23:3), but the indications are perfectly clear. The mention of Chiun or Remphan as worshipped in the desert shows that this idolatry was, in part at least, that of foreigners, and no doubt of those settled in Lower Egypt. The golden calf, at first sight, would appear to be an image of Apis of Memphis, or Mnevis of Heliopolis, or some other sacred bull of Egypt; but it must be remembered that we read in the Apocrypha of “the heifer Baal” (Tob 1:5), so that it was possibly a Phoenician or Canaanitish idol. The best parallel to this idolatry is that of the Phoenician colonies in Europe, as  seen in the idols discovered in tombs at Camirus in Rhodes by M. Salzmann. and those found in tombs in the island of Sardinia (of both of which there are specimens in the British Museum), and those represented on the coins of Melita and the island of Ebusus.

We can now endeavor to explain the passages in which Chiun and Remphan occur. The Masoretic text of Amo 5:26 reads thus: “But ye bare the tent [or “tabernacle”] of your king and Chiun your images, the star of your gods [or “your god”], which ye made for yourselves.” In the Sept. we find remarkable differences; it reads, Kai Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ῾Ραιφάν, τοὺς τύπους αὐτῶν οὕς ἐποιήσατε ἑαυτοῖς. The Vulg. agrees with the Masoretic text in the order of the clauses, though omitting Chiun or Remphan. “Et portastis tabernaculum Moloch vestro, et imaginem idolorum vestrorum, sidus dei vestri, quae fecistis vobis.” The passage is cited in the Acts almost in the words of the Sept.: “Yea, ye took up the tabernacle of Moloch, and the star of your god Remphan, figures which ye made to worship them” (Καὶ ἀνελάβετε τὴν σκηνὴν τοῦ Μολόχ, καὶ τὸ ἄστρον τοῦ θεοῦ ὑμῶν ῾Ρεμφάν, τοὺς τύπους οÞς ἐποιήσατε προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς).

A slight change in the Hebrew would enable us to read Moloch (Malcam or Milcom) instead of “your king.” Beyond this it is extremely difficult to explain the differences. The substitution of Remphan for Chiun caniot be accounted for by verbal criticism. The Hebrew does not seem as distinct in meaning as the Sept.; and if we may conjecturally emend it from the latter, the last clause would be “your images which ye made for yourselves;” and if we further transpose Chiun to the place of “your god Remphan,” in the Sept., את סכות מלכם would correspond to את כוכב אלהיכם כיון; but how can we account for such a transposition as would thus be supposed, which, be it remembered, is less likely in the Hebrew than in a translation of a difficult passage? If we compare the Masoretic text and the supposed original, we perceive that in the former כיון צלמיכם corresponds in position to כוכב אלהיכם, and it does not seem an unwarrantable conjecture that כיון having been by mistake written in the place of כוכב by some copyist, צלמיכם was also transposed. It appears to be more reasonable to read “images which ye made”' than “gods which ye made,” as the former word occurs.. Supposing these emendations to be probable, we may now examine the meaning of the passage.  The tent or tabernacle of Moloch is supposed by Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v. סַכּוּת) to have been an actual tent, and he compares the σκηνὴ ἱερά of the Carthaginians (Diod. Sic. 20:65).

But there is some difficulty in the idea that the Israelites carrierl about so. large an object for the purpose of idolatry, and it seems more likely that it was a small model of a larger tent or shrine. The reading Moloch appears preferable to “your king;” but the mention of the idol of the Ammonites as worshipped in the desert stands quite alone. It is perhaps worthy of note that there is reason for supposing that Moloch was a name of the planet Saturn, and that this planet was evidently supposed by the ancient translators to be intended by Chiun and Remphan. The correspondence of Remphan or Raiphan to Chiun is extremely remarkable, and can, we think, only be accounted for by the supposition that the Sept. translator or translators of the prophet had Egyptian knowledge, and being thus acquainted with the ancient joint worship of Ken and Renpu, substituted the latter for the former, as they may have been unwilling to repeat the name of a foreign Venus. The star of Remphan, if indeed the passage is to be read so as to connect these words, would be especially appropriate if Remphan were a planetary god; but the evidence for this, especially as partly founded upon an Arabic or Persian word like Chiun, is not sufficiently strong to enable us to lay any stress upon the agreement. In hieroglyphics the sign for a star is one of the two composing the word Seb, “to adore,” and is undoubtedly there used in a symbolical as well as. a phonetic sense, indicating that the ancient Egyptian religion was partly derived from a system of star-worship; and there are representations on the monuments of mythical creatures or men adoring stars (Ancient Egyptians, pl. 30 a). We have, however, no positive indication of any figure of a star being used as an idolatrous object of worship. From the manner in which it is mentioned, we may conjecture that the star of Remphan was of the same character as the tabernacle of Moloch, an object connected with false worship rather than an image of a false god. According to the Sept. reading of the last clause, it might be thought that these objects were actually images of Moloch and Remphan; but it must be remembered that we cannot suppose an image to have had the form of a tent, and that the version of the passage in the Acts, as well as the Masoretic text; if in the latter case we may change the order of the words, gives a clear sense. As to the meaning of the last clause, it need only be remarked that it does not oblige us to infer that the Israelites made the images of the false gods, though they may have done so, as in the case of the golden calf; it may mean no more than that they adopted these gods.  It is to be observed that the whole passage does not indicate that distinct Egyptian idolatry was practiced by the Israelites. It is very remarkable that the only false gods mentioned as worshipped by them in the desert should be probably Moloch and Chiun and Remphan, of which the latter two Were foreign divinities worshipped in Egypt. From this we may reasonably infer that while the Israelites sojourned in Egypt there was also a great stranger- population in the Lower Country, and therefore that it is probable that then the Shepherds still occupied the land. See Schroder, De Tabernac. Alolochi et Stella Dei Remph. (Marb. 1745); Maius, Dissert. de Kium et Remphan (1763); Journ. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1852, p. 1039; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 669, 670. SEE CHIUN.

## Remusat, Charles De[[@Headword:Remusat, Charles De]]

             a French statesman and philosopher, was born at Paris in 1797, and died June 6, 1875. Besides Essais de Philosophie (Paris, 1834, 2 volumes) and Philosophie Religieuse (1864), he wrote biographies of Abelard (1845), Anselm of Canterbury (1853; Germ. transl. by Wurzbach, Ratisbon, 1854), and Bacon (1858). (B.P.)

## Remy, Franz[[@Headword:Remy, Franz]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, who died at Berlin, May 3, 1882, was a follower of Schleiermacher, and published Hausandachten aus Schleiermacher's Prediqten in tdglichen Betrachtungen (Berlin, 1861-62, 2 volumes). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Renaissance[[@Headword:Renaissance]]

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

1. Italian. — At the early epoch of its existence, the new style of architecture displays not so much an alteration in the arrangement of the spaces and of the main features of the buildings as in the system of ornamentation and in the aspect of the profiles. During the early period the endeavor was maintained to adapt classical forms with more or less freedom to modern buildings while later (in the 16th century) a scheme  based on ancient architecture was universally prescriptive. Two distinct styles belong to this first period, viz. the Early Florentine and the Early Venetian. In the Roman Renaissance, the system of the second period, which confines itself more closely to classical elements, is more prevalent. The decoration of the interiors of the buildings of the Renaissance is copied from ancient Roman architecture. The rooms are either vaulted or have flat ceilings; but in both cases they are adorned with paintings, after the manner of those discovered in the Baths of Titus. Ornamented panels were employed in large palaces for horizontal ceilings, as also in churches, though in the latter case they were more often applied to cupola vaultings, as notably in St. Peter's. SEE ROME.

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

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

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

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

.

## Renanah[[@Headword:Renanah]]

             SEE PEACOCK.

## Renaudot, Eusebe[[@Headword:Renaudot, Eusebe]]

             a French savant, was born at Paris, July 20, 1646. His early studies were carried on among the Jesuits, and in the College of Harcourt. On their completion he entered the Congregation of the Oratory, but without taking orders. Though he remained but a short time in this institution, the whole of his life was passed in similar ones, and was devoted to his favorite studies of theology and Oriental literature. His knowledge of ecclesiastical affairs caused him to be employed in many negotiations with foreign countries, and his talent made him a favorite at court. In 1700 abbe Renaudot went to Rome, and received from Clement XI the priory of Frossay, in Brittany. During his whole career he endeavored to re-establish the printing of the Oriental classics, and interested the duke of Orleans in the subject, but it was never accomplished. He died at Paris, Sept. 1, 1720. Renaudot's writings were numerous, though he published nothing until a  few years before his death. We mention, Defense de la Perpetuite de la Foi, etc. (Paris, 1708): — Gennadii Patriarchce Homiloe de Eucharistia, etc. (ibid. 1709): — La Penpetuite de la iFoide l'Eglise sur les Sacrements, etc. (ibid. 1713): — Historia Patriarcharum Alexandrinorum Jacobitarunm, etc. (ibid. 1713). This is the most complete work ever written upon the history of Egyptian Christianity. It is based upon the Arabic narrative of bishop Severus, and contains a complete list of the Jacobite patriarchs from Cyril to John Touki, who lived early in the 18th century: — Liturgium Orientalium Collectio (ibid. 1715-16): — Anciennes Relations des Indes et de la Chine, etc. (ibid. 1718). Besides these, he left works on purely literary subjects, and several valuable MSS.: — Histoire de Saladin': — Histoire des Patriarches Syniens et de la Secte iNestorienne, and Traite de l'Eglise d'Ethiopie. See De Beri,Hist. de l'Acad. des Inscript. v; Niceron, Memoires, 12 and 20. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rend[[@Headword:Rend]]

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

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

To rend the garments was in Eastern countries and among ancient nations a symbolical action, expressive of sorrow, fear, or contrition. (See the monographs on the subject in Latin by Grunewold [Hafn. 1708]; Hilliger [Wittenb. 1716]; Rohrensee [bid. 1668]; Schroder, [Jen. 1716]; and Wickmannshausen [Wittenb. 1716].) The passage in Joe 2:13, “Rend your hearts, and not your garments,” is in allusion to this practice. But the phrase here is a Hebraism, meaning “‘ Rend your hearts rather than your  garments,” or “Rend your hearts, and not your garments only;” for the prophet does not forbid the external appearances of mourning, but he cautions them against a merely hypocritical show of sorrow, and exhorts them to cherish that contrite and broken spirit which is acceptable in the sight of God. SEE BURIAL; SEE MOURNING.

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

## Rending Of Clothes[[@Headword:Rending Of Clothes]]

             To rend or tear the garments was from the earliest period an action expressive of the highest grief (Gen 37:29). Jacob and David did it on various occasions; and so did Joshua, Hezekiah, and Ezra (2Sa 13:31; Jos 7:6; 2Ki 19:1; Ezr 9:3). The high-priest was forbidden to rend his clothes (Lev 10:6; Lev 21:10), prob. ably meaning his sacred garments: perhaps those referred to in Mat 26:65, were such as were ordinarily worn, or merely judicial, and not pontificial garments. Sometimes it denoted anger, or indignation mingled with sorrow (Isa 36:22; Isa 37:1; Act 14:14). SEE RENDING.

## Rendu, Louis[[@Headword:Rendu, Louis]]

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

## Renee dEste[[@Headword:Renee dEste]]

             duchess of Ferrara and princess of France, whose career was closely interwoven with the history of the Reformation, was the second daughter of king Louis XII and Anne of Brittany, and was born at Blois, Oct. 29, 1510 (according to some authorities, Oct. 10 or 25; we follow Bonnet [J.], Lettres de J. Calvin, i, 43). She was married July 30, 1527, to duke Hercules of Ferrara, and became the mother of five children; and in the exercise of her tastes for literature and art she made the court of Ferrara a centre of culture which emulated that of Florence and the Medici. Her sympathies, directed no less by personal conviction than by the traditions of her family and her early education, were with the Reformation. She encouraged Bruccioli to prepare an Italian version of the Bible, and allowed him to dedicate to her the first edition (1541), and she afforded a refuge to fugitive Protestants. Calvin availed himself of this asylum in 1535, and thus began a relation which was of great value to the duchess while he lived. He was allowed to pray and expound the Scriptures in a chapel which is still shown, until remonstrances from Rome induced the duke to banish him, and with him all the Protestant friends of his consort,  down to the servants brought with her from France. The same influence led to the persecution of Renee in person. The relations of Ferrara with France had been broken off, and political added to religious prejudices aggravated the situation; but beyond restraints and disrespect she suffered little, until in 1545 the Inquisition was established in Ferrara and the reconquest of the land to Romanism began. The co-operation of Henry II of France was secured; Renee was compelled to listen to sermons in denunciation of her principles; her husband caused her to be imprisoned with two of her women, and placed her daughters Leonora and Lucretia in a convent. These measures broke her spirit and brought her to confession and attendance on the mass. She was restored to liberty Dec. 1,1554, after an imprisonment of two and a half months. She had enjoyed the counsel of Protestant friends during much of her period of trial: Calvin had written frequent letters, and had sent Francis Morel (of Collanges) to act as her spiritual adviser; and her former secretary, Leon Jamez, had also sustained her faithfully; but, in the heat of a persecution in which but few stood firm, her resolution gave way. The unfaltering fidelity of the whole of her subsequent life atoned for that single and temporary lapse. The experience of Renee was sufficiently trying in other respects as well. Her daughter Anna was married, against the earnest protest of her mother, to the chief opponent of the Protestant cause, duke Francis of Guise (Sept. 29, 1548).

Her eldest son, Alphonso, quarrelled with his father and fled the country in 1552. Her husband died Oct. 3, 1559, after exacting from her an oath that she would no longer correspond with Calvin, from which she was, however, absolved by Calvin. Alphonso succeeded his father, and, influenced by pope Pius IV, at once compelled his mother to renounce his country or her faith. She chose the former alternative, and returned to France in September, 1560, leaving her children in Ferrara. France was at this period troubled with the disputes of Navarre and Conde with the Guises, and Conde lay in prison awaiting death. Renee did not hesitate to censure the disloyal cruelty of the Guises; and when their power was broken, on the death of Francis II, she became the open promoter of the Reformation. She invited Protestant clergymen into the country and caused Protestant worship to be held at her seat of Montargis and wherever she might make a temporary home in other places; but she was none the less earnestly engaged in promoting peace between the contending parties. At Montargis she so compromised their disputes that they were definitively laid aside. Her charities and her counsels were expended upon applicants of every class. When her son-in-law, the duke of Guise, began the war which  during thirty years drenched France with blood, she determined that Montargis should be a refuge to all Protestant fugitives. Francis of Guise died Feb. 24, 1563, and the peace of Amboise was declared in March of the same year; and. as she was thereafter forbidden to celebrate the worship of her Church in Paris, even in her own house, she retired permanently to Montargis, though she subsequently accompanied Charles IX on his tour through the kingdom. She founded a school, enlarged and beautified the town, and took a lively interest in the translation of the New Test. into Spanish. At this time she received a last letter from Calvin, written (April 4, 1564) while he was on his death-bed, by the hand of his brother. From this period the records of her life become rare. The second religious war (Sept., 1567, to March, 1568) did not disturb her. She was at the H/tel de Laon in Paris during St. Bartholomew's Night, but was exempted from the general massacre, and succeeded in rescuing several of her coreligionists, whom she carried to Montargis and aided to effect their ultimate escape. She ended her noble life June 12,1575. An eloquent testimony to her faith was included in her will. Her remains were interred in the church at Montargis. See Munch [Ernst], Renata von Este und ihre Tochter (1831-33,2 vols.), not important and not always trustworthy; Catteau-Calleville, Vie de Renee de France (Berl. 1781-83). Brief biographies are given in M'Crie, Hist. of the Ref. in Italy; and Gerdes, Specimen Italioe Reformatoe; and a more detailed life in Young, Life and Times of Aonio Paleario (Lond. 1860, 2 vols.); Bayle, La France Protestante, viii; Bonnet [Jules], La Vie d'Olympe Morate; and Lettres de Jean Calvin. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Renegger, Michael[[@Headword:Renegger, Michael]]

             SEE RENNIGER.

## Renesse, Ludwig Gerard Van[[@Headword:Renesse, Ludwig Gerard Van]]

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

## Reni, Guido[[@Headword:Reni, Guido]]

             an eminent Italian painter, was born at Bologna in 1575, and first studied, under Denys Calvert; afterwards entered the school of the Caracci, and was a brilliant pupil. He soon acquired distinction, and early executed some fine works, particularly his picture of St. Benedict in the Desert, for the cloister of San Michele, in Bosco. He afterwards went to Rome, and executed the Martyrdomo of St. Cecilia, for the church of that saint, and the Crucifixion of St. Peter also. He now rose rapidly in public estimation. His most celebrated works in the palaces at. Rome are his Magdalen, in the Barberini collection, and his fresco of Aurora. The paintings of Guido are numerous, and are to be found in all the principal collections in Italy and throughout Europe. He ruined himself by gambling, and died at Bologna, August 18, 1642. To form a fair estimate of his powers, we are to judge by his best pictures, such as The Magdalen, at Rome; The Miracle of the. Manna, at Ravenna; The Conception, at Forli; The Murder of the Innocents, and The Repentance of St. Peter, at Bologna; The Purification,  at Modena; and The Assumption, at Genoa, with many other works at Rome, Bologna, and elsewhere. See Spooner, Biog. Hist. of the Fine Arts, s.v.

## Rennecke, Christoph Huldreich[[@Headword:Rennecke, Christoph Huldreich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1797. From 1825 to 1831 he acted as tutor of the duchess Helelna of Mecklenburg, afterwards duchess of Orleans. From 1831 to 1871 he was pastor at Dargun, in Mecklenburg, when he retired from the ministry and lived as a patriarch among his people. He died April 27, 1881, at Rostock. Rennecke was a brother-in-law of the well-known professor of Halle, Dr. A. Tholuck, with whom he corresponded on the most important topics of the time. He wrote, Die Lehre vom Amt der Schlussel (Malchin, 1845): — Begrundung der Lehren von der Sunde, von der Person Christi (Magdeburg, 1848):Die Lehre vone Staate, etc. (Leipsic, 1850). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rennell, Thomas[[@Headword:Rennell, Thomas]]

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

## Rennell, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Rennell, Thomas (2)]]

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

## Renniger, Or Rhanger, Michael[[@Headword:Renniger, Or Rhanger, Michael]]

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

## Renou, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Renou, Jean Baptiste]]

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

## Renoult, Jean Baptiste[[@Headword:Renoult, Jean Baptiste]]

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

## Renovation[[@Headword:Renovation]]

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

## Renshaw, Richard[[@Headword:Renshaw, Richard]]

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

## Rensselaer, Van[[@Headword:Rensselaer, Van]]

             SEE VAN RENSSELAER.

## Renunciantes[[@Headword:Renunciantes]]

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

## Renunciation[[@Headword:Renunciation]]

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

## Renunciatores[[@Headword:Renunciatores]]

             SEE APOTACTICI.

## Renwick, James[[@Headword:Renwick, James]]

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

## Reordination[[@Headword:Reordination]]

             the repetition of the sacramental ordinance of ordination, has ever been held to be contrary to the true theory of sacraments, and has been forbidden by the Church under pain of severe penalties. The ground of this prohibition is well expressed by Morinus, quoting the Council of Trent (Sess. 23 c. 4): “In the sacrament of orders, as in baptism and confirmation, a character is conferred which cannot be effaced or taken away.” The historical evidence as to both the doctrine and practice of the Church is full and complete. The 68th apostolical canon condemned it, and pronounced sentence of deposition on the ordainer and the ordained. The third Council of Carthage (canon 52) forbade it along with rebaptism. Whether the ordinations of heretics and schismatics are to be held valid, and whether those who have received them are on their reconciliation to be received in their several orders, is a question in respect to which the practice of the Church has varied considerably. The Council of Nice decreed that those who had: been ordained by Meletius should be admitted to serve the Church by reordination. The 68th apostolical canon, while condemning the reordination of those once ordained in the Church, allows that of those who had only received heretical ordination. The second Council of Saragossa (A.D. 592) ratifies the baptism of the Arians, but condemns their ordinations. In later times the practice of the Roman Catholic Church has also been very contradictory. Thus the ordinations of Formosus were declared null by Stephen VI, considered valid by John IX, and again declared invalid by Sergius III. The modern Roman practice of reordaining those ordained in the Church of England is not based on any decree of the Church, and has not been invariable. The custom of the Church of England forbids reordination in the case of those ordained within  the Church, and asserts the indelibility of the ordination character. See Aquinas, Summ. pars 3 qu. 38 art. ii; Augustine, Cont. Parmen. lib. ii, c. 13; Ep. 50 ad Bonifac. ii, 661 (ed. Bened.); Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. i, ch. 7; Courayer, Valid. Angl. Ord. (Oxf. 1844); Palmer, On the Church, pt. 6 ch. 6. SEE ORDINATION.

## Repairs Of Churches[[@Headword:Repairs Of Churches]]

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

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

## Repentance[[@Headword:Repentance]]

             (נֹחִם, μετάνοια) signifies a change of the mind from a rebellious and disaffected state to that submission and thorough separation from iniquity by which converted sinners are distinguished (Mat 3:2-8). Repentance is sometimes used generally for a mere change of sentiment, and an earnest wishing that something were undone that has been done. In a sense analogous to this, God himself is said to repent; but this can only be understood of his altering his conduct towards his creatures, either in the bestowing of good or infliction of evil — which change in the divine conduct is founded on a change in his creatures; and thus speaking after the manner of men, God is said to repent. In this generic sense also Esau  “found no place of repentance, though he sought it carefully with tears;” that is, he could not move his father Isaac to repent of what he had done, or to recall the blessing from Jacob and confer it on himself (Heb 12:17; Rom 11:29; 2Co 7:10). There are various kinds of repentance, as

(1) a natural repentance, or what is merely the effect of natural conscience;

(2) a national repentance, such as the Jews in Babylon were called unto, to which temporal blessings were promised (Eze 18:30);

(3) an external repentance, or an outward humiliation for sin, as in the case of Ahab;

(4) a hypocritical repentance, as represented in Ephraim (Hos 7:16);

(5) a legal repentance, which is a mere work of the law and the effect of convictions of sin by it, which in time wear off and come to nothing;

(6) an evangelical repentance, which consists in conviction of sin, accompanied by sorrow for it, confession of it, hatred to it, and renunciation of it.

A legal and an evangelical repentance are distinguished thus:

1. A legal repentance flows only from a sense of danger and fear of wrath, but an evangelical repentance produces a true mourning for sin and an earnest desire of deliverance from it.

2. A legal repentance flows from unbelief, but evangelical is always the fruit and consequence of a saving faith.

3. A legal repentance consists of an aversion to God and to his holy law, but an evangelical flows from love to both.

4. A legal repentance ordinarily flows from discouragement and despondency, but evangelical from encouraging hope.

5. A legal repentance is temporary, but evangelical is the daily exercise of the true Christian.

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

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

## Repentinae[[@Headword:Repentinae]]

             a term for State holidays.

## Repetition[[@Headword:Repetition]]

             Our Lord in his sermon on the Mount (Mat 6:7) cautions his followers against using vain repetitions (βαττολογέω) in prayer. SEE PRAYER, FORMS OF. It is well to distinguish that this is not directed against simple repetitions, which may often arise in the fervor and urgency of earnest supplication, but against the vain repetitions of such as think, whether in theory or practice, “that they shall be heard for their much speaking.” The idea that a prevailing merit was attached to much speaking in prayer with multitudinous repetitions has been, and is, found in most of the false systems of religion. Perhaps we find it among Baal's worshippers, who “called upon the name of Baal from morning to noon, saying, O Baal, hear us!” (1Ki 18:26). The practice was certainly common among the classical heathen, and is noticed by some of their more serious writers with disapprobation and laughed at by their satirists. If we may judge by the hymns of Homer, Orpheus, and Callimachus, we may suppose that the pagan prayers were so stuffed up with synonymous epithets and  prerogatives of the Deity as to be justly liable to the censure of “vain repetitions.” The Jews adopted this and other bad practices, insomuch that it was one of their maxims, “He that multiplies prayer shall be heard.” The same idea was inculcated with much earnestness by Mohammed, and is at this day exhibited in full force among his followers. Witness the following from the Mishat-ul-Masabih: “The prophet said, Shall I not teach you an act by which you may attain the greatness of those who have gone before you,i and by which you shall precede your posterity, excepting those who do as you do? Then they said, Instruct us, O prophet of God. He said, Repeat after every prayer Subhan Allah! [O most pure God!] eleven times, and Allaho acber [God is very great] eleven times, and Alhamdo lilldhi [praise to God! eleven times.” Compare this puerility with the sublime instructions of our Saviour. But again: “Whoever says Subhan Alldh and Bihamdihi a hundred times in a day, his faults shall be silenced, though they be as great as the waves of the sea. Whoever says, morning and evening, Subhan Allah and Bihamdihi a hundred times, no one will bring a better deed than his on the day of resurrection, except one who should have said like him, or added anything thereto.” To these instructions the Mohammedans have been most attentive. There are those among Christians, especially Roman Catholics, who repeat the Lord's Prayer and other forms a great number of times, and vainly think that the oftener the prayer is repeated the more efficacious it is, i.e. if repeated two hundred times it will be twice as good as if repeated only one hundred times. (See the literature in Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 33; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 229.) SEE AVE MARIA; SEE PATERNOSTER; SEE ROSARY

.

## Repetitions In The Liturgy[[@Headword:Repetitions In The Liturgy]]

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

## Rephael[[@Headword:Rephael]]

             (Heb. Rephael', רְפָאֵל, healed of God; Sept. ῾Ραφαήλ), a son of Shemaiah the Levite, of the house of Obed-edom. an able-bodied porter in the service of the house of God in David's reign (1Ch 26:7). B.C. cir. 1015.

## Rephah[[@Headword:Rephah]]

             (Heb. Reophach, רֶפִח, riches; Sept. ῾Ραφή), a son of Beriah, of the tribe of Ephraim, ancestor of Joshua (1Ch 7:25). B.C. post 1618.

## Rephaiah[[@Headword:Rephaiah]]

             (Heb. Rephayah', רְפָיָה, healed of Jehovah; Sept. ῾Ραφαϊvα v. r. ῾Ραφαία, etc.), the name of five Israelites.

1. The second named of six sons of Tola, head of a family in Issachar (1Ch 7:2). B.C. ante 1658.

2. Son of Binea, and eighth in lineal descent from Saul's son Jonathan (1Ch 9:43). B.C. long post 1000. He is also called RAPHA (1Ch 8:37).

3. Son of Ishi, and one of the chieftains of the tribe of Simeon, in the reign of Hezekiah, who headed the expedition of five hundred men against the Amalekites of Mt. Seir and drove them out (1Ch 4:42). B.C. cir. 725.

4. Son of Hur, and ruler of “the half” of Jernsalem. He aided in rebuilding the wall (Neh 3:9). B.C. 445.

5. Son of Hananiah and father of Arnan, among the descendants of Zerubbabel (1Ch 3:21); the same with RHESA (q.v.) of the genealogy of Christ (Luk 3:27).

## Rephaim[[@Headword:Rephaim]]

             [many Reph'aim] (Heb. usually with the art. ha-Rephaim', הָרְפָאַים[see below]), a name which frequently occurs, and in some remarkable passages, as that of a race of unusual stature, who originally dwelt in the country east of the Jordan. The earliest mention of them is the record of their defeat by Chedorlsaomer and some allied kings at Ashteroth Karnaim;  Gen 14:5). They are again mentioned (15:20); their dispersion recorded (Deu 2:10; Deu 2:20), and Og the giant king of Bashan said to be “the only remnant of them” (3:11; Jos 12:4; Jos 13:12; Jos 17:15). Extirpated, however, from the east of Palestine, they long found a home in the West; and in connection with the Philistines, under whose protection the small remnant of them may have lived, they still employed their arms against the Hebrews (2Sa 21:18 sq.; 1Ch 20:4). In the latter passage there seems, however, to be some confusion between the Rephaim and the sons of a particular giant of Gath, named Rapha. Such a name may have been conjectured as that of a founder of the race, like the names Ion, Dorus, Teut, etc. (Bottcher, De Inferis, p. 96, note); Rapha occurs also as a proper name (1Ch 7:25; 1Ch 8:2; 1Ch 8:37). It is probable that they had possessed districts west of the Jordan in early times, since the “valley of Rephaim” (κοιλὰς τῶν Τιτάνων, 2Sa 5:18; 1Ch 11:15; Isa 17:5; κ. τῶν γιγάντων, Joseph. Ant. 7:4, 1), a rich valley south-west of Jerusalem, derived its name from them. That they were not Canaanites is clear from there being no allusion to them in Gen 10:15-19. They were probably one of those aboriginal peoples to whose existence the traditions of many nations testify, and of whose genealogy the Bible gives us no information. The few names recorded have, as Ewald remarks, a Shemitic aspect (Gesch. des Volkes Isr. i, 311); but from the hatred existing between them and both the Canaanites and Hebrews, some suppose them to be Japhethites, “who comprised especially the inhabitants of the coasts and islands” (Kalisch, on Genesis p. 351). SEE CANAANITE.

רְפָאַים is rendered by the Greek versions very variously (Sept. ῾Ραφαείμ, γίγαντες, γηγενεῖς, θεόμαχοι, Τιτᾶνες, and ἰατροί [Psalm 87:10; Isa 26:14, where it is confused with רֹפְאַים; comp. Genesis 1, 2], and sometimes νεκροί, τεθνηκότες, especially in the later versions). In the A.V. the words used for it are “Rephaim,” “giants,” and “the dead.” That it has the latter meaning in many passages.is certain (Psa 88:10; Pro 2:18; Pro 9:18; Pro 21:16; Isa 26:14; Isa 26:19). The question arises, how are these meanings to be reconciled? Gesenius gives no derivation for the national name, and derives ר=mortui, from רָפָא, sanavit, and the proper name Rapha from an Arabic root signifying “tall,” thus seeming to sever all connection between the meanings of the word, which is surely most unlikely. Masius, Simon, etc., suppose the second meaning to come from the fact that both spectres and giants strike terror (accepting the  derivation from רָפָה, remisit, “unstrung with fear,” R. Bechai, on Deuteronomy 2); Vitringa and Hiller from the notion of length involved in stretching out a corpse, or from the fancy that spirits appear in more than human size (Hiller, Syntagn. Hermen. p. 205; Virg. AEn. ii, 772, etc.). J. D. Michaelis (ad Lowth S. Poes. p. 466) endeavored to prove that the Rephaim, etc., were troglodytes, and that hence they came to be identified with the dead. Passing over other conjectures, Bottcher sees in רָפָאand רָפָהa double root, and thinks that the giants were called רְפָאַים(languefacti) by a euphemism; and that the dead were'so called by a title which will thus exactly parallel the Greek καμόντες, κεκμηκότες (comp. Buttmann, Lexil. ii, 237 sq.). An attentive consideration seems to leave little room for doubt that the dead were called Rephaim (as Gesenius also hints) tfrom some notion of Sheol being the residence of the fallen spirits or buried giants. The passages which seem most strongly to prove this are Pro 21:16 (where obviously something more than mere physical death is meant, since that is the common lot of all), Isa 26:14; Isa 26:19, which are difficult to explain without some such supposition, Isa 14:9, where the word עִתּוּדַים (Sept. οἱ ἄρξαντες τῆς γῆς), if taken in its literal meaning of goats, may mean evil spirits represented in that form (comp. Lev 17:7), and especially Job 26:5-6. “Behold the gyantes (A.V. “dead things”) grown under the waters” (Douay version), where there seems to be clear allusion to some subaqueous prison of rebellious spirits like that in which (according to the Hindui legend) Vishnu the water-god confines a race of giants (comp. πυλάρχος, as a title of Neptune, Hesiod, Theog. 732; Nork, Brammin. und Rabb. p. 319 sq.). SEE GIANT. Branches of this great unknown people were the following

1. EMIM (אֵימַים; Septt. Ο᾿μμίν, Ι᾿μμαῖοι), smitten by Chedorlaomer at Shaveh Kiriathaim (Gen 14:5), and occupying the country afterwards held by the Moabites (Deu 2:10), who gave them the name אֵימים, “terrors.” The word rendered “tall” may perhaps be merely “haughty” (ἰσχύοντες). SEE EMIM.

2. ANAKIM (עֲנָקַים). The imbecile terror of the spies exaggerated their proportions into something superhuman (Num 13:28; Num 13:33), and their name became proverbial (Deu 2:10; Deu 9:2). SEE ANAKIM.

3. ZUZIM (זוּזַים), whose principal town was Ham (Gen 14:5), and who lived between the Arnon and the Jabbok, being a northern tribe of  Rephaim. The Ammonites who defeated them called them Zamzunzim, זִמְזֻמַּים (Deu 2:20 sq., which is, however, probably an early gloss). — See Jour. Sac. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 151 sq.; Jan. 1852, p. 363 sq.; April, 1852, p. 55 sq.; July, 1852, p. 302 sq.; Oct. 1852, p. 87 sq.; Jan. 1853, p. 279 sq. SEE ZUZIM.

## Rephaim, Valley Of[[@Headword:Rephaim, Valley Of]]

             (Heb. E'mek Rephaim', רְפָאַים עֵמֶק; Sept. ἡ κοιλὰς τῶν Τιτάνων or Γιγάντων in Joshua γῆ or Ε᾿μὲκ ῾Ραφαϊvν; in Isaiah φάραγξ στερεά; Vulg. vallis Raphaimrn or gigantun; A.V. “valley of the giants” in Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16), a valley beginning adjacent to the valley of Hinnom, south-west of Jerusalem, and stretching away south-west on the right of the road to Bethlehem (Jos 15:8; Jos 17:5; Jos 18:6; 2Sa 5:18; 2Sa 5:22). The valley appears to derive its name from the ancient nation of the Rephaim. It may be a trace of an early settlement of theirs, possibly after they were driven from their original seats east of the Jordan by Chedorlaomer (Gen 14:5), and before they again migrated northward to the more secure wooded districts in which we find them at the date of the partition of the country among the tribes (Jos 17:15; A.V. “giants”). In this case it is a parallel to the “mount of the Amalekites” in the centre of Palestine, and to the towns bearing the name of the Zemaraim, the Avim, the Ophnites, etc., which occur so frequently in Benjamin.

The valley of Rephaim is first mentioned in the description given by Joshua of the northern border of Juldah. The passage is important: “The border went up by the valley of the son of Hinnom unto the south side of the Jebusite: the same is Jerusalem; and the border went up to the top of the mountain that lieth before the valley of Hinnom westward, which is at the end of the valley of the giants northward” (Jos 15:8). The last clause in the Hebrew is not quite clear (עמקאּרפאים צפונה בקצה). It may mean that the boundarvlilne was north of the valley, or that the valley was north of the boundary. The latter construction is possible; but the former is unquestionably the more natural, and is supported by the Sept. and the Vulgate, and also by most commentators. If this interpretation be admitted, the situation of the valley is certain: it lay on the south of the hill which enclosed Hinnom on the west. This; view is further strengthened by the notice in Jos 18:16. When David was hiding from Saul in the cave of Adullam, we are told that the Philistines, no doubt taking advantage of  intestine troubles, invaded the mountain fastnesses of Israel. A band of theim pitched in the valley of Rephaim, and at the same time seized and garrisoned Bethlehem, David's native place (2Sa 23:13-14). It was then that three of his warriors, to gratify a wish of their chief, broke through the enemies' lines and drew water from the well by the gate of Bethlehem.

The narrative shows clearly that the valley of Rephaim could not have been far distant from Bethlehem (1Ch 11:15-19). The “hold” (1Ch 11:14) in which David found himself seems (though it is not clear) to have been the cave of Adullam, the scene of the commencement of his freebooting life; but, wherever situated, we need not doubt that it was the same fastness as that mentioned in 2Sa 5:17, since in both cases the same word (הִמְּצוּדָה, with the definite article), and that not a usual one, is employed. The story shows very clearly the predatory nature of these incursions of the Philistines. It was in “harvest time” (2Sa 5:13). They had come to carry off the ripe crops, for which the valley was proverbial (Isa 17:5), just as at Pas-dammum (1Ch 11:13) we find them in the parcel of ground full of barley, at Lehi in the field of lentiles (2Sa 23:11), or at Keilah in the threshing-floors (1Sa 23:1). Their animals (חִיָּה) were scattered among the ripe corn receiving their load of plunder. The “garrison,” or the officer in charge of the expedition, was on the watch in the village of Bethlehem. On two other occasions, soon after David was proclaimed king, the Philistines invaded the mountains and drew up their armies on the same plain; they were at once attacked by David's veterans and routed with great slaughter (2Sa 5:18; 2Sa 5:22; 1Ch 14:9-13). The destruction inflicted on them and on their idols was so signal that it gave the place a new name, and impressed itself on the popular mind of Israel with such distinctness that the prophet Isaiah could employ it, centuries after, as a symbol of a tremendous impending judgment of God — nothing less than the desolation and destruction of the whole earth (Isa 28:21-22). SEE PERAZIM, MOUNT.

But from none of these notices do we learn anything of the position of the valley. Josephus in one place (Ant. 7:4, 1) says that the valley of the giants was near Jerusalem; and in another place (7:12, 4), when narrating the story of the drawing of water from the well at Bethlehem, in which he makes a strange blunder, he says the valley extended from Jerusalem “to the city of Bethlehem.” Eusebius and Jerome, on the other hand, place it on the north of Jerusalem (Onomast. s.v. “Raphaim”), and in the territory of  Benjamin (ibid. s.v. “Emec Raphaim”). Their notices, however, are brief and unsatisfactory (see Onomast. s.v. “Coelas Titanorum,” and the excellent note by Bonfrere). A position north-west of the city is adopted by Furst (Handw. ii, 383 b), apparently on the ground of the terms of Jos 15:8; Jos 18:16, which certainly do leave it doubtful whether the valley is on the north of the boundary or the boundary on the north of the valley; and Tobler, in his last investigations (Dritte Wanderung, p. 202), conclusively adopts the Wady-Der Jasin (W. Makhrior, on Van de Velde's map), one of the side valleys of the great Wady Beit Hanina, as the valley of Rephaim. This position is open to the obvious objection of too great distance from both Bethlehem and the cave of Adullam (according to any position assignable to the latter) to meet the requirements of 2Sa 23:13. Since the latter part of the 16th century the name has been attached to the upland plain which stretches south of Jerusalem, and is crossed by the road to Bethlehemthe Buik'ah of the modern Arabs (Tobler, Jerusalem, ii, 401). Dr. Robinson says, “As we advanced (towards the holy city) we had on the right low hills, and on the left the cultivated valley or plain of Rephaim, or the ‘giants,' with gentle hills beyond. This plain is broad, and descends gradually towards the south-west until it contracts in that direction into a deeper and narrower valley, called Wady el- Werd, which unites farther on with Wady Ahmed, and finds its way to the Mediterranean. The plain of Rephaim extends nearly t6 the city, which, as seen from it, appears to be almost on tle same level. As we advanced, the plain was terminated by a slight rocky ridge, forming the brow of the valley of Hinnom” (Researches, i, 219). It is true that this tract has more of the nature of a plateau or plain considerably elevated than a valley in the ordinary sense. But on the south-west it does partake more of this character (see Bonar, Land of Promise, p. 177), and possibly in designating so wide and open a tract by the name of the Rephaim valley there was a sort of play on the giant race with which it was associated, as if it, like them, must set at naught ordinary dimensions. South of Mount Zion — the most southern part of the valley of Gihon — is called Wady Rafaath by the Arabs, which corresponds to Rephaim in Hebrew. Hence Schwarz infers that this is the true valley of Rephaim, though usually taken for that of the son of Hinnom (Palest. p. 240). SEE JERUSALEM.

## Rephaims[[@Headword:Rephaims]]

             so the Hebrew plural Rephaim (q.v.) is incorrectly pluralized again in English in the A.V. (Gen 14:5; Gen 15:20).

## Rephidim[[@Headword:Rephidim]]

             (Heb. Rephidim', רְפַידַים, supports, i.e., perhaps, resting-places; Sept. and Josephus, ῾Ραφιδίν), a station of the Israelites on their journey through the Arabian desert, to which they passed from the Desert of Sin (Exo 17:1), situated, according to Num 33:14 sq., between Alush and the wilderness of Sinai. Here the Amalekites attacked Israel, but were repulsed (Exo 17:8 sq.). Here also Moses struck the rock, from which the fountain of water leaped forth; to which the later Jewish traditions added many other wonders, as that the rock itself followed the people in theirjourney, supplying water always (seeWettstein and Schottgen, on 1Co 10:4; Buxtorf, Exercit. p. 391 sq.). The knowledge of this miraculous gift of water reached the Romans. Tacitus alludes to it (Hist. v, 3), and supposes that Moses was guided by wild asses, and then by the green pasture, to the exact spot where water was concealed (comp., in the Grecian mythology, especially Pausan. 4:36, 5; but the legend of Hippocrene [Ovid, Met. v, 256 sq.] has scarcely any points of resemblance). The most definite indication as to the situation of Rephidim is incidentally supplied in the Scripture account of the above miracle. While encamped at Rephidim, “there was no water for the people to drink,” and they murmured against Moses. He was therefore commanded to “go on (עֲבֹר, pass, i.e. cross the desert shore) before the people,” and with his rod to smite “the rock in Horeb,” upon which (הִצּוּר

עִל, the towering cliff bounding the range et-Tlh) Jehovah stood. (This admirably suits the entrance of Wady Hibran, but is utterly vague and inapt if spoken of the interior.) In consequence of this, Rephidim was called Massah (“ temptation”) and, Meribah (“chiding”). As the Israelites, though encamped in Rephidim, were able to draw their needful supply of water from “the rock in Horeb,” the two places must have been adjacent. Assuming Jebel Muisa to be Sinai (or Horeb), and that the Israelites approached it by Wady es-Sheik; which is the: only practicable route for such a multitude coming from Egypt, it follows that Rephidim was not more than one march — and apparently a short one — distant from the mountain. Notwithstanding this indication, however, the position of Rephidim has created much discussion among travellers and sacred geographers. Josephus appears to locate it very near to Sinai, and states that the place was entirely destitute of water, while in their preceding marches the people had met with fountains (Ant. 3:1, 7, and 5, 1). Eusebius  and Jerome say it was near Mount Horeb ( Onomast. s.v. “Raphidim”). Cosmas places it at the distance of six miles, which agrees pretty nearly with that of Nebi Saleh (Topographia Christiana, v, 207 sq.). Robinson removes it some miles farther down Wady es-Sheik to a narrow gorge which forms a kind of door to the central group of mountains. He gets over the difficulty in regard to the proximity of Horeb by affirming that that name was given, not to a single mountain, but to the whole group (Bib. Res. i, 120). SEE HOREB.

Mr. Sandie places Rephidim at the extreme end of Wady er-Rahah, and identifies it with a Wady Rudhwan. He supposes that the Israelites marched from the coast plain of el-KIaa by Wady Daghadah (Horeb and Jerusalem, p. 159). This route, however, would scarcely be practicable for such a multitude. Lepsius (ed. Bohn, p. 310 sq.), Stewart (Tent and Khan), Ritter (Pal. und Syr. i, 738 sq.), Stanley (Syr. and Pal. p. 40 sq.), and others, locate Rephidim in Wady Feiran, near the base of Mount Serbal, especially at the oasis of el-Hesmeh or the rock Hesy el-Khatatin (Palmer, Desert of the Exodus, p. 135). The great distance from Sinai — twelve hours' march — and the abundance of water at Feiran appear to be fatal to this theory. No spot in the whole peninsula has such a supply of water, and Feirin is on this account called “the paradise of the Bedawin.” The position of Rephidim, it is thus seen, largely depends upon the route which the Israelites may be supposed to have taken from the Desert of Sin to Mount Sinai. Murphy (Comment. on Exodus p. 174 sq.) regards that by way of Wady Hibran as being out of the question, partly on account of its length (whereas it is really little, if any, farther than either of the two other practicable ones, especially the northern one by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh, which he prefers), and partly on account of the narrow and difficult passes (especially Nagb Ajameh) along it, which, however, are no worse than many others in different parts of their identified route (see Palmer, Desert of the Exodus [Amer. ed.], p. 228).

Keil, who likewise prefers the same northern route for reaching Sinai, observes (Comment. on Pent. [Clarke's ed.] 2, 75) that Rephidim lay at only one day's distance from Sinai (Exo 19:2). He therefore locates Rephidim at the point where the Wady es-Sheik opens into the plain er- Rahah, although this would be almost at the foot of Sinai, and past several fountains which would have relieved their thirst without the need of a miracle. If, on the other hand, we should place Rephidim at the other end of the Wady es-Sheik, this, according to Keil's own showing, would be about as far from Sinai as the mouth of Wady Hibran, which last is, after all, only twenty miles, foilowing the windings of the valleys. The great  objection to the access by way of the Debbet er-Ramleh is that although this (as the name signifies) is in the main a sandy plain, yet there are not wanting springs at various points along its course — one especially, Ain el- Akdar (i.e. “the green”), being situated just at its junction with Wady es- Sheik (Robinson, Bib. Res. i, 125). By the way of the plain el-Kaa and Wady Hibran, on the contrary, there is total drought, so that the Israelites, as the narrative requires, woutl have exhausted the stock brought probably from Elim, without having been meanwhile in a region where their scouts could have procured water within any reaching distance. For the same reason, the most natural route of all — by way of Wady Feiran — must be suspected, which, as already said, is the best watered and most fertile of all in that vicinity (ibid. i, 126). There is still another route from the Red Sea at Ras Abu-Zenimah (where the Israelites evidently encamped) to Sinai — namely, by way of Sarabet el-Khadim. This, although not so smooth as by wadies Feiran and es-Sheik, is nevertheless quite practicable, and is often taken by modern travellers. This route is advocated by Knobel, Keil, Cook (in his Specker's Commentary), and others, who find the Desert of Sin in Debbet er- Ramleh, Dophkah in Wady Tih, and perhaps Alush in Wady el- Esh. The water supply on this route is good, but the presence of a military force of Egyptians at the mines in Sarabet el-Khadim is a grave objection to its having been followed by the Israelites. There are two traditionary spots fixed upon as the scene of Moses' smiting of the rock, and hence called Hajr Mosa, or “Moses's Rock.” Ole is pointed out by the Arabs in Wady Feiran,: and the other by the monks in Wady Lejah. The former is too distant and the latter too near for the Biblical account. SEE MERIBAH.

If the Israelites approached Sin ai by wav of Wady Hibran, we should look for Rephidim at the entrance of that valley from the plain along the Red Sea, as suggested under the article EXODE SEE EXODE; but if they reached Mount Sinai by way of Wady Feiran, as most writers suppose or by way of Sarabet el-Khadim, then we must probably look for Rephidim somewhere near the entrance from Wady es-Sheik to the plain er-Rahah, perhaps at the pass of el-Watiyeh, indicated above by Robinson. This defile was visited and described by Burckhardt (Syria, etc., p. 488) as at about five hours' distance from where it issues from the plain er-Rahah, narrowing between abrupt cliffs of blackened granite to about forty feet in width. Here is also the traditional “seat of Moses.” Within the pass the valley expands, affording ample space for a large camp. The nearest water is in Wady Sheb, two miles distant to the south-west (Porter, Hand-book, p. 65). See Ridgaway, The Lord's Land, p. 57 sq. The arguments in favor  of the location of Rephidim at el-Watlyeh are forcibly presented by Mr. Holland in Jerusalem Recovered, p. 420 sq. SEE SINAI.

## Reposoir[[@Headword:Reposoir]]

             1. A receptacle for the tabernacle in, the procession of Corpus Christi.

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

## Repousse[[@Headword:Repousse]]

             a French artistic term signifying hammered work.

## Representation[[@Headword:Representation]]

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

## Representation, Lay[[@Headword:Representation, Lay]]

             SEE LAY REPRESENTATION.

## Representers[[@Headword:Representers]]

             or MARROW MEN. SEE MARROW CONTROVERSY.

## Reproach[[@Headword:Reproach]]

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

## Reprobation[[@Headword:Reprobation]]

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

1. It cannot be reconciled to the love of God. “God is love.” “He is loving to every man, and his tender mercies are over all his works.”

2. Nor to the wisdom of God; for the bringing into being a vast number of intelligent creatures under a necessity of sinning and of being eternally lost, teaches no moral lesson to the world; and contradicts all those notions of wisdom in the ends and processes of government which we are taught to look for, not only from natural reason, but from the Scriptures.

3. Nor to the grace of God, so often magnified in the Scriptures. For it does not, certainly, argue superabounding richness of grace, when ten thousand have equally offended, to pardon one or two of them.

4. Nor to those passages of Scripture which represent God as tenderly compassionate and pitiful to the worst of his creatures. “I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth;” “The Lord is long-suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish.”

5. Nor to his justice. We may affirm that justice and equity in God are what they are taken to be among reasonable men; and if men everywhere would consider it as contrary to justice that a sovereign should condemn to death one. or more of his subjects for not obeying laws which it was utterly  impossible for them to obey, it is manifestly unjust to charge God with acting in precisely the same manner. In whatever light the subject be viewed, no fault, in any right construction, can be chargeable upon the person so punished, or, as we may rather say, destroyed, since punishment supposes a judicial proceeding which this act shuts out. Every received notion of justice is thus violated.

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

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

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

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

## Reproof[[@Headword:Reproof]]

             (תֹּכִחִת גְּעָרָה, ἔλεγχος), blame or reprehension spoken to a person's face. It is distinguished from a reprimand thus: he who reproves another, points out his fault, and blames him; he who reprimands affects to punish, and mortifies the offender. In giving reproof, the following rules may be observed:

1. We should not be forward in reproving our elders or superiors, but rather to remonstrate and supplicate for redress. What the ministers of God do in this kind, they do by special commission as those that must give an account (1Ti 5:1; Heb 13:17).

2. We must not reprove rashly; there should be proof before reproof.

3. We should not reprove for slight matters, for such faults or defects as proceed from natural frailty, from inadvertency, or mistake in matters of small consequence.

4. We should never reprove unseasonably, as to the time, the place, or the circumstances.

5. We should reprove mildly and sweetly, in the calmest manner, in the gentlest terms.

6. We should not affect to be reprehensive; perhaps there is no one considered more troublesome than he who delights in finding fault with others.

In receiving reproof, it may be observed,

1. That we should not reject it merely because it may come from those who are not exactly on a level with ourselves.

2. We should consider whether the reproof given be not actually deserved; and whether, if the reprover knew all, the reproof would not be sharper than it is.

3. Whether, if taken humbly and patiently, it will not be of great advantage to us.

4. That it is nothing but pride to suppose that we are never to be the subjects of reproof, since it is human to err.

## Reptile[[@Headword:Reptile]]

             a word not used in the A.V., which designates this class of animals by the term “creeping thing” (q.v.), but covers thereby a much wider range of creatures. The following are the true reptilia mentioned in Scripture. They  almost exclusively consist of various unknown species of serpents and lizards. Of course both these classes were unclean to the Hebrews.

## Requiem[[@Headword:Requiem]]

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

## Reredos[[@Headword:Reredos]]

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

## Rescissory Act[[@Headword:Rescissory Act]]

             an act of the Scottish Parliament passed on the restoration of Charles II, annulling all acts passed between 1638 and 1650 for religion and the Reformation; denouncing the Solemn League and Covenant and the  Glasgow Assembly of 1638, and declaring that the government of the Church, as an essential royal prerogative, belongs alone to the crown.

## Rescript[[@Headword:Rescript]]

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

.

## Resemblance To God[[@Headword:Resemblance To God]]

             SEE IMAGE OF GOD.

## Resen[[@Headword:Resen]]

             (Heb. id. ) רֶסֶןa halter, as in Isa 30:20; Sept. Δασέμ v. r. Δασή), an ancient town of Assyria, described as a great city lying between Nineveh and Calah (Gen 10:12). Many writers have been inclined to identify it with the Rhesina or Rhescena of the Byzantine authors (Amm. Marc. 23:5; Procop. Bell. Pers. ii, 19; Steph. Byz. s.v. ῾Ρέσινα), and of Ptolemy (Geograph. v, 18), whkh was near the true source of the western Khabour, and which is most probably the modern Ras el-Ain. There are no grounds, however, for this identification except the similarity of name (which similarity is perhaps fallacious, since the Sept. evidently reads דסןfor רסן, but not the Samar.), while it is a fatal objection to the theory that Resaena or Resina was not in Assyria at all, but in Western Mesopotamia, 200 miles to the west of both the cities between which it is said to have lain. Biblical geographers have generally been disposed to follow Bochart (Phaleg, 4:23) in finding a trace of the Hebrew name in La-issa, Which is mentioned by Xenophon (Anab. 3:4, 9) as a desolate city on the Tigris, several miles north of the Lycus. The resemblance of the names is too faint to support the inference of identity; but the situation is not irreconcilable with the scriptural intimation. Ephrem Syrus (Comment. ad loc.) says that Rassa, which he substitutes for Resen (the Peshito has Ressin), was the  same as Rish-Ain (fountain-head); by which Assemani understands him to mean, not the place in Mesopotamia so called, but another Rish-Ain in Assyria, near Saphsaphre, in the province of Marga, which he finds noticed in a Syrian monastic history of the Middle Ages (Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. 3:2, p. 709).

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

## Resentment[[@Headword:Resentment]]

             generally used in an ill sense, implying a determination to return an injury. Dr. Johnson observes that resentment is a union of sorrow with malignity; a combination of a passion which all endeavor to avoid with a passion which all concur to detest. The man who retires to meditate mischief and to exasperate his own rage; whose thoughts are employed only on means of distress and contrivances of ruin; whose mind never pauses from the  reneembrance of his own sufferings but to indulge some hope of enjoying the calamities of another, may justly be numbered among the most miserable of human beings — among those who are guilty, who have neither the gladness of prosperity nor the calm of innocence.

## Reservation, Or Restriction[[@Headword:Reservation, Or Restriction]]

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

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

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

## Reserve In Teaching[[@Headword:Reserve In Teaching]]

             This is the suppression, in the instruction of the great mass of Christians, of a portion of those Gospel doctrines which are most earnestly set forth in Scripture, as if they were a sort of esoteric mystery of which ordinary believers are unworthy, and which should be reserved as a reward for a long course of pious submission. The maintainers of this system of teaching affect great mystery about the highest and most sacred doctrines of Christianity (such as the atonement, the divinity of our Lord, etc.); they regard them as too solemn and divine to be vulgarized by being explicitly and prominently put before the Christian world at large. They would therefore “economize” the knowledge of such deep doctrines. reserving them for communication to those worthy of being initiated, meanwhile asserting that the ordinary Christian is put in possession of these truths, and to a certain degree derives virtue out of them, by partaking of thle sacraments, etc. It is on the authority of the fathers.that the advocates of  “reserve” chiefly dwell as most fully and expressly supporting the principle; but they adduce also, in justification of the system, the reverence it has a tendencv to beget for sacred things (as if it were reverence, and not superstition, in those who know not what they are reverencing), and allege that doing thus they are acting a merciful part in keeping those in ignorance who would not make a profitable use of knowledge (just as if they had the power of discerning spirits). They contend that they are imitating the most perfect Pattern of wisdom and mercy, who thus economizes light and knowledge (e.g. concealing the Gospel at first under the veil of the Mosaic ritual), as if it were a system of philosophy of their own they undertook to teach, or as if they were imitating the Deity in concealing what he had revealed. The example of our Lord is appealed to, who, they say, taught openly by parables, but privately explained the mysteries of his kingdom to his disciples; a case quite inapplicable, as our Lord used reserve, not to his disciples, but towards wilful unbelievers. The system is also vindicated by studiously confounding it with the gradual initiation of Christians in the knowledge of their religion, and the necessity of gradual teaching; and the care requisite to avoid teaching anything which, though true in itself, would be falsely understood by the hearers is confounded with the system of withholding a portion of Gospel truths from those able and willing to receive it. It is almost needless to add that the entire system is opposed to the Word of God, which commands ministers not to shun to declare to the people “all the counsel of God,” and that it is calculated to throw doubt and uncertainty upon the whole Christian religion; for, as in this system of “reserve” there mav be an indefinite number of degrees, none can ever be sure that he has fathomed the system and ascertained what is the real inmost doctrine of its advocates. See the Rev. Dr. West's Sermon on Reserve in Teaching.

## Reserved Cases[[@Headword:Reserved Cases]]

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

## Resheph[[@Headword:Resheph]]

             (Heb. id. רֶשֶׁפ, flame, as often; Sept. ῾Ρασέφ v.r. Σαράφ), one of the descendants of Ephraim, a “son” of Beriah (q.v.) (1Ch 7:25). B.C. post 1658.

## Residence[[@Headword:Residence]]

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

In Great Britain, at the present time, residence is now regulated by 1 and 2 Vict. c. 106. The penalties for it, without a license from the bishop, are, one third of the annual value of the benefice when the absence exceeds three but does not exceed six months; one half of the annual value when the absence exceeds six but does not exceed eight months; and when it has been for the whole year, three fourths of the annual income are forfeited. Certain persons are exempted from the penalties of nonresidence, as the heads of colleges at Oxford and Cambridge, the warden of Durham University, and the headmasters of Eton, Winchester, and Westminster schools. Privileges for temporary non-residence are granted to a great  number of persons who hold offices in cathedrals and at the two universities of Oxford and Cambridge. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. 6 ch. 4 p. 7; Eadie, Eccles. Cyclop. s.v.

## Resignation[[@Headword:Resignation]]

             a patient, unresisting submission to the will of God, acknowledging both his power and right to afflict. The obligations to this duty arise from: 1. The perfections of God (Deu 32:4). 2. The purpose of God (Eph 1:11). 3. The commands of God (Heb 12:9). 4. The promises of God (1Pe 5:7). 5. Our own interest (Hos 2:14-15). 6. The prospect of eternal felicity (Heb 4:9). SEE PATIENCE.

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

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

1. When a bishop, through the obstinacy, hatred, or disgust of any people, found himself incapable of doing them any service, and that the burden was an intolerable oppression to him; in thatcase, if he desired to resign, his resignation was accepted. Thus Gregory Nazianzen renounced the see of Constantinople because the people murmured at him as a stranger.

2. When in charity a bishop resigned, or showed himself willing to resign, to cure some inveterate schism. Thus Chrysostom announced his willingness to resign if the people had any suspicion that he was a usurper. In such cases canonical pensions were sometimes granted. The following are the rules that prevail in the Church of England: It can be made only to a superior, and it must be to such superior as the one from whom it was immediately obtained; for example, where institution was required, the party having the right to institute is the same to whom resignation is to be made; and in the case of donatives, resignation is to be made to the patron. Resignation must be made personally, and not by proxy: that is, it must be made either by personal appearance before the ordinary, or by an instrument properly attested and presented to him. It must be made without any condition annexed; in the words of the instrument, it must be made “absolute et simpliciter,” and it must further be, in the words of the same instrument, “sponte et pure.” It must also be made voluntarily, and it must not proceed from any corrupt inducement. If an incumbent take any pension, sum of money, or other benefit, directly or indirectly, for or in  respect of the resigning of a benefice having cure of souls, such a transaction is criminal in the view of the law, and both the giver and receiver in it are liable to legal penalties. No resignation can be valid till accepted by the proper ordinary, but the law has provided no remedy if the ordinary should refuse to accept. In as far as legal decisions have hitherto gone, the ordinary is no more compellable to accept a resignation than he is to admit persons into holy orders. Whien a resignation has been accepted, notice is to be given to the patron, if different from the ordinary; and lapse does not begin to run, as against the patron, until notice of the vacancy has been properly given to him. A Presbyterian minister resigns to the presbytery in whose bounds his charge is. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. bk. 6 ch. 4 p. 2; Eden. Theol. Dict. s.v.

## Resolutioners, Or Resolutionists[[@Headword:Resolutioners, Or Resolutionists]]

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

## Respect Of Persons[[@Headword:Respect Of Persons]]

             (προσωποληψία, Rom 2:11; Eph 6:9; Col 3:25; Jam 2:1; a later Greek word, found only in the New Test., and modelled after the use of שָׁעָהwith פָּנַים), partiality for individuals. God appointed that the judges should pronounce sentence without respect of persons (Lev 19:15; Deu 16:17; Deu 16:19). That they should consider neither the poor nor the rich, the weak nor the powerful, but should attend only to truth and justice. God has no respect of persons. The Jews complimented our Saviour that he told the truth, without respect of persons, without fear (Mat 22:16; Isa 32:1-16). Jude (Isa 32:16), instead of the phrase “to have respect of persons,” has “to admire persons.”

Our English term respect seems to imply some kind of deference or submission to a party; but this is not always the proper meaning to be annexed to it in Scripture. When we read (Exo 2:25) “God had  respect to the children of Israel,” it can only express his compas. sion and sympathy for them; when God had respect to the offering of Abel (Gen 4:4), it imports to accept favorably, to notice with satisfaction. (Comp. 1Ki 8:28; Num 16:15.)

## Respond[[@Headword:Respond]]

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

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

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

.

## Responsales[[@Headword:Responsales]]

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

## Response[[@Headword:Response]]

             Among the Hebrews the usual response by the people to prayer was by the utterance of the word Amen at the close; and this practice was naturally adopted, or rather continued, by Christians likewise. This word (אָמֵן), literally “firm, true,” was used as a substantive, “that which is true,” “truth” (Isa 65:16). It was employed in strong asseverations, fixing, as it were, the stamp of truth upon the assertion which it accompanied, and making it binding as an oath (comp. Num 5:22). In the Sept. of 1Ch 16:36; Neh 5:13; Neh 8:6, the word appears in the form Α᾿μήν, which is used throughout the New Test. In other passages the Hebrew is rendered by γένοιτο, except in Isa 65:16. The Vulgate adopts the Hebrew word in all cases except in the Psalms, where it is translated fiat. In Deu 27:15-26, the people were to say “Amen” as the Levites pronounced each of the curses upon Mount Ebal, signifying by this their assent to the conditions under which the curses would be inflicted. In accordance with this usage we find that among the rabbins “Amen” involves the ideas of swearing, acceptance, and truthfulness. The first two are illustrated by thle passages already quoted, the last by 1Ki 1:36; Joh 3:3; Joh 3:5; Joh 3:11 (A.V. “verily”), in which the assertions are made with the solemnity of an oath and then strengthened by the repetition of “Amen.” “Amen” was the proper response of the person to whom an oath was administered (Neh 5:13; Neh 8:6; 1Ch 16:36; Jer 11:5, marg.); and the Deity, to whom appeal is made on such occasions, is called “the God of Amen” (Isa 65:16), as being a witness to the sincerity of the implied compact. With a similar significance Christ is called “the Amen, the faithful and true witness” (Rev 3:14; comp. Joh 1:14; Joh 16:6; 2Co 1:20). It is matter of tradition that in the Temple the “Amen” was not uttered by the people, but that instead, at the conclusion of the priest's prayers, they responded. “Blessed be the name of the glory of his kingdom for ever and ever.” Of this a trace is supposed to remain in the concluding sentence of the Lord's Prayer (comp. Rom 11:36). But in the synagogues and private houses it was customary for the people or members of the family who were present to say “Amen” to the prayers which were offered by the minister or the master of the house, and the custom remained in the early Christian Church (Mat 6:13; 1Co 14:16). And not only public prayers, but those offered in private, and doxologies were appropriately concluded with “Amen”  (Rom 9:5; Rom 11:36; Rom 15:33; Rom 16:27; 2Co 13:13, etc.). SEE AMEN.

## Responses[[@Headword:Responses]]

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

(1.) Amen. This, in the phraseology of the Church, is denominated orationis signaculum, or devotee concionis responsio, and intimates that the prayer of the speaker is heard, and approved by him who gives this response.

(2.) Hallelujah. This was adopted from the Jewish psalmody, particularly from those psalms (113-118) which were sung at the Passover, called the Great Hillel, or Hallel. The use of this phrase was first adopted by the Church at Jerusalem, and from this was received by the other churches, and was restricted to the fifty days between Easter and Whit-Sunday. In the Greek Church it was expressive of grief, sorrow, and penitence, while in the Latin it denoted a joyful spirit.

(3.) Hosanna. The Church, both ancient and modern, has ascribed to this word a meaning similar to that of hallelujah. The true signification is “Lord save” (Psa 118:25).

(4.) “O Lord have mercy” — κύριε ἐλέησον. The Council of Vaison, A.D. 492, canon 3, ordained that this response should be introduced into the morning and evening worship, and into the public religious service. Gregory the Great introduced a threefold form, “O Lord,” “Lord have mercy,” “Christ have mercy.”

(5.) “Glory, glory in the highest,” in use on festive occasions in the 5th century, and in general use in the 7th century.

(6.) “The Lord be with you;” “Peace be with you,” ordained by the Council of Braga, A.D. 561, to be the uniform salutation of bishops and presbyters  when addressing the people. The last-mentioned salutation alone was in use in the Greek Church. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq.; Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.

## Responsorii, Psalmi[[@Headword:Responsorii, Psalmi]]

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

## Ressaunt[[@Headword:Ressaunt]]

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

## Rest, Or Repose[[@Headword:Rest, Or Repose]]

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

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

Rest has the following figurative meanings: to lean, or trust in (2Ch 32:8); to continue fixed (Isa 51:4); to come to an end (Eze 16:42; Eze 21:17); cease from war (Jos 14:15).  Rest, like sleep, is in the Scriptures sometimes used as the symbol of death. Thus the patriarch exclaims, “For now should I have lain still and been quiet, I should have slept; then had I been at rest, with kings and counsellors of the earth” (Job 3:13); and thus a charge is given to Daniel: “Go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days” (Dan 12:13). This phrase also occurs in 1Sa 28:15; Job 11:18; Act 2:26; Rev 6:9; and is common on Jewish monuments for the dead, as “May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with the other just men of the world.” “May his soul rest in peace till the Comforter come.” “May his rest be in the garden of Eden, with other just men. Amen, amen, amen, Selah.”

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

## Restitution[[@Headword:Restitution]]

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

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

(1.) Fines, ענש, onesh, strictly so called, went commonly to the injured party, and were of two kinds: fixed, i.e. those of which the amount was determined by some statute as, for instance, that of Deu 22:19, or deu 22:29; and undetermined, or where the amount was left to the decision of the judges (Exo 21:22).

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

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

(4.) If a man dug a pit and did not cover it, or let an old pit remain open and another man's beast fell into it, the owner of such pit was obliged to pay for the beast and had it for the payment (Exo 21:33-34).

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

Moralists observe respecting restitution:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

(b) Schulz (in his Dissert. de Temporibus τῆς ἀναψύξεως, in the Biblioth. Hagan. v, 119 sq.) understands the time of death, the terminus fixed to each man's life, the future rest of the dead in the Lord; a view which Barkey (ibid. p. 411) justly opposes by this, among other considerations,  that if this had been Peter's meaning it is strange he had not used clearer and more customary phraseology.

(c) Kraft (Obss. Sacr. fascic. 9:271 sq.) remarks that Peter on this passage derives his argument not merely from the hope of pardon, but also from the benefits already bestowed by God, and therefore considers this “refreshing” to be the liberation afforded by Jesus from the ceremonial yoke of bondage of the Jewish law, an exposition which is well refuted by Barkey (Bibl. Hag. 3:119 sq.), who pertinently remarks that Peter at this very time was not himself free from legal prejudices.

(d) Barkey (ibid. v, 397 sq.) thinks these “times of refreshing” are the period of the delay of the divine judgment upon the Jews, the time of the divine longsuffering, in which the zeal of the Almighty's vengeance was remitted or relaxed. He regards the expression “Jesus Christ” here as put for “the word of Jesus Christ,” and so refers the words “he shall send,” etc., to the preaching of the doctrine of Jesus.

(e) In the opinion of Grotius, Hammond, and Bolten, the “times of refreshing” are the time of the freedom of Christians from Jewish persecution and the calamities impending over the wicked and refractory Jews (Mat 24:33; Luk 21:28); while the “times of restitution” are the time of the fulfilment of the predictions concerning the overthrow of the capital and polity of the Jews (comp. Mat 24:15; Mat 24:30).

(f) Ernesti (in his Opusc. Theol. p. 477), who finds a follower in Dbderlein (Institutio Theol. Christ. ii, § 223, obs. 6), interprets the term apocatastasis as meaning a new, greater, and truer perfection of religion, the doctrine of the Gospel clear and free from all shadows of figures and rites; first announced by John, then promulgated by Jesus among the Jews, and finally propagated by the apostle everywhere. This view he fortifies by the observation that “times of restitution” is equivalent to “time of reformation” (διόρθωσις, Heb 9:10).

(g) Also Eckermann (Theologische Beitrage, 1, ii, 112 sq.) interprets the “apocatatasasis of all things” to mean the universal emendation of religion by the doctrine of Christ, and the “times of refreshing” to be the day of renewal, the times of the Messiah. The same writer, however, afterwards (ibid. II, i, 188 sq.) rejects this exposition on the ground that the parallel passages (Mat 11:17; Mar 9:12) speak of Elijah as to precede and rectify Jewish faith and morals. He therefore concludes that Peter was  referring to a restoration of the Jewish polity in its original splendor. Yet finally (in his Erkalrung aller dunkeln Stellen des N.T. ii, 184) he returns to his original opinion. (h) Rosenmuller, following Morus, understands the “times of refreshing” to denote happy times, not merely the day of the resurrectioni of the dead, but also spiritual benefits of every kind which Christians enjoy in this and the future life (Morus: the Messianic times), and refers the “times of restitution” (full and perfect fulfilment of prophecy) to the consummation of that auspicious period when all enemies shall be subdued (1 Corinthians 20:25 sq.; Heb 10:12; Heb 10:15; comp. Psa 110:1), and every influence opposing true religion removed. Many of these interpretations are obviously fanciful, and most of them too vague, although some contain an element of truth. The word ἀποκατάστασις signifies emendation, restoration to a pristine condition, change to a better state. (So Josephus, Ant. 11:3, 8; 4:6; Philo, De Decal. p. 767 b; De Rer. Div. Her. p. 522 c. Hesychius and Phanorinus likewise explain it by τελείωσις; but the scholiast in the Cod. Nosq. ad loc. renders συμπλήρωσις, ἔκβασις. In like manner ἀποκαθιστάνειν signifies to complete, bring to a conclusion; see the Sept. at Job 8:6, where it corresponds with שַׁלֵּם; so in Gen 41:13; Jer 22:8; comp. Polyb. 4, 23, 1; Diod. Sic. 20:34.) By the expression “until the times of the apocatastasis of all things which God hath spoken,” etc., Peter means the time when all affairs shall be consummated, all the prophetical announcements shall be accomplished, including the inauguration of the kingdom of the Messiah and its attendant events, the full extension of the Gospel, the resurrection, judgment, etc. — in short, the end of the world (see Olshausen, De Wette, Hackett, and most others, ad loc.). SEE ESCHATOLOGY.

## Restoration[[@Headword:Restoration]]

             THE, a name generally given to the return of the Church of England to the previously appointed ecclesiastical polity, and to their allegiance to the regular prince, Charles II, which took place in 1660. It has been appointed, by authority, that May 29 in every year shall be kept with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God for this event.

## Restoration Of The Jews[[@Headword:Restoration Of The Jews]]

             This term is applied to two very different classes of prophecies relating to the Hebrew race.

1. Their Return from Captivity. — It is maintained by Von Bohlen (Genesis, p. 116) that the ten tribes intermarried so freely with the surrounding population as to have become completely absorbed; and it appears to be a universal opinion that no one now knows where their descendants are. But it is a harsh assumption that such intermarriages were commoner with the ten tribes than with the two; and certainly, in the apostolic days, the twelve tribes are referred to as a well-known people, sharply defined from the heathen (Act 24:7; Jam 1:1). Not a trace appears that any repulsive principle existed at that time between the Ten and the Two. “Ephraim no longer envied Judah, nor Judah vexed Ephraim;” but they had become “one nation;” though only partially “on the mountains of Israel” (Isa 11:13; Eze 37:22). It would seem, therefore, that one result of the captivity was to blend all the tribes together, and produce a national union which had never been effected in their own land. If ever there was a difference between them as to the books counted sacred, that difference entirely vanished; at least, no evidence appears of the contrary fact. When, moreover, the laws of landed inheritance no longer enforced the maintenance of separate tribes and put a difficulty in the way of their intermarriage, an almost inevitable result in course of time was the entire obliteration of this distinction; and, as a fact, no modern Jews know to what tribe they belong, although vanity always makes them choose to say that they are of the two or three, and not of the ten tribes. That all Jews now living have in them the blood of all the twelve tribes ought (it seems) to be believed, until some better reason than mere assertion is advanced against it.

When Cyrus gave permission to the Israelites to return to their own country, and restored their sacred vessels, it is not wonderful that few persons of the ten tribes were eager to take advantage of it. In two centuries they had become thoroughly naturalized in their Eastern settlements; nor had Jerusalem ever been the centre of proud aspirations to them. It is perhaps remarkable that in Ezr 2:2; Ezr 2:36 (see also ezr 10:18, 25), the word Israel is used to signify what we might call the laity as opposed to the priests and Levites, which might seem as if the writer were anxious to avoid asserting that all the families belonged to the two tribes. (If this is not the meaning, it at least shows that all discriminating force in the words Israel and Judah was already lost. So, too, in the book of Esther, the twelve tribes through all parts of the Persian empire are called Jews.)

Nevertheless, it was to be expected that only those would return to  Jerusalem whose expatriation was very recent, and principally those whose parents had dwelt in the holy city or its immediate neighborhood.The re- migrants, doubtless, consisted chiefly of the pious and the poor; and as the latter proved docile to their teachers, a totally new spirit reigned in the restored nation. Whatever want of zeal the anxious Ezra might discern in his comrades, it is no slight matter that he could induce them to divorce their heathen wives — a measure of harshness which Paul would scarcely have sanctioned (1Co 7:12); and the century which followed was, on the whole, olre of great religious activity and important permanent results on the moral character of the nation. Even the prophetic spirit by no means disappeared for a century and a half; although at length both the true and the false prophet were supplanted among them by the learned and diligent scribe, the anxious commentator, and the over-literal or over- figurative critic. In place of a people prone to go astray after sensible objects of adoration, and readily admitting heathen customs; attached to monarchical power, but inattentive to a hierarchy; careless of a written law, and movable by alternate impulses of apostasy and repentance, we henceforth find in them a deep and permanent reverence for Moses and the prophets, an aversion to foreigners and foreign customs, a profound hatred of idolatry, a great devotion to priestly and Levitical rank, and to all who had an exterior of piety; in short, a slavish obedience both to the law and to its authorized expositors. Now first, so far as can be ascertained (observe the particularity of detail in Neh 8:4, etc.), were the synagogues and houses of prayer instituted and the law periodically read aloud. Now began the close observance of the Passover, the Sabbath, and the sabbatical year. Such was the change wrought in the guardians of the sacred books that, whereas the pious king Josiah had sat eighteen years on the throne without knowing of the existence of “the book of the law” (2Ki 22:3; 2Ki 22:8), in the later period, on the contrary, the text was watched over with a scrupulous and fantastic punctiliousness. From this sera the civil power was absorbed in that of the priesthood, and the Jewish people affords the singular spectacle of a nation in which the priestly rule came later in time than that of hereditary kings. Something analogous may, perhaps, be seen in the priestly authority at Comana, in Cappadocia, under the Roman sway (Cicero, Ep. ad Div. 15:4, etc.).

In their habits of life, also, the Jewish nation was permanently affected by the first captivity. The love of agriculture, which the institutions of Moses had so vigorously inspired, had necessarily declined in a foreign land; and  they returned with a taste for commerce, banking, and retail trade, which was probably kept up by constant intercourse with their brethren who remained in dispersion. The same intercourse in turn propagated towards the rest the moral spirit which reigned at Jerusalem. The Egyptian Jews, it would seem, had gained little good from the contact of idolatry (Jeremiah xliv, 8); but those who had fallen in with the Persian religion, probably about the time of its great reform by Zoroaster, had been preserved from such temptations, and returned purer than they went. Thenceforward it was the honorable function of Jerusalem to act as a religious metropolis to the whole dispersed nation; and it cannot be doubted that the ten tribes, as well as the two, learned to be proud of the holy city, as the great and free centre of their name and their faith. The same religious influences thus diffused themselves through all the twelve tribes of Israel. SEE DISPERSED.

2. Their Future Return to Palestine. — It is a favorite view with many that the Israelitish race, now scattered over the face of the earth, will eventually be brought back to their own land. To this is generally added the belief that they will yet return in a converted, i.e. Christian, state. The final ingathering of the Jews, no less than of all Gentiles, is certainly taught, rot only in the Old Test., but likewise in the New (see Rom 11:11-25). But it appears to be an error to infer that, therefore, they will generally be restored to their original home. See Swaine, Objections to the Restoration of the Jews (3d ed. Lond. 1861); Browne, Restoration of the Jews (Edinb. 1861); Clarke, Restoration of the Jews (Lond. 1861). SEE MILLENNIUM.

## Restorationists[[@Headword:Restorationists]]

             the name assumed by a body of professing Christians who are to a very great extent identical with the Unitarians, on the one hand, and the Universalists, onl the other. Their peculiar doctrine is, that all men will ultimately become holy and happy. They maintain that Godd created men only to bless them, and that he sent his Son to “be for salvation to the ends of the earth.” They further teach that man's probation is not confined to this life, but extends throughout the mediatorial reign of Christ; and that, as he died for all, all will eventually be saved. They consider that punishment is reformatory in its character, and has for its object the conversion of the sinner. Although the Restorationists, as a separate body, have only existedfor a few years, their sentiments are by no means new. Some of the early fathers — Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Didymus of Alexandria, Gregory Nyssen, and others — believed and advocated the restoration of  all fallen intelligences. A branch of the German Baptists, before the Reformation, held and propagated the doctrine. In Europe many prominent names may be cited as its advocates. It was introduced into America about the middle of the 18th century, but not much taught until about 1775 or 1780, when John Murray and Elhanan Winchester became its advocates.

Afterwards we find Dr. Chauncey, of Boston; Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; Dr. Smith, of New York; and Mr. Foster, of New Hampshire, as advocates, although most of them continued in the ranks of the various sects. In 1785 a convention was organized at Oxford, Mass., under the auspices of Messrs. Winchester and Murray; and as all who believed in universal salvation believed that the effects of sin and the means of grace extended into a filture life, the terms Restorationist and Universalist were synonymous, and the convention adopted the latter as their distinctive name. In 1818 the Rev. Hosea Ballou, of Boston, advanced the doctrine that all retribution is confined to this world; to which was added by others the doctrine of the mortality of the soul, that the whole man died a temporal death, and that the resurrection would introduce all men into everlasting happiness. As a result a distinct sect, by the name of Universal Restorationists, was formed at Mendon, Mass., Aug. 17, 1831; but it soon became extinct. The Restorationists maintain that a just retribution does not take place in time; that men are invited to act with reference to a future life; that there are grades of reward and punishment; that it is not death or the resurrection that introduces men into heaven. The Restorationists have never been numerous; they are found more extensively in Massachusetts, although they have a few societies in other states. At one time they published a weekly newspaper, and had from twenty to thirty ministers, with from two to three thousand members. Very many, however, are found in the other sects who entertain the peculiar views of the Restorationists. See Ballou, Ancient History of Universalism; Belcher, Religious Denominations; Foster, Examination of Strong; Hudson, Letter and Reply; Chauncey, Salvation of all Men; Hartley, On Man; Stonehouse, Universal Retribution; Smith, On Divine Government. SEE UNIVERSALISM.

## Resurrection[[@Headword:Resurrection]]

             (ἀνάστασις) OF THE BODY, the revivification of the human body after it has been forsaken by the soul, or the reunion of the soul hereafter to the body which it had occupied in the present world. This is one of the essential points in the creed of Christendom.

I. History of the Doctrine. — It is admitted that there are no traces of such a belief in the earlier Hebrew Scripture. It is not to be found in the Pentateuch, in the historical books, or in the Psalms; for Psa 49:15 does not relate to this subject; neither does Psa 104:29-30, although so cited by Theodoret and others. The celebrated passage of Job 19:25 sq. has indeed been strongly insisted upon in proof of the early belief in this doctrine; but the most learned commentators are agreed, and scarcely any one at the present day disputes, that such a view of the text arises either from mistranslation or misapprehension, and that Job means no more than to express a confident conviction that his then diseased and dreadfully corrupted body should be restored to its former soundness; that he should rise from the depressed state in which he lay to his former prosperity; and that God would manifestly appear (as was the case) to vindicate his uprightness. Thatno meaning more recondite is to be found in the text is agreed by Calvin, Mercier, Grotius, Le Clerc, Patrick, Warburton, Durell, Heath, Kennicott, Doderlein, Dathe, Eichhorn, Jahn, De Wette, and a host of others. That it alludes to a resurrection is disproved thus:

1. The supposition is inconsistent with the design of the poem and the course of the argument, since the belief which it has been supposed to express, as connected with a future state of retribution, would in a great degree have solved the difficulty on which the whole dispute turns, and could not but have been often alluded to by the speakers.

2. It is inconsistent with the connection of the discourse; the reply of Zophar agreeing, not with the popular interpretation, but with the other.

3. It is inconsistent with many passages in which the same person (Job) longs for death as the end of his miseries, and not as the introduction to a better life (Job 3; Job 7:7-8; Job 10:20-22; Job 19; Job 17:11-16).

4. It is not proposed as a topic of consolation by any of the friends of Job; nor by Elihu, who acts as a sort of umpire; nor by the Almighty himself in the decision of the controversy.

5. The later Jews, who eagerly sought for every intimation bearing on a future life which their Scriptures might contain, never regarded this as such; nor is it once referred to by Christ or his apostles.

6. The language, when exactly rendered, contains no warrant for such an interpretation; especially the phrase “yet in my flesh shall I see God,” which should rather be rendered “out of my flesh.” SEE JOB, BOOK OF.

Isaiah may be regarded as the first Scripture writer in whom such an allusion can be traced. He compares the restoration of the Jewish people and state to a resurrection from the dead (Isa 26:19-20); and in this he is followed by Ezekiel at the time of the exile (ch. 37). From these passages, which are, however, not very clear in their intimations, it may seem that in this, as in other matters, the twilight of spiritual manifestations brightened as the day-spring from on high approached; and in Dan 12:2 we at length arrive at a clear and unequivocal declaration that those who lie sleeping under the earth shall awake, some to eternal life, and others to everlasting shame and contempt.

In the time of Christ, the belief of a resurrection, in connection with a state of future retribution, was held by the Pharisees and the great body of the Jewish people, and was only disputed by the Sadducees. Indeed, they seem to have regarded the future life as incomplete without the body; and so intimately were the two things-the future existence of the soul and the resurrection of the body-connected in their minds that any argument which, proved the former they considered as proving the latter also (see Mat 22:31; 1Co 15:32). This belief, however, led their coarse minds into gross and sensuous conceptions of the future state, although there were many among the Pharisees who taught that the future body would be so refined as not to need the indulgences which were necessary in the present life; and they assented to our Lord's assertion that the risen saints would not marry, but would be as the angels of God (Mat 22:30; comp. Luk 20:39). So Paul, in 1Co 6:13, is conceived to intimate that the necessity of food for subsistence will be abolished in the world to come.

In further proof of the commonness of a belief in the resurrection among the Jews of the time of Christ, see Matthew 22; Luke 20; Joh 11:24; Act 23:6-8. Josephus is not to be relied upon in the account which he gives of the belief of his countrymen (Ant. 18:2; War, ii, 7), as he appears to use terms which might suggest one thing to his Jewish readers and another to the Greeks and Romans, who scouted the idea of a resurrection. It is clearly taught in the Apocryphal books of the Old Test. (Wisdom of Solomon 3:1, etc.; 4:15; 2Ma 7:14; 2Ma 7:23; 2Ma 7:29, etc.). —  Many Jews believed that the wicked would not be raised from the dead; but the contrary was the more prevailing opinion, in which Paul once took occasion to express his concurrence with the Pharisees (Act 24:15).

But although the doctrine of the resurrection was thus prevalent among the Jews in the time of Christ, it might still have been doubtful and obscure to us had not Christ given to it the sanction of his authority, and declared it a constituent part of his religion (e.g. Matthew 22; Joh 5:8; Joh 5:11). He and his apostles also, were careful to correct the erroneous notions which the Jews entertained on this head, and to make the subject more obvious and intelligible than it had ever been before. A special interest is also imparted to the subject from the manner in which the New Test. represents Christ as the person to whom we are indebted for this benefit, which, by every variety of argument and illustration, the apostles connect with him, and make to rest upon him (Act 4:2; Act 26:3; 1 Corinthians 15; 1Th 4:14, etc.).

II. Scripture Details. — The principal points which can be collected from the New Test. on this subject are the following:

1. The raising of the dead is everywhere ascribed to Christ, and is represented as the last work to be undertaken by him for the salvation of man (Joh 5:21; Joh 11:25; 1Co 15:22 sq.; 1Th 4:15; Rev 1:18).

2. All the dead will be raised, without respect to age, rank, or character in this world (Joh 5:28-29; Act 24:15; 1Co 15:22).

3. This event is to take place not before the end of the world, or the general judgment (Joh 5:21; Joh 6:39-40; Joh 11:24; 1Co 15:22-28; 1Th 4:15; Rev 20:11).

4. The manner in which this marvellous change shall be accomplished is necessarily beyond our present comprehension, and therefore the Scripture is content to illustrate it by figurative representations, or by proving the possibility and intelligibility of the leading facts. Some of the figurative descriptions occur in Matthew 24; John 5; 1Co 15:52; 1Th 4:16; Php 3:21. The image of a trumpet-call, which is repeated in some of these texts, is derived from the Jewish custom of convening assemblies by sound of trumpet.

5. The possibility of a resurrection is powerfully argued by Paul in 1Co 15:32 sq., by comparing it with events of common occurrence in the natural world. (See also 1Co 15:12-14; and comp. Act 4:2.) — Kitto.

6. The numerous instances of an actual raising of individuals to life by our Lord and his apostles, not to speak of a few similar acts by the Old Test. prophets, and especially the crowning fact of our Lord's resurrection from the grave, afford some light on these particulars. (See below.):

7. The fact of the general judgment (q.v.) is conclusive as to the literal truth of this great doctrine.

But although this body shall be so raised as to preserve its identity, it must yet undergo certain purifying changes to fit it for the kingdom of heaven, and to render it capable of immortality (1Co 15:35 sq.), so that it shall become a glorified body like that of Christ (1Co 15:49; Rom 6:9; Php 3:21); and the bodies of those whom the last day finds alive will undergo a similar change without tasting death (1Co 15:51; 1Co 15:53; 2Co 5:4; 1Th 4:15 sq.; Php 3:21).

III. Theories on the Subject, — Whether the soul, between the death and the resurrection of the present body, exists independent of any envelope, we know not. Though it may be that a union of spirit with body is the general law of all created spiritual life, still this view gives no countenance to the notions of those who have attempted to prove, from certain physiological opinions respecting the renewal — every few years — of the human frame during life, and the final transmission of its decomposed elements into other forms of being, that the resurrection of the body is impossible. The apostle asserts the fact that the “dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed; for this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality” (1Co 15:35-53). While this passage affirms the identity of the body before and after the resurrection, it by no means affirms the identity of the constituent particles of which the body is, at different periods, supposed to be made up. The particles of a man's body may change several times betiween infancy and old age; and yet, according to our ideas of bodily identity, the man has had all the time “the same body.” So also all the particles may be changed again between the process of death and the resurrection, and the  body yet retain its identity (see the Bibliothec Sacra, 2, 613 sq.). Doubtless the future body will be incorruptible, infrangible, and capable of being moved at will to any part of the universe. The highest and most lengthened exercises of thought and feeling will doubtless not occasion exhaustion or languor so as to divert in any way the intellect and the affections from the engagements suited to their strength and perfection (see the Brit. and For. Evang. Rev. April, 1862). But that there is no analogy — that the new body will have no connection with, and no relation to, the old; and that, in fact, the resurrection of the body is not a doctrine of Scripture — does not appear to us to have been satisfactorily proved by the latest writer on the subject (Bush, Annistasis,.N. Y. 1845); and we think so highly of his ingenuity and talent as to believe that no one else is likely to succeed in an argument in which he has failed.

Among the speculations propounded as a solution of the problem of the resurrection, the most ingenious, perhaps, as well as fascinating, is the germ theory, which assumes that the soul at death retains a certain ethereal investiture, alndthat this ha's, by virtue of the vital force, the power of accreting to itself a new body for the celestial life. This is substantially the Swedenborgian view as advocated by the late Prof. Bush, and has recently received the powerful support of Mr. Joseph Cook in his popular lectures. It is thought to be countenanced especially by Paul's language (1 Corinthians 15) concerning the “spiritual body” of the future state (1Co 15:4), and his figure of the renewed grain (1Co 15:37). This explanation, however, is beset with many insuperable difficulties.

(a.) The apostle's distinction between the psychical (ψυχικόν, “natural”) and thepneumatical (πνευματικόν, “spiritual”) in that passage is not of material (φυσικόν, physical) as opposed to immaterial or disembodied; for both are equally called body (σῶμα, actual and tangible substance), such as we know our Lord's resurrection body was composed of (Luk 24:39). It is merely, as the whole context shows (“corruptible- incorruptible,” “mortal-immortal,” etc.), the difference between the feeble, decaying body of this life in its present normal state, and the glorious, fadeless frame of the future world in its transcendent condition hereafter; in short, its aspect as known to us here from natural phenomena, and its prospect as revealed to us in Scripture. This appears from the contrasted use of these terms in another part of the same epistle (1Co 2:14-15) to denote the unregenerate as opposed to the regenerate heart,  the former being its usual or depraved, and the latter its transformed or gracious, state.

(b.) In like manner the apostle's figure of grain as sown, while it admirably illustrates, in a general way, the possibility of changes in the natural world as great as that which will take place in the resurrection body, yet — like all other metaphors — was never intended to teach the precise mode of that transformation, and accordingly it fails in several essential particulars to correspond to the revival of the body from the grave. 1. The seed never actually dies, nor any part of it. It is the germ alone that possesses vitality, and this simply expands and develops, gathering to itself the material of the rest of the seed, which undergoes chemical and vital changes fitting it for nutriment until the young plant attains roots and leaves wherewith to imbibe nourishment from the outer world. This whole process is as truly a growth as that anywhere found in nature; it is, in fact, essentially the same as takes place in the hatching of an egg or the gestation of an animal. 2. The real identity of the original plant or seed and its successor or the crop is lost in this transmutation, as the apostle himself intimates (v. 37). It is, in fact, the reproduction of another but similar thing rather than the continuation or renewal of the: same. The old plant, indeed, perishes, but it never revives. The seed is its offspring, and thus only represents its parent. Nor is the new plant anything more than a lineal descendant of the old one. We must not confound the resurrection with mere propagation. The young plant may, we admit, in one sense be said to be identical with the germ sown, notwithstanding the great change which it takes on in the process of growth; and this is the precise point of the apostle's simile. But we must not press his figure into a literal strictness when comparing things so radically different as the burial of a corpse and the planting of grain. The principle of life is continuous in the latter; but this is not a distinct substance, like the soul; it is merely a property of matter, and in the case of the body must cease with physical dissolution.

(c.) We would ask those who maintain this theory a simple question: Is the so-called germ or “enswathement” which is supposed to survive, escape, or be eliminated from the body at death is it matter or is it spirit? We presume all will admit that there are but these two essential kinds of substance. Which of these, then, is it? It must, of course, belong to the former category. Then the body does not actually and entirely die! But this contradicts all the known phenomena in the case. The whole theory under discussion is not only a pure begging of the question really at issue, but it is  improbable and inconsistent. There is absolutely not the slightest particle of scientific or historical evidence that the body leaves a vital residuum in dissolution, or evolves at death an ethereal frame that survives it in any physical sense whatever as a representation. We remand all such hypotheses to the realm of ghostland and “spiritualism.”

(d.) In the case of the resurrection of the body of Jesus, which is the type of the general resurrection, and the only definite instance on record, it is certain that this theory will not apply. Not, only is no countenance given to it by the language of Holy Scripture concerning the agency which effected that resuscitation, viz. the direct and miraculous power of the Holy Spirit, but the circumstances obviously exclude such a process. There, was the defunct person, entire except that the spark of life had fled. If it be said that there still lingered about it some vital germ that was the nucleus around which reanimation gathered, what is this but to deny that Jesus was ttuly and effectually dead? Then thie whole doctrine of the atonement is endangered. In plain English, he was merely in a swoon, as the Rationalists assert. It may be replied, indeed, that the revivification of our Lord's body, which had not yet decomposed, of course differed in some important respects from that of the bodies of the saints whose elements will have dissolved to dust. But on the ordinary view the two agree in the essential point, viz. an actual and full return to life after total and absolute extinction of it; whereas under the theory in question one main element of this position is denied. It matters little how long the body has been dead, or to what extent disorganization has taken place — whether but a few hours, as in the case of the son of the widow of Nain; or four days, as in that of Lazarus; or thousands of years, as in thatof the saints at the final judgment. It is equally a resurrection if life have utterly left the physical organism, and not otherwise. We conclude, therefore, that there is no scriptural, consistent, or intelligible view except the one commonly entertained by Christians on this subject, viz. that the pure and immaterial soul alone survives the dissolution of the body, and that at the last day almighty power will clothe this afresh with a corporeal frame suitable to its enlarged and completely developed faculties, and that the identity of the latter will consist, not so much, if at all, in the reassemblage of the individual particles of which its old partner was composed, much less of some subtle and continuous tertium quid that emerged from the decaying substance and reconstructs a new physical home for itself, but in the similar combination of similar matter, similarly united with the same immortal spirit, and with it  glorified by some such inscrutable change as took place in our Saviour's body at the transfiguration, and as still characterized it when preternaturally beheld by Saul on his way to Damascus.

IV. Literature. — This is very copious (see a list of works on the subject in the appendix to Alger's Doctrine of a Future Life, Nos. 2929-3181). We here mention only a few of the most important: Knapp, Christian Theology, translated by Leonard Woods, D.D., § 151-153; Hody, On the Resurrection; Drew, Essay on the Resurrection of the Human. Body; Burnet, State of the Dead; Schott, Dissert. de Resurrect. Corporis, adv. S. Burnetumn (1763); Teller, Fides Dogmat. de Resurr. Carnis (1766); Mosheim, De Christ. Resurr. Mort., etc., in Dissertatt. ii, 526 sq.; Dassov, Diatr. gua Judceor. de Resurr. Mort. Sentent. ex Plur. Rabbinis (1675); Neander, All. Geschichte, etc., I, 3:1088,1096; II, 3:1404-1410; Zehrt, Ueber d. Auferstehung d. Todten (1835); Hodgson, Res. of Hum. Body (Lond. 1853). SEE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

## Resurrection Of Christ[[@Headword:Resurrection Of Christ]]

             This great fact, by which “he was declared to be the Son of God with power,” stands out everywhere prominently on the pages of the New Test. as the foundation of the Christian faith (Rom 1:2; Act 13:32-33; 1Co 15:3-15). According to the Scriptures the disciples were assured, by the testimony of their senses, that the body of Christ, after his resurrection, was the same identical body of human flesh and bones which had been crucified and laid in the sepulchre (Mat 16:21; Mat 27:63; Mat 28:5-18; Mar 16:6-19; Luk 24:5-51; Joh 20:9-26; Act 1:1-11). Our Lord himself took special pains to make the impression upon the minds of his disciples that in his crucified body he was actually raised to life. He appealed to the testimony of their own senses “Behold,” says he, “my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me here.” He showed them his hands and his feet, which the nail-prints attested to be the same which had hung upon the cross. Our Lord also invited Thomas to thrust his hand into his wounded side; and, to remove the last remaining shadow of doubt from the minds of his disciples that it was he himself in thle same human body, “he called for food, and he took aand did eat before them” (Luk 24:39-43; Joh 20:27). The fact also that our Lord continued forty days upon earth after his resurrection, in the same human bovy in which he was crucified, shows plainly that he did not rise from the tomb in a glorified  body. And the evidence is equally strong that he now dwells in heaven in a glorified body (Php 3:21; Col 3:4).

Since this event, however, independently of its importance in respect to the internal connection of the Christian doctrine, was manifestly a miraculous occurrence, the credibility of the narrative has from the earliest times been brought into question (Celsius, apud Origen. cont. Cels. i, 2; Woolston, Discourses on the Miracles, disc. vi; Chubb, Posth. Works, i, 330; Morgan, The Resurrection Considered [1744]). Others who have admitted the facts as recorded to be beyond dispute, yet have attempted to show that Christ was not really dead, but that, being stunned and palsied, he wore for a time the appearance of death, and was afterwards restored to consciousness by the cool grave and the spices. The refltation of these views may be seen in detail in such works as Less, Ueber die Religion, ii, 372; id. Auferstehungsgeschichte, nebst Anhang (1799); Doderlein, Fragmente und Antif/ragmente (1782). The chief advocates of these views are Paulus (list. Resurrect. Jes. [1795]), and, more recently, Henneberg (Philol. histor. krit. Commentar fib. d. Gesch. d. Begrabbn., d. Auferstehung u. Himmelfahrt Jesu [1826]). “If the body of Jesus Christ,” says Saurin, “were not raised from the dead, it must have been stolen awav. But this theft is incredible. Who committed it? The enemies of Jesus Christ? Would they have contributed to his glory by countenancing a report of his resurrection? Would his disciples? It is probable they would not, and it is next to certain they could not. How could they have undertaken to remove the body — frail and timorous creatures, people who fled as soon as they saw him taken into custody? Even Peter, the most courageous, trembled at the voice of a servant-girl, and three times denied that he knew him. Would people of this character have dared to resist the authority of the governor? Would they have undertaken to oppose the determination of the Sanhedrim, to force a guard, and to elude, or overcome soldiers armed and aware of danger? If Jesus Christ was not risen again (I speak the language of unbelievers), he had deceived his disciples with vain hopes of his resurrection. How came the disciples not to discover the imposture? Would they have hazarded themselves by undertaking an enterprise so perilous in favor of a man who had so cruelly imposed on their credulity? But were we to grant that they formed the design of removing the body, how could they have executed it? How could soldiers, armed and on guard, suffer themselves to be overreached by a few timorous people? Either (says St. Augustine) they were asleep or awake; if they were awake, why should  they suffer the body to be taken away? If asleep, how could they know that the disciples took it away? How dare they then depose that it was stolen?”

The testimony of the apostles furnishes us with arguements, and there are eight considerations which give the evidence sufficient weight.'

1. The nature of these witnesses. They were not men of power, riches, eloquence, credit, to impose upon the world; they were poor and mean.

2. The number of these witnesses. (See Corinthians 15; Luk 24:34; Mar 16:14; Mat 28:10.) It is not likely that a collusion should have been held among so many to support a lie, which would be of no utility to them.

3. The facts themselves which they avow: not suppositions, distant events, or events related by others, but real facts which they saw with their own eyes (1 John 1).

4. The agreement of their evidence: they all deposed the same thing.

5. Observe the tribunals before which they gave evidence: Jews and heathens, philosophers and rabbins, courtiers and lawyers. If they had been impostors, the fraud certainly would have been discovered.

6. The place in which they bore their testimony. Not at a distance, where they might not easily have been detected, if false, but at Jerusalem, in the synagogues, in the praetorium.

7. the time of this testimony: not years after, but three days after, they declared he was risen; yea, before the rage of the Jews was quelled, while Calvary was yet dyede with the blood they had spilled. If it had been a fralud, it is not likely they would have come forward in such broad daylight, amid so much opposition.

8. Lastly, the motives which induced them to publish the resurrection: not to gain fame, riches, glory, profit; no, they exposed themselves to suffering and death, and proclaimed the truth from conviction of its importance and certainty.

Objections have also been raised upon the apparent discrepancies of the Gospel narratives of the event. These discrepancies were early perceived; and a view of what the fathers have done in the attempt to reconcile them has been given by Niemeyer (De Evangelistarum in Narrando Christi in  Vitam Reditu Dissensione [1824]). They were first collocated with much acuteness by Morgan in the work already cited, and at a later date by an anonymous writer, whose fragments were edited and supported by Lessing, the object of which seems to have been to throw uncertainty and doubt over the whole of this portion of Gospel history. A numerous host of theologians, however, rose to combat and refute this writer's positions, among whom we find the names of Doderlein, Less, Semler, Teller, Maschius, Michaelis, Plessing, Eichhorn, Herder, and others. Among those who have more recently attempted to reconcile the different accounts is Griesbach. who, in his excellent Prolusio de Fontibus uide Evangelistoe suas de Resurrectione Donini Narrationes hauserint (1793), remarks that all the discrepancies are trifling, and not of such moment as to render the narrative uncertain and suspected, or to destroy or even diminish the credibility of the evangelists, but serve rather to show how extremely studious they were of truth “and how closely and even scrupulously they followed their documents.” Griesbach then attempts to slhw how these discrepancies may have arisen, and admits that, although unimportant, they are hard to reconcile, as is indeed evinced by the amount of controversy they have excited. The principal one of these discrepancies has been discussed under APPEARANCE SEE APPEARANCE .

For works on the general subject, besides those referred to under the preceding article, see Malcolm, Theological Index, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. (see Index); and for monographs on the various points connected with our Lord's resurrection, see those cited by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 67 sq.; and by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 160, 221, 225, 227, 230; also the following: Clausewitz, De AMortuorum Tempore Resurrect. et Chr. Resurrectione (Hal. 1741); Kunadius, De Sanctis Redivivis (Viteb. 1665); Hobichhont, De Sanctis Resurgente Christo Resurgentibus (Ros. 1696); Schtirzmann, De Anastasi Atheniensibus pro Dea Habita (Lips. 1708). Numerous articles on the subject are to be found in religious periodicals, among which, as the latest, we name Journ. Sac. Lit. Jan. 1853, Oct, 1854; Studien u. Kritiken, 1870, i; Zeitschr. f. wissenchaft. Theol. 1863; Theol. and Lit. Journal, Oct. 1857, Oct. 1858; Lond. Bib. Rev. April, 1849; Brit. and For. Ev. Rev. April, 1862; Bibl. Sacra, June, 1852. Oct. 1860, Oct. 1869; New-Englander, May, 1857; Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1873, Oct. 1877; Christian Quar. Amril, 1876; Amer. Presb. and Theol. Rev. July and Oct. 1867; South. Presb. Rev. Oct.  1860; Mercersb. Rev. April, 1861; Danville Rev. March, 1863; Universalist Quar. April and Oct. 1861. SEE JESUS CHRIST.

## Resurrection, The First[[@Headword:Resurrection, The First]]

             is a phrase occurring in Rev 20:4-6 :

"And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received his mark upon their foreheads, or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection. Blessed and holy is he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power, but they shall be priests of God and of Christ, and shall reign with him a thousand years."

Interpreters have been divided as to the distinction in time here denoted bv the two successive resurrections. It was the general opinion of the early Christians (but not universal; see Heingstenberg, Apocalyp. 2:348 note, Carter's ed.) that the thousand years were to be comr puted from the birth of Christ; and coupled with this reckoning was often expressed a belief in. the literal resurrection of saints at that time, prior to the general resurrection; but it is hardly a fair statement that "those who lived next to  the apostles and the whole church for three hundred years, understood these words in their literal sense" (Alford, Comment. ad loc.). Bishop Wordsworth affirms (Greek Test. with Notes, ad loc.) that the spiritual interpretation "is that which has been adopted by the best expositors of the Western and Eastern churches from the days of St. Augustine to those of bishop Andrews." A glance at the conspectus given in such works as Poole's Synopsis Criticorum, and Wolff's Curce in N.T., at this place, will suffice to show the great discrepancy' in the earlier interpreters on the subject, and that in Ellicott's Horte Apocalypticae, ad loc., displays an equal divergence in modern times., Those who hold the literal view maintain (1) that this is the only plain meaning of the text, and (2) that it is sustained by several other passages which speak of a distinction of the righteous as raised first (especially 1Th 4:16). But these latter passages do not require, nor even admit, so long an interval between the resurrection of the saints and that of others, which, moreover, are elsewhere represented as substantially simultaneous (Joh 5:28-29; Rev 20:12); indeed, Scripture everywhere (unless in the passage in dispute) knows of but one future advent of our Lord, and that the final and universal one at least after the figurative one at the destruction of Jerusalem. SEE ESCHATOLOGY. Moreover, such a temporal and earthly reign of Christ as the literalists here require, is at variance with the whole spirit and economy of the Gospel and we may add that the anticipations which such a theory engenders have been the bane of Chiliasm (q.v.), and the fosterer of fanaticism in all ages. SEE MILIENARIANS. Finally and conclusively, the passage in dispute itself explicitly limits the resurrection in this case to the "souls" of the martyrs (not all saints), apparently meaning a revival of their devoted spirit, or, at most, their glorification (as in the case of the "two witnesses," Rev 11:11-12); and not a word is said about a terrestrial reign, but only one "with Christ," i.e., in the celestial or spiritual sphere. The modern literature of the discussion is very copious, but quite sporadic, and no complete treatise has yet appeared on the subject. The best is that by David Brown, D.D;, Christ's Second Coming (Lond. 1846, 1847, 1856).

## Reticulated Work[[@Headword:Reticulated Work]]

             (Lat. opus reticulatum=network), masonry constructed with diamond- shaped stones, or square stones placed diagonally. In the city of Rome this mode of decorating the surface of a wall is generally characteristic of the period of the early empire; it was frequently imitated in Romanesqume work in the tympanum of a door-way, especially in Norman work.

## Retribution, Future[[@Headword:Retribution, Future]]

             That man is a responsible being, and that his responsibility extends into his future state of existence, is generally admitted throughout the world. The denial of all punishment in a future state, rests chiefly upon the two unscriptural and contradictory dogmas — the immaculate spirituality and the mortal materialism of the human soul. The position believed to be taught in the Scriptures is this, that all sinners who do not repent and take refuge in the Saviour in the present life shall in the future state suffer everlasting punishment, as the necessary and just retribution of their sins. This doctrine, however awful it must be acknowledged by all to be, appears to be taught in the Scriptures, and has been held by very large portions of the Church in all ages. We shall not, however, depend upon this fact as a proof, though it affords what logicians call a violent presumption, that it was an original part of Christ ianity We present the following as Scripture proof, and urge,

1. Those passages which declare that certain sinners shall not enter the kingdom of heaven (Mat 5:20; Mat 7:13; Mat 7:21-23; Mat 18:3; Mar 10:23-27; Luk 13:24; Luk 13:26 Joh 3:3-5; 1Co 6:9-10; Gal 5:19-21; Eph 5:5; Heb 3:19; Heb 4:1; Heb 4:13). If some men, according to the language of these Scriptures, are to be excludec from heaven, they must necessarily sink to hell; fo the Scriptures give us no intimation of a middl state.

2. Those passages of Scripture which describe the future and final state of men in contrast (Psa 17:14-15 Pro 10:28; Pro 14:35 , Dan 12:2; Mat 3:12; Mat 7:13-14; Mat 7:21; Mat 8:11-12; Mat 13:30-43; Mat 13:47-50; Mat 24:46-51; Mat 25:23-46; Mar 16:16; Luk 6:23-24; Luk 6:47-49; Joh 3:16; Joh 5:29; Rom 6:21-23; Rom 9:21-23; Gal 6:7-8 Php 3:17-21;  2Th 1:5-12; 2Ti 2:19-20; Heb 6:8-9; 1Pe 4:18). These passages are believed to refer to the final state of man because —

(1) in several of them the state is expressly called their end.

(2) The state of the righteous and that of the wicked are put in exact opposition to each other; and if one is not final, neither is the other.

(3) There is a dead silence about any succeeding state; and

(4) the phraseology of some of the passages will admit of no other interpretation.

3. Those passages of Scripture which apply the termi “everlasting” “eternal,” “forever,” and “for ever and ever” to this future state (Dan 12:2; Mat 18:8; Mat 25:41-46; Mar 3:29; 2Co 4:18; 2Th 1:9 2Pe 2:17; Jud 1:6-7; Jud 1:13; Rev 14:10-13; Rev 19:3; Rev 20:10).

4. Those passages which express future punishment by phrases which imply its everlasting duration (Mat 10:28; Mat 12:31-32; Mar 9:43-48; Luk 9:25; Luk 14:26; Joh 3:36; Joh 8:21; Joh 17:9; Php 3:10; Heb 6:2; Heb 10:26-27; Jam 2:13; 1Jn 5:16).

5. Those passages which intimate that a change of heart and a preparation for heaven are confined to this life (Pro 1:24-28; Isa 55:6-7; Mat 25:5-13; Luk 13:24-29; Joh 12:36; 2Co 6:1-2; Heb 3:1-10; Heb 13:15-22; Rev 22:11). 6. Those passages which foretell the consequences of rejecting the Gospel (Psa 2:12; Pro 29:1; Act 13:40-46; Act 20:26; Act 28:26-27; Rom 10:12; 1Co 1:18; 2Co 2:15-16; 2Co 4:3; 1Th 5:3; 2Th 1:8; 2Th 2:10-12; Heb 2:1-3; Heb 4:1-11; Heb 10:26-31; Heb 10:38-39;  Jam 2:14; 1Pe 4:17-18; 2Pe 2:1-21; 2Pe 3:7). The Gospel being the only way of salvation for man (Act 4:12), its rejection is tliat of the only method of salvation. SEE PUNISHMENT, EVER LASTING; SEE UNIVERSALISM.

## Rettberg, Friedrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Rettberg, Friedrich Wilhelm]]

             a German theologian, was born at Cello, Aug. 21, 1805. After teaching in several small institutions, he became professor of theology at Marburg, where he died, April 7, 1849. His works are, De Parabolis Jesu Christi  (Gottingen, 1827): — Cyprianus nach seinzem Leben und Wirken (ibid. 1831): — Heilslehren des Christenthums nach den Grundsatzen der lutherischen Kirche (Leips. 1838): — Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands (Gottingen, 1846-48). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Rettig, Heinrich Christian Michael[[@Headword:Rettig, Heinrich Christian Michael]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Giessen in 1795, where, after completing his studies, he also established himself as academical teacher. In 1832 he published Die freie priotestantische Kirche oder die kirchlichen Verfassungsgrundsatze des Evangeliums, in which he  advocates separation of State and Church. In 1,833 he was called to Zurich as professor of theology, and died March 24, 1836. Of his works we also mention, Ueber das Zeugniss Justins uber die Apokalypse (Leipsic, 1829): — Quaestiones Philippenses (Giessen, 1831). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:92, 263, 555; 2:18. (B.P.)

## Retz, Henri de Gondi de[[@Headword:Retz, Henri de Gondi de]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris in 1572. He was canon of Notre Dame, and held many rich abbeys. In 1596 he became coadjutor of his uncle, cardinal Pierre de Gondi, bishop of Paris, with the promise of succeeding to his title. He received the cardinal's hat in 1618, and, as cardinal de Retz, took part in the affairs of State. He published one work, Ordonnances Synodales. He was the last bishop of Paris. His death occurred at Beziers, Aug. 2, 1622. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Retz, Jean Francois Paul de Gondi[[@Headword:Retz, Jean Francois Paul de Gondi]]

             Cardinal de, often written Rais, a French prelate, was born at Montmirail in Oct. 1614. By birth he was a Knight of Malta, and was destined by his father for the Church, in the hope that he might succeed his uncle as arch- bishop of Paris. The ecclesiastical life was wholly distasteful to him, and his earlier years were spent in prodigality and excesses of all kinds; but, at the same time, he prosecuted his theological studies with great success, and received valuable benefices. He was made canon of Notre Dame in 1627, and adopted the title of abbe de Retz. His ambition and hardihood gained for him the friendship of the count de Soissons, and by the conspiracy planned by that nobleman he hoped to be released from his ecclesiastical life and enter upon a political one, which was more congenial to his intriguing nature. After the death of the count, he devoted himself with more regularity to his profession, and succeeded in gaining so great a popularity that Louis XIII, on his death-bed, appointed him coadjutor to his uncle, the bishop of Paris. In this position he gained the hearts of the people by his charities and great attention to all the outward requirements of religion. During the wars of the Fronde he rendered valuable assistance to the royal cause; but finding that he was dist trusted, he finally became the secret leader of the popular party, and the greatest opponent of cardinal Mazarin. He was made cardinal in 1652, and received tempting offers of a position as ambassador of France to the Holy See; but before he had decided to accept this proposition, he was arrested by order of Louis XIV, and was kept closely confined at Vincennes. On the death of his uncle,  March 21,1654, his friends took possession of the archbishopric in his name. By resigning his claims, he succeeded in gaining a change of residence, and was removed to the Chateau of Nantes. He escaped from his confinement Aug. 8,1654, and after many adventures reached Spain. Philip IV offered him an escort, and he immediately hastened to Rome, where he declared himself archbishop of Paris, the pope having refused to acknowledge his resignation. Retz subsequently travelled through Europe; and having been prohibited by Louis XIV from occupying his archbishopric in person, he governed it by vicars and subordinates until 1662, when he formally resigned all claim to it in consideration of receiving other valuable benefices. He was reconciled to the king, and received permission to establish himself at Commercy, where he kept up a petty state, and occupied himself in study and works of charity. He died at Paris, Aug. 24,1679. His writings are chiefly political, and as such are not of interest here. But his greatest work is his Memoires, composed during his years of retirement. They were first published in 1717, and have been translated into several foreign languages. See Memoires du Cardinal de Retz; Lettres de Madame de Sevigne; Voltaire, Siecle de Louis XIV. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Retz, Pierre de Gondi de[[@Headword:Retz, Pierre de Gondi de]]

             a French cardinal, was born at Lyons in 1533. After entering the ecclesiastical life, he received many favors from Catherine de' Medici, and advanced rapidly. He was made bishop of Langres in 1565, and was transferred to the see of Paris in 1570, and became grand-almoner, chancellor, and chief of the council of Charles IX. He was several times ambassador to the Holy See, and in 1587 was created cardinal. He refused to take the oath of allegiance, and explained his reasons in a letter, to which the writers of the League replied with passion. In 1592 he was sent by Henry IV on an embassy to the pope. He died Feb. 17, 1616. Retz was an honest but parsimonious man, and possessed little genuine talent. — Biog. Universelle, s.v.

## Reu[[@Headword:Reu]]

             (Heb. Reii', רְעוּ,fri-end; Sept. ῾Ραγαῦ v. r. ῾Ραγαύ, 1Ch 1:25), the son of Peleg and father of Serug in the Abrahamic ancestry (Gen 11:18; Gen 11:21; 1Ch 1:25). B.C. cir. 1950. He is called Ragau in Luk 3:35. He lived 239 years. “Bunsen (Bibelwerk) says Reu  is Roha, the Arabic name for Edessa, an assertion which, borrowed from Knobel, is utterly destitute of foundation, as will be seen at once on comparing the Hebrew andArabic words. A closer resemblance might be found between Reu and Rhagoe, a large town of Media, especially if the Greek equivalents of the two names be taken”

## Reuben[[@Headword:Reuben]]

             (Heb. Reiiben', רְאוּבֵן, see a son [see below]; Sept. and New Test. ῾Ρουβήν), the name of one of the Jewish patriarchs and of the tribe descended from him. The following account is chiefly compiled from the Scriptural statements. SEE JACOB

.

1. Reuben was Jacob's first-born child (Gen 29:32), the son of Leah, apparently an unexpected fruit of the marriage (Gen 29:31; Josephus, Ant. i, 19, 8). B.C. 1919. This is perhaps denoted by the name itself, whether we adopt the obvious signification of its present form — reu'bn, i.e. “behold ye, a son!” (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 1247 b) — or the explanation given in the text, which seems to imply that the original form was רָאוּי בְּעָנְיַי, rau bMonyi, “Jehovah hath seen my affliction,” or that of Josephus, who uniformly presents it as Roubel ( ῾Ρούβηλος, so also in Ant. ii, 3, 1), and explains it (Ant. i, 19, 8) as the “pity of God”- ἔλεον τοῦ θεοῦ, as if from רָאוּי בְּאֵל(Furst, Heb. Lex. p. 1269). The Peshito (Rabil) and the Arabic version of Joshua agree with this last form. Redslob (Die alttestamentl. Namen, p. 86) maintains that Reubel is the original form of the name, which was corrupted into Reuben, as Bethel into the modern Beitin, and Jezreel into Zerin. He treats it as signifying the “flock of Bel,” a deity whose worship greatly flourished in the neighboring country of Moab, and who under the name of Nebo had a famous sanctuary in the very territory of Reuben. In this case it would be a parallel to the title, “people of Chemosh,” which is bestowed on Moab. The alteration of the obnoxious syllable in Reubel would, on this theory, find a parallel in the Meribbaal and Eshbaal of Saul's family, who became Mephibosheth and Ishbosheth. But all this is evidently fanciful and arbitrary.

The notices of the patriarch Reuben in the book of Genesis and the early Jewish traditional literature are unusually frequent, and on the whole give a favorable view of his disposition. To him, and him alone, the preservation of Joseph's life appears to have been due. B.C. 1895. His anguish at the disappearance of his brother, and the frustration of his kindly artifice for  delivering him (Gen 37:22); his recollection of the minute details of the painful scene many years afterwards (Gen 42:22); his offer to take the sole responsibility of the safety ot the brother who had succeeded to Joseph's place in the family (Gen 42:37), all testify to a warm and (for those rough times) a kindly nature. We are, however, to remember that he, as the eldest son, was more responsible for. the safety of Joseph than were the others, and it would seem that he eventually acquiesced in the deception practiced upon his father. Subsequently Reuben offered to make the lives ot his own sons responsible for that of Benjamin, when it was necessary to prevail on Jacob to let him go down to Egypt (Gen 42:37-38). The fine conduct ot Judah in afterwards undertaking the same responsibility is in advantageous contrast with this coarse, although well-meant, proposal. For his adulterous and incestuous conduct in the matter of Bilhah, Jacob in his last blessing deprived him of the pre-eminence and double portion which belonged to his birthright, assigning the former to Judah and the latter to Joseph (Gen 44:3-4; comp. Gen 44:8-10; Gen 48:5). Of this repulsive crime we know from the Scriptures only the fact (Gen 35:22). In the post-Biblical traditions it is treated either as not having actually occurred (as in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan), or else as the result of a sudden temptation acting on a hot and vigorous nature (as in the Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs) — a parallel, in some of its circumstances, to the intrigue of David with Bathsheba. Some severe temptation there must surely have been to impel Reuben to an act which, regarded in its social rather than in its moral aspect, would be peculiarly abhorrent to a patriarchal society, and which is specially and repeatedly reprobated in the law of Moses. The Rabbinical version of the occurrence (as given in the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan) is very characteristic, and well illustrates the difference between the spirit of early and of late Jewish history. “Reuben went and disordered the couch of Bilhah, his father's concubine, which was placed right opposite the couch of Leah, and it was counted unto him as if he had lain with her. And when Israel heard it, it displeased him, and he said, Lo! an unworthy person shall proceed from me, as Ishmael did from Abraham, and Esau from my father. And the Holy Spirit answered him and said, All are righteous, and there is not one unworthy among them.” Reuben's anxiety to save Joseph is represented as arising from a desire to conciliate Jacob, and his absence while Joseph was sold, from his sitting alone on the mountains in penitent fasting. These traits, slight as they are, are those of an ardent, impetuous, unbalanced, but not ungenerous, nature; not crafty and cruel, as were Simeon and Levi, but rather, to use the  metaphor of the dying patriarch, bdiling up (פִּפִּז, A.V. “unstable,” Gen 44:4) like a vessel of water over the rapid wood-fire of the nomad tent, and as quickly subsiding into apathy when the fuel was withdrawn.

2. The Tribe of Reuben. — At the time of the migration into Egypt (or rather at the time of Jacob's decease), Reuben's sons were four (Gen 46:9; 1Ch 5:3). From them sprang the chief families of the tribe (Num 26:5-11). One of these families — that of Pallu — became notorious as producing Eliab, whose sons or descendants, Dathan and Abiram, perished with their kinsman On in the divine retribution for their conspiracy against Moses (16:1; 26:8-11). The census at Mount Sinai (1:20, 21; 2:11) shows that at the Exodus the numbers of the tribe were 46,500 men above twenty years of age, and fit for active warlike service. In point of numerical strength, Reuben was then sixth on the list, Gad, with 45,650 men, being next below. On the borders of Canaan, after the plague which punished the idolatry of Baal-peor, the numbers had fallen slightly, and were 43,730; Gad was 40,500; and the position of the two in the list is lower than before, Ephraim and Simeon being the only two smaller tribes (26:7, etc.). During the journey through the wilderness the position ot Reuben was on the south side of the Tabernacle. The “camp” which went under his name was formed of his own tribe, that of Simeon (Leah's second son), and that of Gad (son of Zilpah, Leah's slave). The standard of the camp was a deer with the inscription, “Hear, O Israel! the Lord thy God is one Lord!” and its place in the march was second (Targum Pseudo-Jonathan [Num 2:10-16]).

The Reubenites, like their relatives and neighbors on the journey, the Gadites, had maintained through the march to Canaan the ancient calling of their forefathers. The patriarchs were “feeding their flocks” at Shechem when Joseph was sold into Egypt. It was as men whose “trade had been about cattle from their youth” that they were presented to Pharaoh (Gen 46:32; Gen 46:34), and in the land of Goshen they settled “with their flocks and herds and all that they had” (Gen 46:32; Gen 47:1). Their cattle accompanied them in their flight from Egypt (Exo 12:38); not a hoof was left behind; and there are frequent allusions to them on the journey (34:3; Num 11:22; Deu 8:13, etc.). But it would appear that the tribes who were destined to settle in the confined territory between the Mediterranean and the Jordan had, during the journey  through the wilderness, fortunately relinquished that taste for the possession of cattle which they could not have maintained after their settlement at a distance from the wide pastures of the wilderness. Thus the cattle had come into the hands of Reuben, Gad, and the half of Manasseh (Num 32:1), and it followed naturally that when the nation arrived on the open downs east of the Jordan, the three tribes just named should prefer a request to their leader to be allowed to remain in a place so perfectly suited to their requirements. The country east of Jordan does not appear to have been included in the original land promised to Abraham. That which the spies examined was comprised, on the east and west, between the “coast of Jordan” and “the sea.” But for the pusillanimity of the greater number of the tribes it would have been entered from'the south (13:30), and in that case the east of Jordan might never have been peopled by Israel at all. Accordingly, when the Reubenites and their fellows approach Moses with their request, his main objection is that by what they propose they will discourage the hearts of the children of Israel from going over Jordan into the land which Jehovah had given them (Gen 32:7). It is only on their undertaking to fulfil their part in the conquest of the western country, the land of Canaan proper, and thus satisfying him that their proposal was grounded in no selfish desire to escape a full share of the difficulties of the conquest, that Moses will consent to their proposal.

The “blessing” of Reuben by the departing lawgiver is a passage which has severely exercised translators and commentators. Strictly translated as they stand in the received Hebrew text, the words are as follows:

“Let Reuben live, and not die,

And let his men be a [small] number.”

As to the first line there appears to be no doubt, but the second line has been interpreted in two exactly opposite ways.

1. By the Sept.,

“And let his men be many in number.”

This has the disadvantage that מַסְפָּרis never employed elsewhere for a large number, but always for a small one (e.g. 1Ch 16:19; Job 16:22; Isa 10:19; Eze 12:16). 2. That of our own A.V.,

“And let not his men be few.”

Here the negative of the first line is presumed to convey its force to the second, though not there expressed. This is countenanced by the ancient Syriac version (Peshito) and the translations of Junius and Tremellius, and Schott and Winzer. It also has the important support of Gesenius (Thesaur. p. 968 a, and Pent. Samuel p. 44). It is, however, a very violent rendering. 3. A third and very ingenious interpretation is that adopted by the Veneto- Greek version, and also by Michaelis (Bibelfur Ungelehrten, Text), which assumes that the vowel-points of the word מְתָיו, “his men,” should be altered to מֵתָיו, “his dead” “And let his dead be few” — as if in allusion to some recent mortality in the tribe, such as that in Simeon after the plague of Baal-peor. These interpretations, unless the last should prove to be the original reading, originate in the fact that the words in their naked sense convey a curse, and not a blessing. Fortunately, though differing widely in detail, they agree in general meaning. The benediction of the great leader goes out over the tribe which was about to separate itself from its brethren, in a fervent aspiration for its welfare through all the risks of that remote and trying situation. Both in this and the earlier blessing of Jacob, Reuben retains his place at the head of the family, and it must not be overlooked that the tribe, together with the two who associated themselves with it, actually received its inheritance before either Judah or Ephraim, to whom the birthright which Reuben had forfeited was transferred (1Ch 5:1).

From this time it seems as if a bar, not only the material one of distance, and of the intervening river and mountain-wall, but also of difference in feeling and habits, gradually grew up more substantially between the Eastern and Western tribes. The first act of the former after the completion of the conquest, and after they had taken part in the solemn ceremonial in the valley between Ebal and Gerizim, shows how wide a gap already existed between their ideas and those of the Western tribes. The pile of stones which thev erected on the western bank of the Jordan to mark their boundary — to testify to after-ages that, though separated by the rushing river from their brethren and the country in which Jehovah had fixed the place where he would be worshipped, they had still a right to return to it for his worship — was erected in accordance with the unalterable habits of Bedouin tribes both before and since. It; was an act identical with that in which Laban and Jacob engaged at parting, with that which is constantly performed by the Bedouin of the present day. But by the Israelites west of Jordan, who were fast relinquishing their nomad habits and feelings for  those of more settled permanent life, this act was completely misunderstood, and was construed into an attempt to set up a rival altar to that of the sacred tent. The incompatibility of the idea to the mind of the Western Israelites is shown by the fact that, notwithstanding the disclaimer of the two and a half tribes, and notwithstanding that disclaimer having proved satisfactory even to Phinehas, the author of Joshua 22 retains the name mizbeach for the pile, a word which involves the idea of sacrifice — i.e. of slaughter (see Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 402)-instead of applying to it the term gal, as is done in the case (Gen 31:46) of the precisely similar “heap of witness.” Another Reubenitish erection, which long kept up the memory of the presence of the tribe on the west of Jordan, was the stone of Bohan ben-Reuben which formed a landmark on the boundary between Judah and Benjamin (Jos 15:6). This was a single stone (Eben), not a pile, and it appears to have stood somewhere on the road from Bethany to Jericho, not far from the ruined khan so well known to travellers.

The doom, “Thou shalt not excel,” was exactly fulfilled in the destinies of the tribe descended from Reuben, which makes no figure in the Hebrew history, and never produced any eminent person. No judge, no prophet, no hero of the tribe of Reuben is handed down to us, unless it be “Adina the Reubenite, a captain of the Reubenites, and thirty with him” (1Ch 11:42). In the dire extremity of their brethren in the north under Deborah and Barak, they contented themselves with debating the news among the streams (פֶּלֶג) of the Mishor. The distant distress of his brethren could not move Reuben: he lingered among his sheepfolds, and preferred the shepherd's pipe and the bleating of the flocks to the clamor of the trumpet and the turmoil of battle. His individuality fades more rapidly than Gad's. The eleven valiant Gadites who swam the Jordan at its highest, to join the son of Jesse in his trouble (1Ch 12:8-15); Barzillai; Elijah the Gileadite; the siege of Ramoth-gilead, with its picturesque incidents — all give a substantial reality to the tribe and country of Gad. But no person, no incident, is recorded to place Reuben before us in any distincter form than as a member of the community (if community it can be called) of “the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the halftribe of Manasseh” (1Ch 12:37). The very towns of his inheritance — Heshbon, Aroer, Kirjathaim, Dibon, Baalmeon, Sibmah, Jazer — are familiar to us as Moabitish, and not as Israelitish, towns. The city life so characteristic of Moabitish civilization had no hold on the Reubenites. They are most in  their element when engaged in continual broils with the children of the desert, the Bedouin tribes of Hagar, Jetur, Nephish, Nodab; driving off their myriads of cattle, asses, camels; dwelling in their tents, as if to the manner born (5:10), gradually spreading over the vast wilderness which extends from Jordan to the Euphrates (1Ch 12:9), and every day receding further and further from any community of feeling or of interest with the Western tribes. See MOAB. Thus remote from the central seat of the national government and of the national religion it is not to be wondered at that Reuben relinquished the faith of Jehovah. “They went after the gods of the people of the land whom God destroyed before them,” and we hear little more of them till the time of Hazael, king of Syria, who ravaged and for a time held possession of their country (2Ki 10:33). The last historical notice which we possess of them, while it records this fact, records also as its natural consequence that the Reubenites and Gadites and the half-tribe of Manasseh were carried off by Pul and Tiglath-pileser, and placed in the districts on and about the river Khabfir, in the upper part of Mesopotamia — “in Halah, and Habor, and Hara, and the river Gozan” (1Ch 5:26).

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe of Reuben, with their probable identifications. For the boundaries, SEE TRIBE.

Abarim.Mountains.El-Belka.Almon-diblathaim.Town.[N. of Dhiban]?Arnon.River.Mojeb.Aroer.Town.Arair.Ashdoth-pisgah.Brooks.SEE PISGAH.Ataroth.Town.Atarus.Baal-meon.do.Main.Bajith.do.SEE BAAL-MEON.Bamoth (-baal).Hill ( Misgab)Jebel Humeh?Beer (-elim).Well.[On Seil Hadan]?Beon.Town.SEE BAAL-MEON.Beth-baal-meon.do.SEE BAAL-MEON.Beth-diblathaim.do.SEE ALMON- NIBNLATHAIM.Beth-jeshimoth.do.Beit-Jismuth?Beth-meon.do.SEE BAAL-MEON.Beth-peor.Temple.[N. W. of Hesban]?

Bezer.Town.[Burazin]?Dibon [or Dimon].do.Dhiban.Ealaleh.do.El-Al.Heshbon.do.Hesban.Jahaz.do.[Khan es-Shib]?Kedemoth.do.[Ed-Duleilat]?Kiijathaim.do.Kureyat?Lasha.doSEE CALLIRRHO.Mattanah.do.[In plain Ard Ramadan]?Medeba.do.Medaba.Mephaath.do.[ Em el- Weled]?Miunith.do.Minyah.Migab.do.SEE BAMOTH.Nahaliel.do.[N. of Wady Maleh]?Nebo.Mount.Jebel Neba.Nophah.Town.[El-Habeeis]?Pisgah.Mount.SEE NEBO.Shebern, Shebman, or Sibmah.Town.Es-Sameh]?Zareth-shahar.do.Zara?Zophim.Field.[Plain of Medeba]?The country allotted to the Reubenites extended on the south to the river Arnon, which divided it from the Moabites (Jos 13:8; Jos 13:16); on the east it touched the desert of Arabia; on the west were the Dead Sea and the Jordan. The northern border was probably marked by a line running eastward from the Jordan, through Wady Hesban (Jos 13:17-21; Num 32:37-38). This country had originally been conquered and occupied by the Moabites; but they were driven out a short time before the Exodus by Sihon, king of the Amorites, who I was in his turn expelled by the Israelites (Deuteronomy 2; Num 21:22-31). Immediately after the captivity e the Moabites again returned to their old country and occupied their old cities. This is the reason why, in the later prophets, many of the cities of Reuben are emtbraced in the curses pronounced upon Moab (Jeremiah 48). — The territory was divided into sections — the western declivities towards the Dead Sea and the Jordan valley, which were steep,  rugged, and bare, with the little section of the lower plain of Jordan (called in Scripture — “the plains of Moab” [Num 22:1]) at their base; and the high table-land stretching from the summit of the ridge away towards Arabia. The latter, from its even surface, as contrasted with the rocky soil of Western Palestine, received from the accurate sacred writers the appropriate name Mishor (q.v.). Under its modern name of the Belka it is still esteemed beyond all others by the Arab sheepmasters. It is well watered, covered with smooth, short turf, and losing itself gradually in those illimitable wastes which have always been, and always will be, the favorite resort of pastoral nomad tribes. The whole region is now deserted; there is not a single settled inhabitant within its borders. Its great cities, mostly bearing their ancient names, are heaps of ruins. The wild wandering tribes of the desert visit it periodically to feed their flocks and herds on its rich pastures, and to drink the waters of its fountains and cisterns. See Burckhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 365 sq.; Irby and Mangles, Travels, p. 460 sq.; Porter, Hand-book for Syria, p. 298 sq.

## Reubenite[[@Headword:Reubenite]]

             (Heb. with the art. ha-Reubeny', הָרְאוּבֵנַי; Sept. ῾Ρουβήν, occasionally οἱ υἱοὶ ῾Ρουβήν or ῾Ρουβηνί), a descendant of Reuben (Num 26:7, etc.).

## Reuchlin[[@Headword:Reuchlin]]

             a name common to several Lutheran theologians, of whom we here mention the following:

1. CHRISTOPH, the teacher of the famous Bengel, born in 1660, studied at Tubingen and Wittenberg, and died at the former place, June 11, 1707, doctor and professor of theology. He wrote, De Artificio Jacobi Magico, etc.: — De Diluvio Mosaico, etc.: — De Nova Creatione Eph 2:10 : — De Evangelio ad Rom 1:16-17 : — De Credendis e Scripturae Sacra Dictis Exegesi Theologica Demonstratis. — De Dubitatione Cairtesiana. — De Arianismo, etc. See Jocher. Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.

2. FRIEDRICH JACOB, born at Gerstheim, near Strasburg, in 1695, and died at the latter place, June 3, 1788, doctor and professor of theology, is the author of De Doctrina Cypriaana (1751-56, 3 parts). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:906.

3. HERMANN, who died at Stuttgard in 1873, doctor of philosophy, wrote, Das Christenthum in Frankreich innerhalb und ausserhalb der Kirche (Hamburg,1837): — Geschichte von Port-Royal, etc. (1839, 2 volumes):Pascal's Leben, etc.. (Stuttgard, 1840). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reuchlin, Johann Von[[@Headword:Reuchlin, Johann Von]]

             an eminent German scholar, who adopted the Graecized name of Capnio, was born at Pforzheim in 1454. After serving in different political finctions, he became, in 1520, professor of Greek and Hebrew at Ingolstadt, whence he removed to Tubingen, thence to Stuttgart, where he died, Dec. 28, 1521. Besides his memorable services in connection with classical literature and general culture, he may be regarded as the principal promoter of the study of Hebrew in his day. He published a Hebrew grammar and lexicon under the title Ad Dionysium Fratrem suum de Rudimentis Hebraicis Libri III (s.. 1506, 4to), of which an improved edition, by Seb. Munster, appeared in 1537 (Basel, fol.). Reuchlin wrote also De Accentibus et Orthographia Ling. Heb. (Hagenau, 1518, 4to).

## Reuden, Ambrosius[[@Headword:Reuden, Ambrosius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 1, 1543, studied at Leipsic and Jena, and died at the latter place, June 1, 1615. He wrote, Compendium Grammaticae Ebraicae (Wittenberg, 1586): — Isagoge Grammatica in Linguacm Hebraicam (1604): — Isagoge Biblica (Hamburg, 1602): — OEconomia Veteris et Novi Testamenti, Ostendens quid ibi Observandum sit (Leipsic, 1603), etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud., s.v. (B.P.)

## Reuel[[@Headword:Reuel]]

             (Heb. Reiel', רְעוּאֵל, friend of God; Sept. ῾Ραγουήλ; A.V. Raguel [Num 10:29]), the name of three or four men.

1. A son of Esau by Bashemath (Gen 36:4; Gen 36:10; 1Ch 1:35; 1Ch 1:37); his four sons (Gen 36:13) were princes, i.e. chiefs of the Edomites (Gen 36:17). B.C. post 1963. SEE ESAU.

2. A Midianitish priest and nomadic herdsman in the wilderness, to whom Moses fled from Egypt, and whose daughter Zipporah he married (Exo 2:16 sq.); but in Exo 3:1; Exo 4:18, JETHRO is called father-in-law of Moses, and in 3:1 is made priest and herdsman. Various methods are suggested for meeting the difficulty:

(1.) Josephus (Ant. ii, 12,1) considers Reuel and Jethro as two names of one man. So Lengerke (Kenaan, i, 393) and Bertheau (Isr. Gesch. p. 242).

(2.) Aben-Ezra, followed by Rosenmiiller, understands by father in Exo 2:18, grandfather.

(3.) Ewald (Isr. Gesch. ii, 14) thinks “Jethro son of” has fallen out of the text before Reuel in Exodus ii, 18.

(4.) Ranke (Pentat. ii, 8) understands the word chothen', חֹתֵו, rendered father-in-law, to mean brother-in-law, and compares the ambiguous use of the Greek γαμβρός. We must then suppose that Jethro had succeeded to the priesthood and flocks of his deceased father (Exo 3:1).

(5.) Others find a double genealogical tradition (Hartmann, Pentat. p. 223 sq.; comp. De Wette, Einleit. ins A. T. p. 196). On this supposition the “compiler” must have been very careless. The third explanation derives no support from the fact that the Sept., in Exo 2:16, twice mentions Jethro as father of seven daughters. The translators might have considered Reuel as the grandfather, and this would support No. 2. The fourth supposition is forced. If we must decide for any particular view, it seems simplest to understand grandfather for father (Exo 2:18), since Reuel was the father of the house until Jethro acquired independence. SEE HOBAB; SEE RAGUEL.

3. Father of Eliasaph, the leader of the tribe of Gad at the time of the census at Sinai (Num 2:14). In the parallel passages (Num 1:14; Num 7:42; Num 7:47; Num 10:20) the name is given DEUEL SEE DEUEL (q.v.).

4. Son of Ibnijah, father of Shephatiah (1Ch 9:8), of the tribe of Benjamin. B.C. ante 1618.

## Reumah[[@Headword:Reumah]]

             (Heb. Reiimah', רְאוּמָה, elevated [Gesen.], or pearl [Furst]; Sept. ῾Ρευμά), a concubine of Nahor, Abraham's brother; and by him mother of Tebah and others (Gen 22:24). B.C. cir. 2040.

## Reuss, Benigna Von[[@Headword:Reuss, Benigna Von]]

             (Countess), a German hvmnist, was born at Ebersdorf Dec. 15, 1695, where she also died, Aug. 1, 1751. She was a sister of count Henry XXIX of Reuss-Ebersdorf, and of the countess Erdmuth Dorothea, wife of count von Zinzendorf. She was a godly woman, and wrote some hymns, one of which has been translated into English: Komm Segen aus der Hohe (Engl. transl. in Sacred Lyrics from the German, p. 155, “Attend, Lord, my daily toil”). (B. P.)

## Reuss, Jeremias Friedrich[[@Headword:Reuss, Jeremias Friedrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born December 2, 1700. He studied at Tiibingen, travelled extensively, was in 1731 appointed court- preacher and professor at Copenhagen, in 1742 doctor of theology, in 1749 general superintendent of Schleswig and Holstein, in 1757 professor at Tubingen, and died March 6, 1777. He published, De Usu Experientiae Spiritualis in Scripturarum Intepretatione (2d ed. Leipsic, 1735): — Meletema de Sensu Septem Parabolarum Matthew 13 Prophetico (1733): — Meletema de Spiritus Sancti Testimonio (1734): — Diss. qua Illustre Oraculum Zachariah 6:12, 13 Explanatur (1758): — De Auctore Apocalypaeos (1767), etc. See Diorius, Die gelehrteen Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian. of Germany, was born at Schlawe, Pomerania, June 17, 1675. He studied at Wittenberg, in 1702 was deacon there, in 1708 pastor at Zerbst, in 1711 doctor of theology, and died April 6, 1744. He published, De Libanio, Nobile Grcecorum Rhetore (Wittenberg, 1699): — De Cultu Dei Adversus Hobbesium, Chaerburg et Spinozaon (1702): — De Mlacario Egyptio (1703): — De Foederibus et Testamentis (1706): — De Precibus Beatorum in Ccelis pro Hominibus in Ternis (1714): — De Lege Moali non Abrogata ex Joh 1:18 (eod.): — Δικαίωμα τοῦ νόμου ex Romans 8 (1716): — Typus Doctrinae et Theologiae Moralis (1718): — Electa Theologica (1720). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Reuter, Quirinus[[@Headword:Reuter, Quirinus]]

             a German scholar, pupil and successor of Zach. Ursinus, was born at Mosbach, September 27, 1558. He studied at Heidelberg. In 1578 he went to Neustadt, where his former teachers lectured at the newly-founded academy. In 1580 Reuter went to Breslau as private tutor; but returned to Neustadt in 1583. In 1590 he was again at Heidelberg, became in 1601 doctor of theology, in 1602 professor of Old Test. theology, and died March 22, 1613. Of his writings we mention, Censura Catecheseos Heidelbergensis: — Diatriba de Ubiquitate: — Tractatus de Ecclesia: — Aphorismi Theologici de Vera Reliqione: — Dissertatio de δικαιώματι Legis in Chrisfo et Chrisfianis ad Romans 8 : — Commentarius in Obadiam Prophetam una cum Illustriorum Quorundam de Messiae  Persona et Officio Vaticiniorum Explicatione, etc. See Freher, Theatrum Vivorum Clariss.; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Iselin, Historisches Universal-Lexikon, s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Reuterdahl, Henrik[[@Headword:Reuterdahl, Henrik]]

             a Swedish Protestant divine, was born in 1795 at Malmo, in Sweden. He studied at Lund, and in 1817 commenced lecturing as “privat docent” of theology. In 1824 he was made adjunct to the theological faculty, in 1826 prefect of the seminary, in 1827 member of the chapter, in 1838 librarian, and in 1844 professor of theology at Lund. In 1852 he was appointed state-councillor and head of the department for religious matters, which position he occupied till 1855, when he was made bishop of'Lund, and in 1856 archbishop of Upsala. He died in 1870. He wrote, On the Study of Theology (Lund, 1834): — Introduction to Theology (ibid. 1837): — History of the Swedish Church (ibid. 1838-63, 3 vols.). Besides, he also published since 1828 the Theologisk Quartalskrift, and continued the Apparatus ad Historiam Suedo-Gothicam, commenced by Celse. His De Fontibus Historien Ecclesiastica Eusebiance, published in 1826, in 4 pts., is still of great value. See Winer, Handbuch der theoloqischen Literatur, i, 833, 892, ii, 730; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. ii, 1059 sq. (B. P.)

## Reval-Esthonian Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Reval-Esthonian Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This version, which is used by the inhabitants of the north of Livonia, including the three adjacent islands of Oesel, Dagden (or Dagoe), and Mohn, was first printed at Reval in 1739, and partly published at the expense of the celebrated count Zinzendorf. In 1815, through the zeal of Dr. Paterson, and the aid afforded by the British and Foreign Bible Society,  an edition of 10,000 copies of the New Test. was printed. Prior to 1824 the Russian Bible Society published 5100 copies of the Old Test., and some recent editions have been issued at Dorpat. Of late the American Bible Society has undertaken the publication of the whole Bible in the Reval- Esthonian, now printing at Berlin, which is probably now ready, having the previous year (1876) issued an edition of 20,000 copies of the New Test., with the Psalms, in 12mo. We subjoin the Lord's Prayer in that dialect, from Dalton's Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands, p. 65: “Meie iza, kes sa oled taewas, pihitsetud sagu slnu nimi, sinu rik tulgu, sine tahtmine sundigu kui taewas nenda ka ma peal; meie igapaewane leib anna meile tana-paeiw; ja anna andeks meile meie wolad, kui ka meie andeks anname oma wolglastele; ja ara sada meid mitte kiuzatuze sisse, waid peasta meid ara kurjast; sest sinu paralt on rik, ja wagi ja au igaweste. Amen.” See Bible of Every Land, p. 330 sq.; Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands, p. 25 sq., 65; Annual Reports of the American Bible Society, 1876, 1877. (B. P.)

## Revelation[[@Headword:Revelation]]

             (ἀποκάλυψις), a disclosure of something that was before unknown; and divine revelation is the direct communication of truths before unknown from God to men. The disclosure may be made by dream, vision, oral communication, or otherwise (Dan 2:19; 1Co 14:26; 2Co 12:1; Galatians 1:12; Rev 1:1). Revelation is not to be confounded with inspiration. The former refers to those things only of which the sacred writers were ignorant before they were divinely taught, while the latter has a more general meaning. Accordingly revelation may be defined that operation of the Holy Spirit by which truths before unknown are communicated to men; and inspiration, the operation of the Holy Spirit by which not only unknown truths are communicated, but by which also men are excited to publish truths for the instruction of others, and are guarded from all error in doing it. Thus it was revealed to the ancient prophets that the Messiah should appear, and they were inspired to publish the fact for the benefit of others. The affecting scenes at the cross of Christ were not revealed to John, for he saw them with his own eyes (Joh 19:35); but he was inspired to write a history of this event, and by supernatural guidance was kept from all error in his record. It is therefore true, as the apostle affirms, that every part of the Bible is given by inspiration of God (2Ti 3:16), though every part of the Bible is not the result of immediate revelation. For convenience' sake, we call the  whole Bible a revelation from God, because most of the truths it contains were made known by direct communication from God, and could have been discovered in no other way; and generally it is only the incidental circumstances attending the communication of these truths that would be ascertained by the writers in the ordinary modes of obtaining information.

Concerning a divine revelation, we remark that,

1. It is possible. God may, for aught we know, think proper to make known to his creatures what they before were ignorant of; and, as a Being of infinite power, he cannot be at a loss for means of communication.

2. It is desirable; for while reason is necessary to examine the matter of revelation, it is incapable, unaided, of finding out God.

3. It is necessary; for without it we can attain to no certain knowledge of God, of Christ, and of salvation.

4. Revelation must, to answer its endsbe sufficiently marked with internal and external evidences. These the Bible has.

5. Its contents must be agreeable to reason. Not that everything revealed must be within the range of reason; but this may be true, and yet there be no contradiction. To calm, dispassionate reason there is nothing in doctrine, command, warning, promises, or threatenings which is opposed thereto.

6. It must be credible; and we find the facts of Scripture supported by abundant evidence from friend and foe.

7. Revelation also must necessarily bear the prevailing impress of the circumstances and tastes of the times and nations in which it was originally given. The Bible, however, though it bears the distinct impress of Asiatic manners, as it should do, is most remarkable for rising above all local and temporary peculiarities, and seizing on the great principles common to human nature under all circumstances; thus showing that as it is intended for universal benefit, so will it be made known to all mankind. The language of the Bible is the language of men, otherwise it would not be a divine revelation to men. It is to be understood by the same means and according to the same laws bv which all other human language is understood. It is addressed to the common-sense of men, and common- sense is to be consulted in its interpretation.  In a narrower sense, “revelation” is used to express the manifestation of Jesus Christ to Jews and Gentiles (Luk 2:32); the manifestation of the glory with which God will glorify his elect and faithful seryants at the: last judgment (Rom 8:19), and the declaration of his just judgments in his conduct both towards the elect and towards the reprobate (2:5-16). There is a very noble application of the word revelation to the consummation of all things, or the revelation of Jesus Christ in his future glory — (1Co 1:7; 1Pe 1:13). See Brown, Compendium of Natural and Revealed Religion; Archbp. Campbell, On Revelation; Delany, Revelation Examined; Ellis, On Divine Things; Fuller, Works; Horne, Introduction; Leland, Necessity of Revelation; View of Deistical Writers. SEE INSPIRATION; SEE MIRACLES; SEE PROPHECY.

## Revelation, Book Of[[@Headword:Revelation, Book Of]]

             This, the last of the books of the New Test., according to their usual arrangement, is entitled in the A.V. “The Revelation (Α᾿ποκάλυψις, Apocalypse) of [St.] John the Divine (τοῦ θεολόγου),” but in Codices Alex., Sinait., and Ephr. Rescrip. it is simply Α᾿ποκάλυψις Ι᾿ωάννου; and in Cod. Vat. it takes the fuller and more explicit form of ‘Α᾿ποκάλυψις Ι᾿ωάννου θεολόγου καὶ Εὐαγγελιστοῦ, thus clearly identifying the author with the writer of the fourth gospel. The true and authoritative title of the book, however, is that which it bears iln its own commencing words, Α᾿ποκάλυψις Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ; which has been restored by Tregel!es in his critical edition of 1844, and whichl has been adopted by most of the critical authorities and versions since.

I. Canonical Authority and Authorship. — These two points are intimately connected with each other. If it can be proved that a book, claiming so distinctly as this does the authority of divine inspiration, was actually written by John, then no doubt will be entertained as to its title to a place in the canon of Scripture. Was, then, John the apostle and evangelist the writer of the Revelation? This question was first mooted by Dionysius of Alexandria (Eusebius. H.E. 7:25). The doubt which he modestly suggested has been confidently proclaimed in modern times by Luther ( Vorrede auf die Offenbarung, 1522 and 1534), and widely diffused through his influence. Lucke (Einleitung, p. 802), the most learned and diligent of modern critics of the Revelation, agrees with a majority of the eminent scholars of Germany in denying that John was the author. But the general  belief of the mass of Christians in all ages has been in favor of John's authorship.

1. Evidence in Favor of the Apostolic Authorship. This consists of the assertions of the author and historical tradition.

(1.) The author's description of himself in the first and twenty-second chapters is certainly equivalent to an assertion that he is the apostle. (a) He names himself simply John, without prefix or addition — a name which at that period, and in Asia, must have been taken by every Christian as the designation, in the first instance, of the great apostle who dwelt at Ephesus. Doubtless there were other Johns among the Christians at that time, but only arrogance or an intention to deceive could account for the assumption of this simple style by any other writer. He is also described as (b) a servant of Christ, (c) one who had borne testimony as an eye-witness of the word of God and of the testimony of Christ — terms which were surely designed to identify him with the writer of the verses Joh 19:35; Joh 1:14 : and l Joh 1:2. He is (d) in Patmos for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ: it may be easy to suppose that other Christians of the same name were banished thither, but the apostle is the only John who is distinctly named in early history as an exile at Patmos. He is also (e) a fellow-sufferer with those whom he addresses, and (f) the authorized channel of the most direct and important communication that was ever made to the seven churches of Asia, of which church es John the apostle was at that time the spiritual governor and teacher. Lastly (g), the writer was a fellowservant of angels and a brother of prophets — titles which are far more suitable to one of the chief apostles, and far more likely to have been assigned to him than to any other man of less distinction. All these marks are found united together in the apostle John, and in him alone of all historical persons. We must go out of the region of fact into the region of conjecture to find such another person. A candid reader of the Revelation, if previously acquainted with John's other writings and life, must inevitably conclude that the writer intended to be identified with John. It is strange to see so able a critic as Lucke (Einleitung, p. 514) meeting this conclusion with the conjecture that some Asiatic disciple and namesake of the apostle may have written the book in the course of some missionary labors or some time of sacred retirement in Patmos. Equally unavailing against this conclusion is the objection brought by Ewald, Credner, and others, from the fact that a promise of the future blessedness of the apostles is implied in 18:20 and 21:14: as if it were inconsistent with the true modesty and  humility of an apostle to record — as Daniel of old did in much plainer terms (Dan 12:13) — a divine promise of salvation to himself personally. Rather those passages may be taken as instances of the writer quietly accepting as his just due such honorable mention as belongs to all the apostolic company. Unless we are prepared to give up the veracity and divine origin of the whole book, and to treat the writer's account of himself as a mere fiction of a poet trying to cover his own insignificance with an honored name, we must accept that description as a plain statement of fact, equally credible with the rest of the book, and in harmony with the simple, honest, truthful character which is stamped on the face of the whole narrative.

Besides this direct assertion of John's authorship, there is also an implication of it running through the book. Generally, the instinct of single- minded, patient faithful students has led them to discern a connection between the Revelation and John's gospel and epistles, and to recognise, not merely the same Spirit as the source of this and other books of Holy Scripture, but also the same peculiarly formed human instrument employed both in producing this book and the fourth gospel, and in speaking the characteristic words and performing the characteristic actions recorded of John. This evidence is set forth at great length and with much force and eloquence by J. P. Lange in his essay on the connection between the individuality of the apostle John and that of the Apocalypse, 1838 (Vermischte Schriften, ii, 173-231). After investigating the peculiar features of the apostle's character and position, and (in reply to Lucke) the personal traits shown by the writer of the Revelation, he concludes that the book is a mysterious but genuine effusion of prophecy under the New Test., imbued with the spirit of the Gospel, the product of a spiritual gift so peculiar, so great and noble, that it can be ascribed to the apostle John alone. The Revelation requires for its writer John, just as his peculiar genius requires for its utterance a revelation. This special character of the Apocalypse as an inspired production under remarkably vivid circumstances is the true key to its diction, which certainly exhibits many striking differences as compared with John's other well-accredited writings. At the same time, there are not a few marked coincidences in the phraseology. Both of these points have been developed at great length by the writers above named and by others in their commentaries and introductions, to which we must refer the reader for details. Arguments of this nature are always inconclusive as to authorship, and we therefore rest  the conclusion upon evidence of a more palpable character. (See § 3 below.)

(2.) The historical testimonies in favor of John's authorship are singularly distinct and numerous, and there is very little to weigh against them.

(a.) Justin Martyr (cir. A.D. 150) says: “A man among us whose name was John, one of the apostles of Christ, in a revelation which was made to him, prophesied that the believers in our Christ shall live a thousand years in Jerusalem” (Tryph. § 81, p. 179, ed. Ben.).

(b.) The author of the Muratorian Fragment (cir. A.D. 170) speaks of John as the writer of the Apocalypse, and describes him as a predecessor of Paul, i.e. as Credner and Luicke candidly interpret it, his predecessor in the office of apostle.

(c.) Melito of Sardis (cir. A.D. 170) wrote a treatise on the Revelation of John. Eusebius (II. E. 4:26) mentions this among the books of Melito which had come to his knowledge; and as he carefully records objections against the apostle's authorship, it may be fairly presumed, notwithstanding the doubts of Klenker and Lucke (Einleitung, p. 514), that Eusebius found no doubt as to John's authorship in the book of this ancient Asiatic bishop.

(d.) Theophilus, bishop of Antioch (cir. 180), in a controversy with Hermogenes, quotes passages out of the Revelation of John (Eusebius, H.E. 4:24).

(e.) Irenseus (cir. 195), apparently never having heard a suggestion of any other author than the apostle, often quotes the Revelation as the work of John. In 4:20, § 11, he describes John the writer of the Revelation as the same who was leaning on Jesus' bosom at supper, and asked him who should betray him. The testimony of Irenaeus as to the authorship of Revelation is, perhaps, more important than that of any other writer: it mounts up into the preceding generation, and is virtually that of a contemporary of the apostle. For in 5:30, § 1, where he vindicates the true reading (666) of the number of the Beast, he cites in support of it, not only the old correct copies of the book, but also the oral testimony of the very persons who themselves had seen John face to face. It is obvious that Irenseus's reference for information on such a point to those contemporaries of John implies his undoubting belief that they, in common with himself, viewed John as the Writer of the book. Licke (p. 574)  suggests that this view wvas possibly groundless because it was entertained before the learned fathers of Alexandria had set the example of historical criticism; but his suggestion scarcely weakens the force of the fact that such was the belief of Asia, and it appears a strange suggestion when we remember that the critical discernment of the Alexandrians, to whom he refers, led them to coincide with Irenaeus in his view.

(f.) Apollonius (cir. 200) of Ephesus (?), in controversy with the Montanists of Phrygia, quoted passages out of the Revelation of John, and narrated a miracle wrought by John at Ephesus (Euseb. H.E. v. 18).

(g.) Clement of Alexandria (cir.200)quotes the book as the Revelation of John (Stromata, 6:13, p. 667), and as the work of an apostle (Poed. ii, 12, p. 207).

(h.) Tertullian (A.D. 207), in at least one place, quotes by name “the apostle John in the Apocalypse” (Adv. Marcion. 3:14).

(i.) Hippolytus (cir. 230) is said, in the inscription on his statue at Rome, to have composed an apology for the Apocalypse and Gosple of St. John the apostle. He quotes it as the work of John (De Antichristo, § 36, p. 756, ed. Migne).

(j.) Origen (cir. 233), in his commentary on John, quoted by Eusebius (H.E. 6:25), says of the apostle, “he wrote also the Revelation.” The testimonies of later writers, in the 3d and 4th centuries, in favor of John's authorship of the Revelation are equally distinct and far more numerous. They may be seen quoted at length in Lucke, p. 628-638, or in dean Alford's Prolegomena (N.T. vol. 4. pt. 2). It may suffice here to say that they include the names of Victorinus, Methodius, Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, Basil, Hilary, Athanasius, Gregory, Didymus, Ambrose, Augustine; and Jerome.

All the foregoing writers, testifying that the book came from an apostle, believed that it was a part of Holy Scripture. But many whose extant works cannot be quoted for testimony to the authorship of the book refer to it as possessing canonical authority. Thus

(a) Papias, who is described by Irenaeus as a hearer of John and friend of Polycarp, is cited, together with other writers, by Andreas of Cappadocia, in his commentary on the Revelation, as a guarantee to later ages of the divine inspiration of the book (Routh, Rel. Sacr. i, 15; Cramer, Catena  [Oxford, 1840], p. 176). The value of this testimony has not been impaired by the controversy to which it has given rise, in which Licke, Bleek, Hengstenberg, and Rettig have taken different parts.

(b) In the epistle from the churches of Lyons and Vienne, A.D. 177, inserted in Eusebius, H.E. v, 1-3, several passages (e.g. 1:5; 14:4; 22:11) are quoted or referred to in the same way as passages of books whose canonical authority is unquestioned.

(c) Cyprian (Epp. 10,12,14,19, ed. Fell) repeatedly quotes it as a part of canonical Scripture. Chrysostom makes no distinct allusion to it in any extant writing; but we are informed by Suidas that he received it as canonical. Although omitted (perhaps as not adapted for public reading in church) from the list of canonical books in the Council of Laodicea, it was admitted into the list of the third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397.

2. Evidence against John's Authorship. — Marcion, who regarded all the apostles except Paul as corrupters of the truth, rejected the Apocalypse and all other books of the New Test. which were not written by Paul. The Alogi, an obscure sect, (cir. A.D. 180), in their zeal against Montanism, denied the existence of spiritual gifts in the Church, and rejected the Revelation, saving it was the work, not of John, but of Cerinthus (Epiphanius, Adv. Heer. 51). The Roman presbyter Caius (cir. A.D. 196), who also wrote against Montanism, is quoted by Eusebius (H.E. 3:28) as ascribing certain revelations to Cerinthus; but it is doubted (see Routh, Rel. Sacr. ii, 138) whether the Revelation of John is the book to which Caius refers. But the testimony which is considered the most important of all in ancient times against the Revelation is contained in a fragment of Dionysius of Alexandria (cir. A.D. 240), the most influential, and perhaps the ablest, bishop in that age. The passage, taken from a book On the Promises, written in reply to Nepos, a learned Judaizing Chiliast, is quoted by Eusebius (H.E. 7:25). The principal points in it are these: Dionysius testifies that some writers before him altogether repudiated the Revelation as a forgery of Cerinthus; many brethren, however, prized it very highly, and Dionysius would not venture to reject it, but received it in faith as containing things too deep and too sublime for his understanding. (In his Epistle to Hermammon [Euseb. H.E. 7:10] he quotes it as he would quote Holy Scripture.) He accepts as true what is stated in the book itself, that it was written by John, but he argues that the way in which that name is mentioned, and the general character of the language, are unlike what we  should expect from John the evangelist and apostle; that there were many Johns in that age. He would not say that John Mark was the writer, since it is not known that he was in Asia. He supposes that it must be the work of some John who lived in Asia; and he observes that there are said to be two tombs in Ephesus, each of which bears the name of John. He then points out at length the superiority of the style of the Gospel and the First Epistle of John to the style of the Apocalypse, and says, in conclusion, that whatever he may think of the language, he does not deny that the Writer of the Apocalypse actually saw what he describes, and was endowed with the divine gifts of knowledge and prophecy. To this extent, and no further, Dionysius is a witness against John's authorship. It is obvious that he keenly felt the difficulty arising from the use made of the contents of this book by certain unsound Christians under his jurisdiction; that he was acquainted with the doubt as to its canonical authority which some of his predecessors entertained as an inference from the nature of its contents; that he deliberately rejected their doubt and accepted the contents of the book as given by the inspiration of God; that, although he did not understand how John could write in the style in which the Revelation is written, he yet knew of no authority for attributing it, as he desired to attribute it, to some other of the numerous persons who bore the name of John.

A weightier difficulty arises from the fact that the Revelation is one of the books which are absent from the ancient Peshito version, and the only trustworthy evidence in favor of its reception by the ancient Syrian Church is a single quotation which is adduced from the Syriac works (ii, 332 c) of Ephrem Syrus. Eusebius is remarkably sparing in his quotations from the “Revelation of John,” and the uncertainty of his opinion about it is best shown by his statement in H.E. 3:39, that “it is likely that the Revelation was seen by the second John (the Ephesian presbyter); if any one is unwilling to believe that it was seen by the apostle.” SEE JOHN THE PRESBYTER. Jerome states (Ep. ad Dardanum. etc.) that the Greek churches felt, with respect to the Revelation, a similar doubt to that of the Latins respecting the Epistle to the Hebrews. Neither he nor his equally influential contemporary Augustine shared such doubts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret abstained from making use of the book, sharing, it is possible, the doubts to which Jerome refers. But they have not gone so far as to express a distinct opinion against it. The silence of these writers is the latest evidence of any  importance that has been adduced against the overwhelming weight of the testimony in favor of the canonical authority and authorship of this book. SEE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

II. Time and Place of Writing. — The date of the Revelation is given by the great majority of critics as A.D. 95-97. The weighty testimony of Irenseus is almost sufficient to prevent any other conclusion. He says (Adv. Haer. v. 30, § 3), “It [i.e. the Revelation] was seen no very long time ago, but almost in our own generation, at the close of Domitian's reign.” Stuart's attempt to interpret this of Nero's reign (Comnment. ad loc.) is evidently forced. Eusebius also records as a tradition which he does not question, that in the persecution under Domitian, John the apostle and evangelist, being yet alive, was banished to the island of Patmos for his testimony of the divine word. Allusions in Clement of Alexandria and Origen point in the same direction. There is no mention in any writer of the first three centuries of any other time or place. Epiphanius (51, 12), obviously by mistake, says that John prophesied in the reign of Claudius. Two or three obscure and later authorities say that John was banished under Nero.

Unsupported by any historical evidence, some commentators have put forth the conjecture that the Revelation was written as early as the time of Nero. This is simply their inference from the style and contents of the book. But it is difficult to see why John's old age rendered it, as they allege, impossible for him to write his inspired message with force and vigor, or why his residence in Ephesus must have removed the Hebraistic peculiarities of his Greek. It is difficult to see in the passages Rev 1:7; Rev 2:9; Rev 3:9; Rev 6:12; Rev 6:16; Rev 11:1, anything which would lead necessarily to the conclusion that Jerusalem was in a prosperous condition, and that the predictions of its fall had not been fulfilled when those verses were written. A more weighty argument in favor of an early date might be urged from a modern interpretation of Rev 17:10, if that interpretation could be established. Galba is alleged to be the sixth king, the one that “is.” In Nero these interpreters see the beast that was wounded (Rev 13:3), the beast that was and is not, the eighth king (Rev 17:11). For some time after Nero's death the Roman populace believed that he was not dead, but had fled into the East, whence he would return and regain his throne; and these interpreters venture to suggest that the writer of the Revelation shared and meant to express the absurd popular delusion. Even the able and learned Reuss (Theol. Chret. i, 443), by way of supporting this  interpretation, advances his untenable claim to the first discovery of the name of Nero Caesar in the number of the beast, 666. The inconsistency of this interpretation with prophetic analogy, with the context of Revelation, and with the fact that the book is of divine origin, is pointed out by Hengstenberg at the end of his Commentary on ch. 13 and by Elliott, Horoe Apoc. 4:547.

It has been inferred from 1:2, 9, 10, that the Revelation was written in Ephesus, immediately after the apostle's return from Patmos. But the text is scarcely sufficient to support this conclusion. The style in which the messages to the seven churches are delivered rather suggests the notion that the book was written in Patmos. — SEE JOHN THE APOSTLE.

III. Language. — The thought first suggested by Harenberg, that the Revelation was written in Aramaic, has met with little or no reception. The silence of all ancient writers as to any Aramaic original is alone a sufficient answer to the suggestion. Lucke (Einleit. p. 441) has collected internal evidence to show that the original is the Greek of a Jewish Christian.

Lucke has also (p. 448-464) examined in minute detail, after the preceding labors of Donker-Curtius, Vogel, Winer, Ewald, Kolthoff, and Hitzig, the peculiarities of language which obviously distinguish the Revelation from every other book of the New Test. In subsequent sections (p. 680-747) he urges with great force the difference between the Revelation, on one side, and the fourth Gospel and first Epistle on the other, in respect of their style and composition and the mental character and attainments of the writer of each. Hengstenberg, in a dissertation appended to his Commentary, maintains that they are by one writer. That the anomalies and peculiarities of the Revelation have been greatly exaggerated by some critics is sufficiently shown by Hitzig's plausible and ingenious, though unsuccessful, attempt to prove the identity of style and diction in the Revelation and the Gospel of Mark. It may be admitted that the Revelation has many surprising grammatical peculiarities. But much of this is accounted for by the fact that it was probably written down, as it was seen, “in the spirit,” while the ideas, in all their novelty and vastness, filled the apostle's mind, and rendered him less capable of attending to forms of speech. His Gospel and Epistles, on the other hand, were composed equally under divine influence, but an influence of a gentler, more ordinary kind, with much care, after long deliberation, after frequent recollection  and recital of the facts, and deep pondering of the doctrinal truths which they involve.

Gebhardt has recently given the coincidences in language between the Gospel and the Revelation of John in a most convincing manner (Doctrine of the Apocalypse, etc.; transl. from the German, Edinb. 1878): “There are underlying identities of style which demonstrate identity of authorship. The subjects, of course, are stupendously different, and so require even of the same writer a stupendous difference of style. In the Apocalypse the pictorial imagination is perpetually on the utmost stretch; events and objects are crowding upon each other with intense rapidity. The scenery and pictorial material are generally borrowed from the Hebrew Scriptures, with immense improvements. More than all, the mind of the writer, steeped in Hebraism, is in a preternatural state. He who was in his youth a son of thunder has all the thunder of his youth preternaturally renewed within him. Rightly, the extraordinary conditions demand an extraordinary change of style, both in thought and language. Yet, underlying all this change, the natural style and mind unmistakably disclose themselves. He who cannot see this was never born a critic, and can never be reconstructed into one” (Meth. Quar. 1878. p. 739). SEE JOHN (Gospel and Epistles).

IV. Contents. — A full analysis of the book would involve much that is disputed as to its interpretation. We therefore here content ourselves with a general outline, in which the main visions are specified.

The first three verses contain the title of the book, the description of the writer, and the blessing pronounced on the readers, which possibly, like the last two verses of the fourth gospel, may be an addition by the hand of inspired survivors of the writer. John begins (Rev 1:4) with a salutation of the seven churches of Asia. This, coming before the announcement that he was in the spirit, looks like a dedication not merely of the first vision, but of all the book, to those churches. In the next five verses (Rev 1:5-9) he touches the key-note of the whole following book, the great fundamental ideas on which all our notions of the government of the world and the Church are built — the person of Christ; the redemption wrought by hiim; his second coming to judge mankind; the painful, hopeful discipline, of Christians in the midst of this present world; thoughts which may well be supposed to have been uppermost in the mind of the persecuted and exiled apostle even before the divine inspiration came on him.

a. The first vision (Rev 1:7 to Rev 3:22) shows the Son of Man with his injunction, or epistles to the seven churches. While the apostle is pondering those great truths and the critical condition of his Church which he bad left, a Divine Person resembling those seen by Ezekiel and Daniel, and identified by name and by description as Jesus, appears to John, and, with the discriminating authority of a lord and judge, reviews the state of those churches, pronounces his decision upon their several characters, and takes occasion from them to speak to all Christians who may deserve similar encouragement or similar condemnation. Each of these sentences, spoken by the Son of Man, is described as said by the Spirit. Hitherto the apostle has been speaking primarily, though not exclusively, to some of his own contemporaries concerning the present events and circumstances. Henceforth he ceases to iddress them particularly. His words are for the ear of the universal Church in all ages, and show the significance of things which are present in hope or fear, in sorrow or in joy, to Christians everywhere.

b. In the next vision (Revelation 4 :l-8:1), Patmos and the Divine Person whom he saw are gone. Only the trumpet voice is heard again calling him to a change of place. He is in the highest court of heaven, and sees God sitting on his throne.The seven-sealed book or roll is produced, and the slain lamb, the Redeemer, receives it amid the sound of universal adoration. As the seals are opened in order, the apostle sees

(1) a conqueror on a white horse;

(2) a red horse, betokening war;

(3) the black horse of famine;

(4) the pale horse of death;

(5) the eager souls of martyrs under the altar;

(6) an earthquake, with universal commotion and terror. After this there is a pause, the course of avenging angels is checked while 144,000, the children of Israel, servants of God, are sealed, and an innumerable multitude of the redeemed of all nations are seen worshipping God. Next

(7) the seventh seal is opened, and half an hour's silence in heaven ensues.

c. Then (Rev 8:2 to Rev 11:19) seven angels appear with trumpets, the prayers of saints are offered up, the earth is struck with fire from the altar, and the seven trumpets are sounded.

(1) The earth, and

(2) the sea, and

(3) the springs of water, and

(4) the heavenly bodies are successively smitten;

(5) a plague of locusts afflicts the men who are not sealed (the first woe);

(6) the third part of men are slain (the second woe), but the rest are impenitent. Then there is a pause: a mighty angel with a book appears and cries out; seven thunders sound, but their words are not recorded; the approaching completion of the mystery of God is announced; the angel bids the apostle eat the book, and measure the temple with its worshippers, and the outer court given up to the Gentiles; the two witnesses of God, their martyrdom, resurrection, ascension, are foretold. The approach of the third woe is announced, and

(7) the seventh trumpet is sounded, the reign of Christ is proclaimed, God has taken his great power, the time has come for judgment and for the destruction of the destroyers of the earth.

The three preceding visions are distinct from one another. Each of the last two, like the longer one which follows, has the appearance of a distinct prophecy, reaching from the prophet's time to the end of the world. The second half of the Revelation (chapters 12-22) comprises a series of visions which are connected by various links. It may be described generally as a prophecy of the assaults of the devil and his agents (i.e. the dragon, the ten-horned beast, the two-horned beast or false prophet, and the harlot) upon the Church, and their final destruction. It appears to begin with a reference to events anterior, not only to those which are predicted in the preceding chapter, but also to the time in which it was written. It seems hard to interpret the birth of the child as a prediction, and not as a retrospective allusion.

d. A woman (ch. 12) clothed with the sun is seen in heaven, and a great red dragon with seven crowned heads stands waiting to devour her offspring;  her child is caught up unto God, and the mother flees into the wilderness for 1260 days. The persecution of the woman and her seed on earth by the dragon is described as the consequence of a war in heaven in' which the dragon was overcome and cast out upon the earth.

The Revelator (ch. 13), standing on the sea-shore, sees a beast with seven heads, one wounded, with ten cxrowned horns, rising, from the water, the representative of the dragon. All the world wonders at and worships him, and he attacks the saints and prevails. He is followed by another two- horned beast rising out of the earth, who compels men to wear the mark of the beast, whose number is 666.

Next (ch. 14) the lamb is seen with 144,000 standing on Mount Zion, learning the song of praise of the heavenly host. Three angels fly forth calling men to worship God, proclaiming the fall of Babylon, denouncing the worshippers of the beast. A blessing is pronounced on the faithful dead, and the judgment of the world is described under the image of a harvest reaped by angels.

John (chapters 15 and 16) sees in heaven the saints who had overcome the beast, singing the song of Moses and the Lamb. Then seven angels come out of the heavenly temple having seven vials of wrath, which they pour out upon the earth, sea, rivers, sun. the seat of the beast, Euphrates, and the air, after which there are a great earthquake and a hail-storm.

One (chapters 17, 18) of the last seven angels carries John into the wilderness and shows him a harlot, Babylon, sitting on a scarlet beast with seven heads and ten horns. She is explained to be that great city, sitting upon seven mountains, reigning over the kings of the earth. Afterwards John sees a vision of the destruction of Babylon, portrayed as the burning- of a great city amid the lamentations of worldly men and the rejoicing of saints.

Afterwards (ch. 19) the worshippers in heaven are heard celebrating Babylon's fall and the approaching marriage-supper of the lamb. The Word of God is seen going forth to war at the head of the heavenly armies; the beast and his false prophet are taken and cast into the burning lake, and their worshippers are slain.

An angel (Revelation 20 - Rev 22:5) binds the dragon, i.e. the devil, for one thousand years, while the martyred saints who had not worshipped the beast reign with Christ. Then the devil is unloosed, gathers  a host against the camp of the saints, but is overcome by fire from heaven, and is cast into the burning lake with the beast and false prophet. John then witnesses the process of the final judgment, and sees and describes the new heaven and the new earth, and the new Jerusalem, with its people and their way of life.

In the last sixteen verses (Rev 22:6-21) the angel solemnly asseverates the truthfulness and importance of the foregoing sayings, pronounces a blessing on those who keep them exactly, gives warning of his speedy coming to judgment, and of the nearness of the time when these prophecies shall be fulfilled.

V. Schemes of Interpretation. — Few, if any, books of the Bible have been the sport of so great differences of view as this, arising largely from prejudice and the passion of the times. We can give here but a brief outline of these conflicting opinions, which prevail even to the present day.

1. Historical Review. — The interval between the apostolic age and that of Constantine has been called the Chiliastic period of Apocalyptic interpretation. The visions of John were chiefly regarded as representations of general Christian truths, scarcely yet embodied in actual facts, for the most part to be exemplified or fulfilled in the reign of Antichrist, the coming of Christ, the millennium, and the day of judgment. The fresh hopes of the early Christians, and the severe persecution they endured, taught them to live in those future events with intense satisfaction and cbmfort. They did not entertain the thought of building up a definite consecutive chronological scheme even of those symbols which some moderns regard as then already fulfilled; although from the beginning a connection between Rome and Antichrist was universally allowed, and parts of the Revelation were regarded as the filling up of the great outline sketched by Daniel and Paul. The only extant systematic interpretations in this period are the interpolated commentary on the Revelation by the martyr Victorinus, cir. A.D. 270 (Bibliotheca Patrum Maxima, 3, 414, and Migne, Patrologia Latina, 5, 318; the two editions should be compared), and the disputed treatise on Antichrist by Hippolytus (Migne, Patrologia Groeca, 10:726). But the prevalent views of that age are to be gathered also from a passage in Justin Martyr (Trypho, 80, 81), from the later books, especially the fifth, of Irenaeus, and from various scattered passages in Tertullian, Origen, and Methodins. The general anticipation of the last  days of the world in Lactantius, 7:14-25, has little direct reference to the Revelation.

Immediately after the triumph of Constantine, the Christians, emancipated from oppression and persecution, and dominant and prosperous in their turn, began to lose their vivid expectation of our Lord's speedy advent and their spiritual conception of his kingdom, and to look upon the temporal supremacy of Christianity as a fulfilment of the promised reign of Christ on earth. The Roman empire, become Christian, was regarded no longer as the object of prophetic denunciation, but as the scene of a millennial development. This view, however, was soon met by the figurative interpretation of the millennium as the reign of Christ in the hearts of all true believers. As the barbarous and heretical invaders: of the falling empire appeared, they were regarded: by the suffering. Christians as fulfilling the woes denounced in the Revelation. The beginning of a regular chronological interpretation is seen in Berengaud (assigned by some critics to the 9th century), who treated the Revelation as a history of the Church from the beginning of the world to its end. The original Commentary of the abbot Joachim is remarkable, not only for a further development of that method of interpretation, but for the scarcely disguised identification of Babylon with papal Rome, and of the second beast or Antichrist with some universal pontiff. The chief commentaries belonging to this period are that which is ascribed to Tichonius (cir. A.D. 390), printed in the works of Augustine; Primasius of Adrumetum in Africa (A.D. 550), in Migne, Patrologia Latina, l48, 1406; Andreas of Crete (cir. A.D. 650), Arethas of Cappadocia, and Ecumenius of Thessaly in the 10th century, whose commentaries were published together in Cramer's Catena (Oxon. (1840); the Explanatio Apoc. in the works of Bede (A.D. 735); the Expositio of Berengaud, printed in the works of Ambrose; the Commentary of Haymo (A.D. 853), first published at Cologne in 1531; a short treatise on the (seals by Anselm, bishop of Havilberg (A.D. 1145), printed in D'Achery's Spicilegium, i, 161; the Expositio of abbot Joachim of Calabria (A.D. 1200), printed at Venice in 1527.

In the dawn of the Reformation, the views to which the reputation of abbot Joachim gave currency were taken up by the harbingers of the impending change, as by Wycliffe and others; and they became the foundation of that great historical school of interpretation, which up to this time seems the most popular of all (For the later commentaries, see § 6 below.)

2. Approximate Classification of Modern Interpretations. — These are generally placed in three great divisions.

(1.) The Praeterist expositors, who are of opinion that the Revelation has been almost, or altogether, fulfilled in the time which has passed since it was written; that it refers principally to the triumph of Christianity over Judaism and paganism, signalized in the downfall of Jerusalem and of Rome. The most eminent expounders of this view are Alcasar, Grotius, Hammond, Bossuet, Calmet,Wettstein, Eichhorn, Hug, Herder, Ewald, Lucke, De Wette; Dusterdieck, Stuart, Lee, and Maurice. This is the favorite interpretation with the critics of Germany, one of whom goes so far as to state that the writer of the Revelation promised the fulfilment of his visions within the space of three years and a half from the time in which he wrote.

Against the Proeterist view it is urged that prophecies fulfilled ought to be rendered so perspicuous to the general sense of the Church as to supply an argument against infidelity; that the destruction of Jerusalem, having occurred twenty-five years previously, could not occupy a large space in a prophecy; that the supposed predictions of the downfall of Jerusalem and of Nero appear from the context to refer to one event, but are by this scheme separated, and, moreover, placed in a wrong order; that the measuring of the Temple and the altar, and the death of the two witnesses (ch. 11), cannot be explained consistently with the context.

(2.) The Futurist expositors, whose views show a strong reaction against some extravagances of the preceding school. They believe that the whole book, excepting perhaps the first three chapters, refers principally, if not exclusively, to events which are yet to come. This view, which is asserted to be merely a revival of the primitive interpretation, has been advocated in recent times by Dr. J. H. Todd, Dr. S. R. Maitland, B. Newton, C. Maitland, I. Williams, De Burgh, and others.

Against the Futurist it is argued that it is not consistent with the repeated declarations of a speedy fulfilment at the beginning and end of the book itself (see Rev 1:3; Rev 22:6-7; Rev 22:12; Rev 22:20). Christians, to whom it was originally addressed, would have derived no special comfort from it had its fulfilment been altogether deferred for so many centuries. The rigidly literal interpretation of Babylon, the Jewish tribes, and other symbols which generally forms a part of Futurist schemes, presents peculiar difficulties.

(3.) The Historical or Continuous expositors, in whose opinion tihe Revelation is a progressive history of the fortunes of the Church from the first century to the end of time. The chief supporters of this most interesting interpretation are Mede, Sir L. Newton, Vitringa, Bengel, Woodhouse, Faber, E. B. Elliott, Wordsworth, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, and others. The recent Commentary of dean Alford belongs mainly to this school.

Against the historical scheme it is urged that its advocates differ very widely among themselves; that they assume without any authority that the 1260 days are son many years; that several of its applications — e.g. of the symbol of the ten-horned beast to the popes, and the sixth seal to the conversion of Constantine are inconsistent with the context; that attempts by some of this school to predict future events by the help of Revelation have ended in repeated failures.

Two methods have been proposed by which the student of the Revelation may escape the incongruities and fallacies of the different interpretations, while he may derive edification from whatever truth they contain. It has been suggested that the book may be regarded as a prophetic poem, dealing in general and inexact descriptions, much of which may be set down as poetic imagery — mere embellishment. But such a view would be difficult to reconcile with the belief that the book is an inspired prophecy. A better suggestion is made, or rather is revived, by Dr. Arnold in his sermons On the Interpretation of Prophecy: that we should bear in mind that predictions have a lower historical sense, as well as a higher spiritual sense; that there maybe one, or more than one, typical, imperfect, historical fulfilment, of a prophecy, in each of which the higher spiritual fulfilment is shadowed forth more or less distinctly. SEE DOUBLE SENSE

.

In choosing among the various schemes of interpretation, we are inclined to adopt that which regards the first series of prophetical visions proper (ch. 4-12) as indicating the collapse (in part at the time already transpired) of the nearest persecuting power, namely, Judaism; the second series (ch. 13-19) as denoting the eventual downfall of the succeeding persecutor, i.e. Rome (first in its pagan and next in its papal form); and the third series (20:1-10) as briefly outlining the final overthrow of a last persecutor, some yet future power or influence (figuratively represented by a name borrowed from Ezekiel). These three opponents of Christianity are set forth as successive developments of Antichrist, and the symbols employed are  cumulative and reiterative rather than historical and consecutive. For special explanations, SEE ANTICHRIST; SEE MAGOG; SEE NUMBER OF THE BEAST, ETC.

VI. Commnentaries. — Most of the above questions are treated in the regular commentaries and introductions, and in numerous monographs, published separately, or in periodicals. The following are the exegetical helps solely on the whole book; to the most important we prefix an asterisk: St. Anthony, Expositio (in Opp. p. 645); Victorinus, Scholia (in Bibl.Max. Patr. 3, 414; Galland. Bibl. Patr. 4:49; also Par. 1549, 1609, 8vo); Berengaud, Expositio (in Ambrosii Opp. ii, 499); Trichonius, Expositio (in Augustini Opp. 16:617); Primasius, Commentarius (in Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. x); Andreas Caesar, Commentarius (ibid. v, 590); Arethas, Explanationes (ibid. 9:741; also in (Ecumenii Opp. vol. ii); Bede, Explanatio (in Opp. v, 701; also in Works, i, 189; 12:337); Ambrosius Autpert. In Apocal. (in Bibl. Max. Patr. 13:403); Alcuin, Commentarii (in Mai, Script. Vet. 9:257); Bruno, in Apocal. (in Opp. vol. i); Hervaeus, Enarrationes (in Anselmi Opp. ed. Picard, 1612); Rupert, In Apocal. (in Opp. ii, 450); Anon. Glossa (Lips. 1481, 4to); Albert, Comment. (Basil. 1506, 4to; also in Opp. vol. xi); Joann. Viterb. Glossa (Colon. 1507, 8vo); \*Joachim, In Apocal. (Ven. 1519, 527, 4to); Huss, Commentarius (ed. Luther, Vitemb. 1528, 8vo); Lambert, Exegesis (Marp. 1528; Basil. 1539, 8vo); Aimo, Commentarius (Colon. 1529,1531,1534; Par. 1540, 8vo); Melch. Hoffmann, Auslegung (Argent. 1530, 8vo); Bullinger, Conciones (Basil. 1535,1570, and often, fol.; also in English, Lond. 1573, 4to); Thompas of Wales, Expositio (Flor. 1549, 8vo; also in Aquinas, Conmment. Paris, 1641); Bibliander, Commentarius (Basil. 1549, 8vo); Meyer, Commentarius (Tigur. 1554, 1603, fol.); Fulke, Prcelectiones (Lond. 1557, 1573, 4to); Conrad, Commentarius (Basil. 1560,1574, 8vo); Borrhaus, Conzmnentarius, (ibid. 1561; Tigsur. 1600, fol.); Serranus, Commentaria (Complut. 1563, fol.); Chytraeus, Comnenztarius (Vitemb. 1563, 1571, 1575, 8v-; Rost. 1581, 4to); Artopoeus, Explicatio (Basil. 1563, 8vo); Selnecker, Erklirung (Jen. 1567, 1568, 1608, 4to); (Tyfford, Sermons (Lond. 1573, 4to); Marloratus, Exposition (from the Latin, ibid. 1574, 4to); Brocardus, Interpretatio (L. B. 1580, 1590, 8vo; also in English, Lond. 1583, 4to); De Fermo [Rom. Cath.], Enarratio (from the Italian, Antw. 1581, 8vo); De Melo [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Pint. 1584, fol.) Foxe, Proelectiones (Lond. 1587, fol.; Geneva, 1596,1618, 8vo); Bulenger [Rom. Cath. l, Ephrasis (Paris; 15.89, 1597, 8vo); Junius,  Illustratio (Heidelb. 1591; Basil. 1599, 8vo; and in Opp. vol. i, 1694; also in French, Basle, 1592, 1598.; in English, Lond. -1592, 1596, 4to; 1616, 8vo); De Ribera [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Salam. 1591, fol.; Lugd. 1593, 4to; Antw. 1603: Duoc. 1623, 8vpo); Gallus, Clavis (Antw. 1592, 8vo); \*Napier, Interpretation (Edinb. 1593, 1611, 1645. 4to; in French, Rupp. 1603,1607; Geneva, 1643, 4to; in Dutch, Magdeb. 1618; in German, Leips. 1611; Frankf. 1615, 627, 8vo; Ger. 1661,4to); Funcke, Erklarung (Fr. a. M. 1596, 4to); Du Jon, Exposition (from the French, Lond. 1596, 4to); Foorthe, Revelatio (ibid. 1597, 4to); Winckelmann. Commentarius (Francf. 1600, 1609; Lub. 1615, 8vo); De la Perie, Paraphrase (French, Geneva, 1600, 1651, 4to); Eglin, Epilysis (Tigur. 1601, fol.; Hanov. 1611, 4to); Viegas [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Ebor. 1601, fol,; Lugd. 1602, 1606; Ven. 1602, 1608; Colon. 1603, 1607-; Par. 1606, 1615, 1630, 4to); Richter, Die Offenbarung (Leips. 1602, 4to); Dent, Exposition (Lond. 1603, 1607, 4to; 1623, 8vo; 1644, 4to); Pererius, Disputationes (Lugd. 1606; Ven. 1607, 4to); Brightmann. Scholia (Francf. 1609, 4to; 1618; Heidelb. 1612, 8vo; also in English, Amst. 1611, 1615, 4to; Lond. 1616; Leyd. 1644, 8vo; and in Works, Lond. 1644, 4to); Taffin, Exposition (French, Fless. 1609; Middelb. 1614, 8vo); Hoe. Commentarii (Lips. 1609-11, 2 vols. 4to; 1671, fol.); Broughton, Revelation (Lond. 1610,4to; also in Works, p. 408); Becan, Commentarius (Mogunt. 1612, 12mo): Lucius, Notoe (Hanov. 1613, 8vo); Forbes. Commentary (Lond. 1613, fol.; also in Latin, Amst. 1646, 4to); CottiBre, Expositio (Salm. 1614; Sedan, 1625, 4to); Alcassar. [Rom. Cath.], Investigatio (Antw. 1614; Lugd. 1618, fol.); also 5 additional Libri (Lugd. 1632, fol.); Graser, Commentarius (Tigur. 1614, 4to); Cramer, Erklarung (Stet. 1618, 4to); Pareus, Commentarius (Heidelberg, 1618, 1622, 4to; also in English, Amst. 1644, fol.); Lautensack, Erklarungq (Frankf. 1619, 4to); Cowper, Commentary (Lond. 1619, 4to; and in Works, p. 811; also in Dutch. Amst. 1656, fol.; and in German, Leips. 1671, 8vo); Montacut, Paraphrasis (Lond. 1619, fol.); Cluver, Morgenlicht (Gosl. 1620, 8vo; in Latin, Lub. 1647, fol.); Wolter, Auslegung (Rost. 1625, 1629, 4to); De Dieu, Animadversiones (L. B. 1627, 4to); \*Mede, Clavis (Cambr. 1627, 1629, 1649, 4to; also in English, ibid. 1632; Lond. 1643, 1650, 4to; 1831, 12mo; 1833, 8vo; both with additional notes in: Works, vol. ii); Baaz, Commentary (in Swedish, Calmar, 1629, 8vo); Anon. Explication (French, Leyd. 1633, 4to); Le Bux, Paraphrase (French, Genev. 1641, 4to); Gerhard, Adnotationes (Jen. 1643, 1645; Lips. 1712, 4to); Gravins, Tabuloe (L. B. 1647, fol.); also Ausleguy (Hamb. 1657, 4to); Holland,  Exposition (Lond. 1650, 4to); Hartlib, Revelation (from the Dutch, ibid. 1651, 8vo); Ferrarius [Rom. Catbh.], Commentaria (Mediol. 1654, 3 vols. fol.); De la Haye [Rom. Cath.];Commentarii (Par. 1654 sq., 2 vols. fol.); Guild, Explanation (Aberdeen, 1656, 12mo); Fromond [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Lov. 1657, 4to; also [with other books] Par. 1670, fol.); Durham, Commentary (Glasg. 1658, fol.; 1680, 1764, 1788, 4to; Edinb. 1680, 4to; Amst. 1660, 4to; Falkirk, 1799, 2 vols. 8vo): Amyrald, Introduction (French, Hag, 1658, 4to); Bordes, Elucidatio (Par. 1658, 2 vols. fol.); also Explicatio (ibid. 1659, fol.); Kromayer [J.], Commentarius (Lips. 1662,1674, 4to); DeSylveira [Rom. Cath.], Commentaria (Lugd. 1663, 1669, 1700, 2 vols. fol.); Diest [A.], Analysis (Arnh. 1663, 4to); More, Apocalypsis (Lond. 1666,1680, 4to); and Ratio (ibid. 1666, 4to; in English, ibid. 1680, 4to; both in his Opp. ibid. 1675, fol.); Brenius, Verklaaringe [includ. Joh.] (Amst. 1666, 4to); Pegan, Erklarung (Frankf. 1670, 1676, 12mo); Schindler, Delineation (German, Brunlsen. 1670, 4to); Grellot, Prodromus (L. B. 1675, 4to); Kircher [Rom. Cath.], Explicatio (Colon. 1676. 4to); Matthew Hoffman, Chronotaxis (Jen. 1678, 1687, 4to); Heunisch, Synopsis (ibid. 1678, 4to); also Hauptschli'ssel (Schleus. 1684, 4to; Leips. 1697, 8vo; and in Latin, Rottenb. 1684; Lips. 1698, 4to); Muller, Elucidatio (Hard. 1684, 2 vols. 4to); Hierve [Rom. Cath.], Explanatio (Lugd. 1684, 4to); Heidegger, Diatribe (L. B. 1687, 2 vols. 4to); Van Wesel, Verklaaring (Ench. 1688, 4to); Bossuet [Rom. Cath.], Explication (French, Par. 1689, 8vo); Cressener, Explication (Lond. 1689, 4to); also Demonstration (ibid. 1690, 4to); also Paraplrase (ibid. 1693, 4to); Marck, Commentarius (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1689, 1699, 4to); La Cherlardie [Rom. Cath.], Explication (French, Par. 1692, 8vo; 1702, 1708, 4to); Petersenias, Anleitung (Leips. 1696, fol.); Brunsmann, Phosphorus (Hafn. 1696, 1699, 8vo); Gebhard, Isagoge (Gryphsw. 1696, 1697, 4to); Durer, Erkldirung (Hanov. 1701, 12mo); Biermann, Clavis (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1702, 4to); Vitringa, Anacrisis (Franeck. 1705; Amst. 1719; Wessenf. 1721,4to); Whiston, Essay (Cambr. 1706, 1744, 4to); M. Kromayer, Erkldrung (Leips. 1708, 4to); Scliweizer, Erklarung (Ulm, 1709, 8vo); Gronewegen, Auslegung (from the Dutch, Frankf. 1711, 4to); Kerckerdere [Rom. Cath.], Systemma (Lov. 1711, 12mo); Brussken, Schlissel (Offenb. 1713, 4to); Mandcit [Rom. Cath.], Analyse (Par. 1714, 8vo); Weple, Paraphrase (Lond. 1715,.4to); Boekholt, Verklaaring (Had. 1717, 4to); Driessen, Meditationes (Fr.-a.-Rh. 1717, 4to); Wells, Help (Oxf. 1718, 8vo); \*Daubuz, Commentary (Lond. 1720, fol.); Abbadie, Ouverture (Amst. 1721, 2 vols. 12mo; also in Dutch, by Monbach, ibid. 1726, 2 vols.  4to); Bomble, Chronotaxis (ibid. 1721, 4to); Reinbeck, Errtferung (Berl. 1722, 8vo); Scheuermann, Erklarung (Lipstad. 1722, 4to); Andola, Clavis [includ. other passages] (Leon. 1726, 4to); De Dioneus, Essai (Amst. 1729, 4to); Lange [J.], Eklarung (Hal. 1730, fol.); Dimpel, Einleitung (Leips. 1730, 8vo); Lancaster, Commentary (Lond. 1730, 4to); Robertson, Exposition (Edinb. 1730, fol.); Losecken, Erklarung (Hal. 1731, 4to); Sir I. Newton, Observations (Lond. 1733, 4to; also in Latin, Amst. 1737, 4to); Pyle, Paraphraase (Lond. 1735, 1795, 8vo); Van den Hornet, Dissertationes (L. B. 1736, 4to); Lowman, Notes (Lond. 1737, 1745, 4to; 1791, 1807, 8vo; and since); \*Bengel, Erkldrung (Stuttg. 1740, 1746, 8vo; new ed. ibid. 1834, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1757, 8vo); Reinhard, Chronotaxis (Vinar. 1741, 4to); Cremer, Commentarius (Zutph. 1757, 4to); Harenberg, Erklarung (Brunsw. 1759, 4to); Fehr. Anleitung (Altenb. 1761, 4to); Taylor, Essay (Lond. 1763, 8vo); Swedenborg, Revelatio (Amst. 1766, 4to; in English, Lond. 1832,2 vols. 8vo); Gill, Exposition (ibid. 1776, 4to); Murray EJ.], Sermons (ibid. 1778,8vo); Reader, Remarks (ibid. 1778, 8vo); Herrnschneider, Tentamen (Argent. 1786, 4to); Mrs. Bowdler, Observations (Bath, 1787,1800,8vo); Pfeiffer, Anleitung (Stuttg. 1788, 8vo); Purves, Observations (Edinb. 1789-93, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Eichhorn, Commentarius (Gott. 1791, 2 vols. 8vo); Johnstone, Commentary (Edinb. 1794, 1807, 2 vols. 8vo); Semler, Eklarung (Leips. 1794, 1811, 8vo); Hagen, Anmerk. (Ell. 1796, 8 ,o); Gilbert, Reflections (French, Guernsey, 1796, 8vo); Sniodgrass, Commentary (Paislev, 1799, 8vo); Jung. Erklarung (Niirnb. 1799, 1822, 8vo); Mitchell, Exposition (Lond. 1800, 8-v); J. Galloway, Commentaries (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Whitaker, Commentary (ibid. 1802, 8vo); Woodhotlse, Notes (ibid. 1805, 8vo); also Annotations (ibid. 1828, 8vo); Thruston, Researches (Coventry, 1812, 2 vols. 8vo); Fuller, Discourses (Lond. 1815, 8vo; also in Works, p. 436); Holmes, Elucidation (ibid. 1815, 8vo); also Fulfilment (ibid. 1819, 8vo); \*Heinrichs. Annotatio (Gott. 1818, 1821,2 vols. 8vo; also in Koppe's New Test.); Culbertson, Lectures (Edinb. 1818, 8vo); Girdlestone [C.], Observations (Oxf. 1820, 8vo); Herder, Commentary (from the German, Lond. 1821, 12mo); Gauntlett, Exposition (ibid. 1821, and later, 8vo); Laurmann. Proelectio (Groning. 1822, 8vo); Tilloch, Dissertations (Lond. 1823, 8vo); Park, Exposition (ibid. 1823, 8vo); also Explanation (ibid. 1832, 12mo); Murray [R.], Introduction (Dubl. 1826, 8vo); Holzhauser, Erklarung (Leips. 1827, 8vo); Croly, Interpretation (Lond. 1827, 4to; 1838,8vo); \*Ewald, Commentarius (Lips. 1828, 8vo; in German, Gott. 1862, 8vo); Matthaii: Erklarung (Gott. 1828, 8vo); Scholz, Erilduternung  (Frankf. 1828, 8vo): Allwood, Key (Lond. 89, 2 vo8o) \*orN.Y. 1892 s8vo; \*Lord,.. 1831, 8vo); Irving, Lectures (Lo.nd. 1831, 4 vols.12mo); Losecke, Erklarung (Hal. 1831, 4to); \*Lucke, Einleitung (Bonn. 1832, 1852, 8vo); Basset, Explication (French, Par. 1832-33, 3 vols. 8vo); Cooper, Commentary (Lond. 1833, 8vo); Anon. Unveiling (ibid. 1833, 12mo); Roe, Arrangement (Dubl. 1834, 4to); Ashe, Notes (ibid. 1834, 8vo); Boost, Erkldrung (Darmst. 1835,8vo); Hutchinson, Guide (Lond. 1835, 8vo); Pearson, Consideration (Camb. 1835, 8vo); Jones, Interpreter (Lond. 1836,12mo); Vivien, Explication (French, Par. 1837, 12mo); Sanderson, Essays (Lond. 1838, 12mo); Lovett, Eaplanation (ibid. 1838, 8vo); Anon. Studies (ibid. 1838, 12mo); Franz, Betrachtungen (Quedlinb. 1838-40, 3 vols. 8vo); Tinius, Erklarung (Leips. 1839, 8vo); \*Tullig, Erkldrung (ibid. 1840, 2 vols. 8vo); Habershon, Exposition .(Lond. 1841,8vo; 1842,1844,2 vols.); Paulus [H.E. G.], Philosophie (Berl. 1843, 8vo); Govett, Revelation (Lond. 1843,12mo); \*Stuart, Commentary (Andover and Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo); Clifford, Exposition (Lond. 1845, 4 vols. 8vo); Storey, Notes (ibid. 1845,12mo); Von Brandt, Erklarung (Leips. 1845, 1847, 8vo); De Burgh, Exposition (Dubl. 1845, and later, 12mo); Galloway [W. B..], Exposition (Lond. 1846. 2 vols. 8vo); Newton [B. W.], Thoughts (ibid. 1846,1853, 8vo); Hooper [J.], Explanation (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Girdlestone [H.], Notes (ibid. 1847, 8vo); Rogers, Lectures (ibid. 1847, 12mo); \*De Wette, ‘Erklarung (Leips. 1848, in his Exeg. Handb.); Hoare, HIarmony (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Tregelles, Translation (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Wordsworth, Lectures (ibid. 1848, 8vo), also Notes (ibid. 1849, 12mo); also Harmony (ibid. 1851, 4to); Kelly, Interpretation (ibid. 1849-51, 2 vols. 12mo); Cumming, Lectures (ibid. 1849-52, 3 vols. 12mo); also Readings (ibid. 1853, 12mo); Graber, Erkldrung (Heidelb. 1850, 8vo); Frere, Notes (Lond. 1850, 8vo); \*Elliott, 17orce Apoc. (English, ibid. 1851, 4 vols. 8vo), Goodwin, Exposition (ibid. 1851, 8vo); Wickes, Exposition (ibid. 1851,8vo); James, Lectures (ibid. 1851,12mo); \*Hengstenberg, Eriauterung (Berl.:,1852, 2 vols. 8vo; in English, Edinb. and N. Y. 1851-53, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Jenour, Rationale Apoc. (English, Lond. 1852, 2 vols. 8vo); Barnes, Notes (N. Y. 1852, 12mo); Williams, Notes (Lond. 1852, 8vo); \*Ebrard, Er'kldrunq (Konigsb. 1853, 8vo, in Olshalusen's Conmmentar); Scott, Interpretation (Lond. 1853, 8vo); \*Auberlen, Quenbaruung, etc. (Basel, 1854,1857, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1856,8vo); Graham, Readings (Lond. 1854, 12mo); Sutcliffe, Lecturies (ibid. 1854. 8vo); Stern [Rom. Cath.], Comnmentar (Schaffh. 1854. 8vo); Wichtler, Predigten (Essen. 1854-55, 2 vols. 8vo); Grieves, Analysis  (Lond. 1855, 8vo); Desprez, Fuifilment (ibid. 1855, 8vo); Pollok, Lectures (ibid. 185558, 2 vols. 12mo); Godwin. Translation (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Skeen, Lectures (ibid. 1857, 8vo); C. Paulus, Blicke (Stuttg. 1857,12mo); Winslow, Examination (Lond. 1857, 12mo); Huntingford, Interpretation (ibid. 1858, 12mo; 1871, 1873, 8vo); Porter, Lectures (Edinb. 1858, 8vo); \*Diisterdieck, Handbuch (Gott. 1859, 8vo, in Meyer's Commentar); Monk, Interpretation (Lond. 1859, 12mo); Galton, Lectures (ibid. 1859, 2 vols. 12mo); Brandt, Anleitung (Amst. 1860, 8vo); Kelly [W.], Lectures (Lond. 1860,1871, 8vo); Curzon, Key (ibid. 1860, 12mo); Benno [Rom. Cath. ], Er-klarung (Munich, 1860, 8vo); Maurice, Lectures (Cambr. 1861, 8vo); Hooper [F. B.], Exposition (Lond. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Harper, Exposition (ibid. 1861, 2 vols. 8vo); Smith, Exposition (ibid. 1861, 8vo); Luthardt, Erklcrung (Leips. 1861, 8vo); Williams, Notes (Lond. 1861, 1873, 8vo); \*Volkmar, Commentar (Ziir. 1862, 8vo); Sabel, Erklarun;g (Heidelb. 1862, 8vo); Tucker, Explanation (Lond. 1862,12mo); Kemmler, Erdluterung (Tiib. 1863, 8vo); Vaughan, Lectures (Lonl. 1863, 2 vols. 8vo); Bleek, Vorlesungen (Berl. 1863, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1875, 8vo); Jessin, Erkldrung (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Blech; Uebersicht (Dantz. 1864, 8vo); Pacificus, Erlauterung (Leips. 1864, 8vo); Lammert, Auslegung (Stuttg. 1864, 8vo); Clay, Exposition (Lond. 1864, 8vo); Richter, Auslegung (Leips. 1864, 8vo). Hirschfeld, Erluterung (Saarb. 1865, 8vo); Diedrich, Erlauterung (Neu Rupp.1865, 8vo); W. .A. B.,: Lectures (Dubl. 1865, 8vo); De Rougemont, Explication (French, Neucliatel, 1866,'8-o)'; Boihm'er, Versuch (Bres. 1866, 8vo); Garrett, Canmeifa-y j (Lond./1866, 8vo); Harvey, -Exposition:(ibid. 1867, 8vo); Riemann, Erlauterung (Halle, 1868, 8vo); Armstrong, Illustration (Lond. 1868, 8vo); Tomlin, Interpretation (ibid. 1868, 8vo); Snell, Notes-(2d ed. ibid. 1869, 8vo); Seirs, Lectures (ibid. 1869, 8vo); Stone, Explanation (ibid. 1869, 12mo); Vaughan, Lectures' (3d ed. ibid. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo); Kienlen, Commentaire (Paris, 1870. 8vo): Anon. Commentary (Lond. 1870, 8vo); \*Cowles,'Notes (N.Y. 1871, 12mo); Anon. Exposition (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Pond, Opening (Edinb. 1871, 8vo); Glasgow, Exposition (ibid. 1872, 8vo); Gartner, Erklarung (Stuttg. 1872, 8vo); Harms, Erlduterung (Leips. 1873, 8vo); \*Kliefoth, Erklarung (ibid. 1874,3 vols. 8vo); Lincoln, Lectures (Lond. 1874,12mo); Filler, Erklarung (Nordl. 1874, 8vo); Henley, Musings (Lond. 1874, 12mo); Robinson, Expositions (ibid. 1876, 8vo); Baylee, Commentary (ibid. 1877, 8vo); Wolfe, Exposition (ibid. 1877, 8vo). SEE NEW TESTAMENT.  The following are exclusively on the epistles to the seven churches: Laurentius, Expositio (Amst. 1649, 4to); Ramirez, Commentarius (Lugd. 1652, fol.); More, Exposition (Lond. 1669, 12mo); Smith, Epistola [topographical] (ibid. 1678, 8vo); Johnson, Laodicean Age (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Allen, — Improvement (ibid. 1733, 8vo); Wadsworth, Lectures (Idle, 1825, 12mo); Theime, Commentatio (L. B. 1827, 4to); Wichelhaus, Predigten (Elberf. 1827, 8vo); \*Arundel, Visit [descriptive] (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Milner [J.]. Sermons (ibid. 1830, 8vo); Milner [T.], History (ibid. 1832,8vo); Withy, Lectures (ibid. 1833, 8vo); Hyatt, Sermonois (ibid. 1834, 12mo); Muir, Sermons (ibid. 1835,12mo); \*M'Farlane, Seven Churches [descriptive, with etchings] (ibid. 1836, 4to); Blunt, Exposition (ibid. 1838,12mo); Carr, Sermons (ibid. 1840, 12mo); Wallace, Con C- rdition (ibid. 1842, 8vo); West, Discourses (ibid. 1846,12mo); Thompson, Sermons (ibid. 1848. 8vo); Stathan, Lectures (ibid. 1848, 12mo); Heubner, Predigten (Berl. 1850, 8vo); Tom, Die sieben Sendschr. (Bayr. i850, 8vo); Cumming, Lectures (Lond. 1850, 12mo); Parker, Interpretation (ibid. 1852,12mo); Chamberlain, Seven Ages (ibid. 1856, 8vo); Biber, Sermons (ibid. 1857, 12mo); \*Trench, Commentary (ibid. and N. Y. 1861, 12mo); \*Svobode, Seven Churches [with 20 photographs, and Notes by Tristram] (Lond. 1869, 4to); \*Plumptre, Exposition (ibid. 1877, 12mo); Anon. Symbolic Parables (Edinb. 1877,12mo). SEE ASIA MINOR.

## Revelations, Spurious[[@Headword:Revelations, Spurious]]

             The Apocalyptic character, which is occupied in describing the future splendor of the Messianic kingdom and its historical relations, presents itself for the first time in the book of Daniel. which is thus characteristically distinguished from the former prophetical books. In the only prophetical book of the New Test., the Apocalypse of John, this idea is fully developed, and the several apocryphal revelations are mere imiitations, more or less happy, of these two canonical books, which furnished ideas to a numerous class of writers in the first ages of the Christian Church. We here consider those especially which profess to be of a prophetic character. The principal spurious revelations extant have been published by Fabricius, in his Cod. Pseudep. V. T., and Cod. Apoc. N.T., and their character has been still more critically examined in recent times by archbishop Laurence (who has added to their number), by Nitzsch, Bleek, and others, and especially by Dr. Liicke, in his Einleit. in die Offenbarung Johazn. und die gesammte apocalyptische iteratur. , (See the preceding article.) Tischendorf, in his Apocalypses Apocryphic (Lips. 1866, 8vo), has  published the following: “Apocalypsis Mosis” (Gr. ed. princeps); “Apocalypsis Esdrae” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Apocalypsis Pauli” (Gr. ed. pr.); Apocalypsis Johannis” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Johannis Liber de Dominatione Mariae” (Gr. ed. pr.); “Translatio Marise” (Lat. ed. pr.); another “Translatio Mariae” (Lat.); “Ad ditamenta ad Acta Apost. Apocrypha;” “Ad Acta Andreae et -Matthise, ex codice unciali;” “Ad Acta Philippi, ex codd. Parisiensi et Barocciano;” “Ad Acta Thomae, e codd. Moncrensi et Bodleiano;” “Acta Petri et Andreae, in fine mutila, e cod. Barocciano.” In the ac'count below we have brought together the most im portant of these works. SEE APOCRYPHA.

I. Pseudo-Revelations Purportzng to Refer to Hebrew Characters. — These are principally the following:

1, 2. The Apocalypse of Adam and that of Abraham are cited by Epiphanius (Hoeres. 31, 8) as Gnostic productions. They are now wholly lost.

3. The Book of Enoch is one of the most curious of the spurious revelations, resembling in its outward form both the book of Daniel and the Apocalypse; but it is uncertain whether this latter work or the book of Enoch was first written. SEE ENOCH, BOOK OF.

4. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is a similar apocryphal production. SEE TESTAMENT OF THE TWELVE PATRIARCHS.

5. The Apocalypse of Moses, mentioned by Syncellus (Chronog.) and Cedrenus (Comp. Hist.), fragments of which have been published by Fabricius (ut sup.), is conjectured by Grotius to have been a forgery of one of the ancient Christians.

In addition to this and the above work published by Tischendorf, there has lately been discovered an “Ascension” or “Assumption (Α᾿νάληψις) of Moses,” in the library at Milan, which has been published by Ceriani (Monumenta Sacra [Mediol. 1861]); Hilgenfeld (N.T. extra Canonemr [Lips. 1866]); Volkmar (Handb. z. d. Apokr. [Leips. 1867, vol. iii]); and Merx (Archiv f. wiss. Erforsch. etc. [ibid. 1867, vol. ii]). It represents an interview between Moses and Joshua just before the death of the former, and professes to depict the future history of Israel. It seems to have been written bv a Jew of the early Christian times (Ewald, Jahrbucher, 1852, 1853). SEE MOSES.  These are different, works from the so-called “Little Genesis.” SEE JUBILEES, BOOK OF

6. The Ascension and Vision of Isaiah (Α᾿ναβατικὸν καὶ ῞Ορασις ῾Ησαϊvου), although for a long time lost to the world, was a work well known to the ancients, as is indicated by the allusions of Justin Martyr, Origen, Tertullian, and Epiphanius. The first of these writers (Dial. c. Tryph. ed. ri, p. 49) refers to the account therein contained of the death of Isaiah, who “was sawn asunder with a wooden saw — a fact,” he adds, “which was removed by the Jews from the sacred text.” Tertullian, also (De Patientia), among other examples from Scripture, refers to the same event; and in the next (the 3d) century Origen (Epist. ad African.), after stating that the Jews were accustomed to remove many things from the knowledge of the people which they nevertheless preserved in apocryphal or secret writings, adduces as an example the death of Isaiah, “who was sawn asunder, as stated in a certain apocryphal writing, which the Jews perhaps corrupted in order to throw discredit on the whole.” In his Comm. on Matthew he refers to the same events, observing that if this apocryphal work is not of sufficient authority to establish the account of the prophet's martyrdom, it should be believed upon the testimony borne to that work by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb 11:37); in the same manner as the account of the death of Zechariah should be credited upon the testimony borne by our Saviour to a writing not found in the common and published books (κοίνοις καὶ δεδημευμένοις βιβλίοις), but probably in an apocryphal work. Origen cites a passage from the apocryphal account of the martyrdom of Isaiah in one of his Homiilies (ed. De la Rue, 3:108). The Apostolical Constitutions also refer to the apocryphal books of Moses, Enoch, Adam, and Isaiah as writings of some antiquity.

The first writer, however, who mentions the Ascension of Isaiah by name is Epiphanius, in the 4th century, who observes (Hoeres. 40.) that the apocryphal Ascension of Isaiah was adduced by the Archonites in support of their opinions respecting the seven heavens and their archons, or ruling angels, as well as by the Egyptian Hieracas and his followers in confirmation of their heretical opinions respecting the Holy Spirit; at the same time citing the passage from the Α᾿ναβατικόν to which they refer (Ascens. of Isaiah 9:27, 32-36; 11:32,33). Jerome also (in Esai. lxiv, 4) expressly names the work, asserting it to be an apocryphal production originating in a passage in the New Test. (1Co 2:9). St.  Ambrose (Opp. i, 1124) cites a passage contained in it, but only as a traditionary report, “plerique ferunt” (Ascens. of Isa 5:4-8); and the author of the Imperfect Work on Matthew, a work of the 5th century erroneously attributed to St. Chrysostom (Chrysost. Opp. hom. 1), evidently cites a passage from the same work (Ascens. of Isa 1:1, etc.). After this period all trace of the book is lost until the 11th century, when Euthymius Zigabenus informs us that the Messalian heretics made use of that “abominable pseudepigraphal work the Vision of Isaiah.” It was also used (most probably in a Latin version) by the Cathari in the West (P. Moneta, Adv. Catharos, ed. Rich. p. 218). The Vision of Isaiah is also named in a catalogue of canonical and apocryphal books in a Paris MS. (No. 1789), after the Qucest. et Resp. of Anastasius (Cotelerius, PP. Apost. i, 197, 349). Sixtus of Sienna (Bibl. Sanct. 1566) states that the Vision of Isaiah, as distinct from the Anavasis (as he calls it), had been printed at Venice. Referring to this last publication, the late archbishop Laurence observes that he had hoped to find in some bibliographical work a further notice of it, but that he had searched in, vain; concluding, at the same time, that it must have been a publication extracted from the Ascension of Isaiah or a Latin translation of the Vision, as the title of it given by Sixtus was “Visio Admirabilis Esaise Prophetse in Raptu Mantis, qun e Divinae Trinitatis Arcana et Lapsi Generis Humani Redemptionem continet.” Dr. Laurence observes also that the mode of Isaiah's death is further in accordance with a Jewish tradition recorded in the Talmud (Yebammoth, iv); and he supposes that Mohammed may have founded his own journey through seven different heavens on this same apocryphal work. He shows, at the same time, by an extract from the Raboth, that the same idea of the precise number of seven heavens accorded with the Jewish creed.

There appeared now to be little hopes of recovering the lost Ascension of Isaiah, when Dr. Laurence (then regius professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford) had the good fortune to purchase from a bookseller in Drury Lane an Ethiopic MS. containing the identical book, together with the canonical book of Isaiah and the fourth (called in the Ethiopic the first) book of Esdras. It is entitled the Ascension of the Prophet Isaiah, the first chapters containing the martyrdom, and the rest (for it is divided in the MS. into chapters and yerses) the Ascension, or Vision, of Isaiah. At the end of the canonical book are the words, “Here ends the prophet Isaiah;” after which follows the Ascension, etc.; concluding with the words, “Here  ends Isaiah the prophet with his Ascension.” Then follows a postscript, from which it appears that it was transcribed for a priest named Aaron, at the cost of a piece of fine cloth twelve measures long and four broad. The Ascension of Isaiah was published by Dr. Laurence at Oxford in 1819, with a new Latin anld an English version. This discovery was first applied to the illustration of Scripture by Gesenius (Comm. on Isaiah). Some time afterwards the indefatigable Dr. Angelo Mai (Nova Collect. Script. Vet. e Vat. Codd. [Rome, 1828]) published two Latin fragments as an appendix to his Sermon. Arian. Fragment. Antiquiss., which he conjectured to be portions of some ancient apocryphal writings. Niebuhr, however, perceived them to be fragments of the Ascension and Vision of Isaiah; and Dr. Nitzsch (Nachweisung zweyer Bruchstiicke, etc., in the Theolog. Stud. und Kritik. 1830) was enabled to compare them with the two corresponding portions (2:14-3:12; 7:1-19) of the Ethiopic version. Finally, in consequence of the more complete notice of the Venetian edition of the Latin version given by Panzer (Annal. Typog. 8:473), Dr. Gieseler had a strict search made for it, which was eventually crowned with success, a copy being discovered in the library at Munich. This work, the date of whose impression was 1522, contained also the Gospel of Nicodemus and the Letter of Lentulus to the Roman Senate. The Latin version contains the Vision only, corresponding to the last chapters of the Ethiopic version.

The subject of the first part is the martyrdom of Isaiah, who is here said to have been sawn asunder; in consequence of the visions which he related to Hezekiah, in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of that monarch, different from those in the canonical book. These relate principally to the coming of “Jesus Christ the Lord” from the seventh heaven; his being changed into the form of a man; the preaching of his twelve apostles; his final rejection and suspension on a tree, in company with the workers of iniquity, on the day before the Sabbath; the spread of the Christian doctrine; the last judgment; and his return to the seventh heaven. Before this, however, the arch-fiend Berial is to descend on earth in the form, of an impious monarch, the murderer of his mother, where, after his image is worshipped in every city for three years seven months and twentyseven days, he and his powers are to be dragged into Gehenna.

The second portion of the work gives a prolix account of the prophet's ascent through seven heavens, each more resplendent and more glorious than-the other. It contains distinct prophetical allusions to the miraculous birth of Christ of the Virgin Mary at Bethlehem; his crucifixion,  resurrection, and ascension; and the worship of “the Father, his beloved Christ, and the Holy Spirit.” The mode of the prophet's own death is also announced to him. “The whole work,” observes its learned translator, “is singularly characterized by simplicity of narration, by occasional sublimity of description, and by richness as well as vigor of imagination.” Dr. Laurence conceives that the writer had no design of imposing upon the world a spurious production of his own as that of the prophet, but rather of composing a work, avowedly fictitious, but accommodated to the character and consistent with the prophecies of him to whom it is ascribed.

As to the age of tins work, Dr. Laurence supposes, from the obvious referenceto Nero and the period of three years seven months and twenty- seven days, and again of three hundred and thirty-two days, after which Berial was to be dragged to Gehenna, that the work was written after the death of Nero (which took place on June 9. A.D. 68), but before the close of the year 69. Lucke, however (Einleitung), looks upon these numbers as purely arbitrary and apocalyptical, and maintains that the dogmatical character of the work, the allusion to the corruptions of the Church, the absence of all reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, and the Chiliastic view, all point to a later period. All that can be considered as certain respecting its date is that the first portion was extant before the time of Origen and the whole before Epiphanius. It has been doubted whether the work does not consist of two independent productions, which were afterwards united into one, as in the Ethiopic version; but this is a question impossible to decide in the absence of the original. The Latin fragments discovered by Mai correspond literally with the Ethiopic; while they not only differ from the Venetian edition in single phrases, but the latter contains passages so striking as to induce the supposition that it is derived from a later recension of the original text.

The author was evidently a Jewish Christian, as appears from the use made of the Talmudical legend already referred to, as well as by his representing the false accuser of Isaiahas a Samaritan. Thework also abounds in Gnostic, Valentinian, and Ophitic notions, such as the account of the seven heavens and the presiding angels of the first five, the gradual transmutation of Christ until his envelopment in the human form, and finally the docetic conception of his history on earth. All this has induced Liucke (ut sup.) to consider the whole to be a Gnostic production of the 2d or 3d century, of which, however, the martyrdom was first written. Dr. Laurence. finds so strong a resemblance between the account of the seven heavens here and in  the testament of Levi (Twelve Patriarchs), that he suspects the latter to “betriy a little plagiarism.” If this learned divine were right in his conjecture respecting the early age of this production, it would doubtless afford an additional testimony, if such were wanting, to the antiquity of the belief in the miraculous conception and the proper deity of Jesus, who is here called the Beloved, the Lord, the Lord God, and the Lord Christ. In respect, however, to another passage, in which the Son and Holy Spirit are represented as worshipping God, the learned prelate truly observes that this takes place only in the character of angels, which they had assumed.

Dr. Lucke observes that the drapery only of the apocalyptic element of this work is Jewish, the internal character being altogether Christian. But in both form and substance there is an evident imitation, if not of the Apocalypse of St. John, at least of the book of Daniel and of the Sibylline oracles. The use of the canonical Apocalypse Lucke (op. cit. § 16) considers to be undeniable in 8:45. Comp. Rev 19:10; Rev 22:8-9. SEE ISAIAH.

7. The Epistle of Baruch is given as the “First Book of Baruch” in the Paris and London Polvglots in Syriac and Latin, the “Second Book of Baruch” being there what is commonly known as the apocryphal book of Baruch. This letter is also contained in the Svriac “Apocalypse of Baruch” noticed below.

(I.) The Design of this Epistle is to comfort the nine tribes and a half who were beyond the river Euphrates, by assuring them that the sufferings which they have to endure in their captivity, and which are far less than theyi deserve, are but for a season, and are intended to atone for their sins; and that God, whose love towards Israel is unchangeable, will speedily deliver them from their troubles and requite their oppressors. They are therefore not to be distracted by the prosperity of their wicked enemies, which is but momentary, but to observe the law of Moses, and look forward to the day of judgment, when all that is now perplexing will be rectified.

(II.) The Method or Plan which the writer adopted to carry out the design of this epistle will best be seen from a brief analysis of its contents. Being convinced of the unchangeable love of God towards his people (Rev 1:2), and of the close attachment subsisting between all the tribes (Rev 1:3), Baruch feels constrained to write this epistle before he dies (Rev 1:4) to comfort his captive brethren under their sufferings (Rev 1:5),  which are far less than they deserve (Rev 1:6), and are designed to atone for (Rev 1:7-8), as well as to wean them from, their sins (Rev 1:9), so that God might gather them together again. Baruch then informs them, first of all, that Zion has been delivered to Nebuchadnezzar because of the sins of the children of Israel (Rev 1:11-12). That the enemy, however, might not boast that he had destroyed the sanctuary of the Most High by the strength of his own arm, God sent angels from heaven to destroy the forts and walls, and also to hide some of the vessels of the Temple (Rev 1:13-16); whereupon the enemy carried the Jews as captives to Babylon, and left only few in Zion (Rev 1:17), this being the burden of the epistle (Rev 1:18-19). But they are to be comforted (Rev 1:20), for while he was mourning over Zion and praying for mercy (v. 21, 22) the Lord revealed words of consolation to Baruch that he might comfort his brethren, which is the cause of his writing this epistle (v. 23, 24), viz. 1 that the Most High will punish their enemies, and that the day of judgment is nigh (v. 25, 26). The great prosperity of the world (v. 27), its splendid government (v. 28), great strength (v. 29) and glory (v. 30), luxurious life (v. 31), barbarous cruelty (v. 32), and glorious dominion (v. 33) which the Gentiles now enjoy; notwithstanding their wickedness, will speedily vanish, for the day of judgment is at hand (v. 34), when every thought and deed will be examined and made manifest (v. 35, 36). The captive Jews are therefore not to envy any of the present things, but patiently to look forward to the promises of the latter days (v. 37, 38), the fulfilment of which is rapidly approaching, and for which they are to prepare themselves, lest, by neglecting this, they might lose both this world and the world to come (v. 39-41). All that now happens tends to this truth (Rev 2:1-7). This Baruch sets forth to lead his brethren to virtue (Rev 2:8), and to warn them of God's judgment before he dies (Rev 2:9), that they may give heed to the words of Moses, who, in Deu 4:26; Deu 4:28; Deu 30:19; Deu 31:28, foretold what would befall them for leaving the law (Deu 31:9-12). Baruch also assures them that after they have suffered and become obedient they shall receive the reward laid up for them (Deu 31:13-14), charges them to regard this epistle as a testimony between him and his brethren that they may be minidful of the law, the holy land, their brethren, the covenant of their forefathers, the solemn feasts and Sabbaths (Deu 31:15-16), to transmit it, together with the law, to their children (Deu 31:17), and to be instant in prayer to God that he may pardon their sins and impute unto them the righteousness of their forefathers (Deu 31:18-19), for “unless God judges us according to the multitude of his mercies, woe to us all who are born” (Deu 31:20). He, moreover, assures them that notwithstanding the fact that they have now no prophets and holy men in Zion to pray for them as in former days, yet if they rightly dispose their hearts they will obtain incorruptible treasures for their corruptible losses (Deu 31:21-27), and admonishes them constantly to remember these things, and prepare themselves, while in possession of this short life, for the life that is to come (Deu 31:28-30), when repentance will be impossible, as the judgment pronounced upon every one will be final (v. 36-39); and to read the epistle on the solemn fast (v. 40, 41).

(III.) The Unity of the Epistle. — The foregoing analysis will show that every part of this epistle contributes to the development of the main design of the writer, thus demonstrating the unity of the whole. This is, moreover, corroborated by the uniformity of diction which prevails throughout this document. It must, however, be admitted that hypercriticism may find some ground for scepticism in the latter part of it, viz. ii, 2141. But even if it could be shown that this is a later addition, it would not interfere with the design of the whole.

(IV.) The Author, Date, and Canonicity of the Epistle. — With the solitary exception of the learned and eccentric William Whiston (who has translated it in A Collection of Authentic Records [Lond. 1727]), this epistle has been, and still is, regarded by all scholars as pseudepigraphic, and we question whether a critic could be found in the present day bold enough to defend its Baruchic authorship. All that we can gather from the document itself is:

1. That it was written by a Jew, as is evident

(a) from the Hagadic story, mentioned in 1:13-15, about the destruction of the walls and forts by the angels and the hiding of the holy vessels (comp. also 2Ma 2:1-4);

(b) from the solemn admonition strictly to adhere to the law of Moses;

(c) from the charge that this epistle be transmitted by the Jews to their posterity, together with the law of Moses, and be read in their assemblies at their fasts; and

2. That it was written most probably about the middle of the 2d century B.C., as appears from the admonition to be patient under the sufferings from the Gentiles, and to wait for the day of judgment which is close at  hand (1:37-41), and the frequent reference to a future life. Ewald (Gesch. Isr. 4:233) and Fritzsche (Exeget. Handb. zu den Apokr. i, 175) contemptuously dismiss it in a few lines, and most unjustly regard it as written “in a prolix and senseless style” by a monk. Besides the London and Paris Polyglots, the Syriac is contained in the beautiful edition of the Apocrypha just published (Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace, recogn. Paul. Anton. de Lagarde, Lond. 1861), and the Latin may be found in Fabricii Cod. Pseudepigr. V. T. ii, 147 sq. SEE BARUCH.

8. The Apocalypse of Baruch was discovered in a Syrian manuscript, judged by Curetoni to belong to the 6th century, and was first published by Cerrain in 1866 in a close Latin translation (.Mon. Sac. et Prof: I, ii, 7398), and in 1871 in the original Syriac (ibid. 5, ii). The last few chapters, however, had long been known as the “Epistle of Baruch” noticed above.

(I.) Contents. — The composer of this work has, like the author of the book of Baruch in the ordinary Apocrypha of the Old Test., chosen as the fictitious writer of his revelations the friend and amanuensis of Jeremiah. The scene is laid in or near Jerusalem; and the supposed time is that immediately preceding and following the destruction of the city and the transportation of the people to Babylon. The author professes to give the exact year, “the twenty-fifth of Jechoniah of Judah.” Jechoniah must here stand for Jehoiakim, and the twenty-fifth year ought to be the eleventh. The work divides itself into seven parts, if we treat the letter to the nine and a half tribes as a kind of appendix. Baruch is throughout represented as the speaker, referring to himself in the first person, except in the opening of ch. 1 and 78, which are of the nature of a title.

The first part (ch. 1-9) opens by telling how the Word of the Lord came to Baruch, and warned him of the destruction impending over Jerusalem on account of the wickedness of its inhabitants. The punishment should last only for a time, and the ruin of the city should not be accomplished by the hands of its enemies. The next day the army of the Chaldaeans surrounded Jerusalem; and when the sacred vessels had been committed to the safe custody of the earth, to be kept till the last times, angels overthrew the walls, the enemy were admitted, and the people were led captive to Babylon. Then Baruch and Jeremiah rent their clothes and fasted seven days.  In the second part (ch. 10-12) Jeremiah is sent to Babylon, but Barutch is told to remain amid the desolatioll of Zion, that God may show him what will come to pass at the end of days. So Baruch sits before the gates of the Temple and utters a lamentation over the fate of Zion, and prophesies vengeance against the victorious land now so prosperous. Having thus given vent to his grief, he again fasts for seven days.

In the third part (ch. 13-20) he stands upon Mount Zion, and is told that he shall be preserved till the end of times, that he may bear testimony against the nations which oppressed his people. He answers that only few shall survive in those days to hear the word of the Lord, and complains that those who have not walked in vanity like other peoples have derived no advantage from their faithfulness. The Lord answers that the future world was made on account of the just, “for this world is a contest and trouble to them in much labor, and therefore that which is to come is a crown in great glory.” In further conversation Baruch is advised not to estimate the blessings of life by its leigth, and to look rather to the end than the beginning. He is then desired to sanctify himself and fast for seven days.

In the fourth part (ch. 21-30) he comes from a cave in the valley of Cedron, whither he had withdrawn, to the place where God spoke with him before. It is sunset, and he begins to deplore the bitterness of life, and calls upon God to hasten the promised end. In reply he is reminded of his ignorance, and told that the predetermined number of men must be completed, but “that the end is not far distant.” Baruch then says that he does not know what will happen to the enemies of his people, or at what time God will visit them. The signs of the end are accordingly enumerated, the last time being divided into twelve parts, each with its distinguishing characteristic. These parts, however, are to be mixed together and to minister to one another. The specified signs shall affect the whole earth, “and then Messiah will begin to be revealed.” A description of the Messianic period follows, on which we need not dwell. With this the conversation terminates, and though the usual fast is not mentioned, the section evidently comes to a close.

In the fifth part (ch. 31-43), having consoled the people by telling them of the future glory of Zion, he goes and sits upon the ruins of the Temple. While he laments he falls asleep, and has a vision of a vine and a cedar, of which the interpretation is afterwards given to him. The vision relates to the triumph of the Messiah. Baruch then asks, To whom and to how many  shall these things be, or who shall be worthy to live in that time? for many of God's people have thrown away the yoke of the law, but others have left their vanity and fled for refuge under God's wings. God answers him, To those who have believed will be the predicted blessings, and to those who despise will be the opposite of this. Baruch is then commanded to go and instruct the people, and afterwards to fast for: seven days, preparatory to further communications.

In the sixth part (ch. 44-47) he calls together his first-born son, his friend Gadelii, and seven of the elders of the people, and tells them that he is going to his fathers, according to the ways of all the earth. He exhorts them not to depart from the law, and promises that they shall see “the consolation of Zion.” He dwells on the rewards and punishments of the future world, desires them to advise the people, and assures them that, though he must die, “a wise man shall not be wanting to Israel, nor a son of the law to the race of Jacob.” He then goes to Hebron, and fasts for sevnen days.

In the seventh part (ch. 48-76) he prays for compassioon on this people, the people whom God has chosen, and who are unlike all others. He is told that the time of tribulation must arise, and many of its circumstances are recounted. He deplores such sad consequences of the sin of Adam, and in answer to an inquiry he is informed about the resurrection and its results. At last he falls asleep and has a vision. As this vision (ch. 53) and its interpretation (ch. 56-74), though they bring us to no definite date, throw an interesting light upon the uncertain methods in which history was parcelled out into periods, we may notice them at more length than would otherwise be necessary. A cloud ascended from the great sea, and it was full of white and black waters, and a similitude of light. ning appeared at its extremity. It passed quickly on and covered the whole earth. Afterwards it began to discharge its rain; but the waters which descended from it were not all alike, for first there were very black waters for a time, and afterwards the waters became bright, but of these there were not many. Black waters succeeded and again gave place to bright, and so on for twelve times; but the black waters were always more than the bright. At the end of the cloud it rained black waters, and these were darker than all that had been before, and fire was mingled with them, and they brought corruption and ruin. After these things the lightning which he had seen in the extremity of the cloud flashed so that it illumined the whole earth, and it healed those regions where the last waters had descended. After this  twelve rivers ascended from the sea and surrounded that lightning, anid were mnade subject to it. At this point Baruch awoke through fear. In answer to his prayer for the interpretation of the vision, the angel Ramiel was sent to satisfy his request. The cloud symbolized the length of the age.” The first black waters were the sin of Adam, with its consequences, including the fall of the angels and the flood. The second — the bright waters — were Abraham and his descendants, and those who were like them. The third (black) waters were the mixture of all the sinners after the death of these just men, and the iniquity of the land of Egypt. The fourth (bright) waters were the advent of Moses, Aaron, Miriam, Joshua, Caleb, and all who were like them, in whose time “the lamp of the eternal law shone upon all who were sitting in darkness.” The fifth (black) waters were the works of the Amorites, and the sins of the Israelites in the days of the judges. The sixth (bright) waters were the time of David and Solomon. The seventh (black) waters were the perversion of Jeroboam, and the sins of his successors, and the time of the captivity of the nine and a half tribes. The eighth (bright) waters were the righteousness of Hezekiah. The ninth (black) waters were the universal impiety in the days of Manasseh. The tenth (bright) waters were the purity of the generations of Josiah. The eleventh (black) waters were the calamity which had just happened to Zion. The rest of the interpretation is, of course, given in the future tense. “As for the twelfth (bright) waters which thou hast seen, this is the world. For the time shall come after these things when thy people shall fall into calamity, so as to be in danger of all perishing together. But nevertheless they shall be saved, and their enemies shall fall before them. And they shall for some time have much joy. And in that time, after a little, Zion shall be again built, and its oblations shall be again established, and the priests shall return to their ministry, and the nations shall again come to glorify it, but nevertheless not fully, as in the beginning. But it shall come to pass after these things that there shall be the ruin of many nations. These are the bright waters which thou hast seen.” The other waters, which were blacker than all the rest, after the twelfth, belonged to the whole world, and they represented times of trouble and conflict, which are described at some length; and all who survived these should be delivered into the hands of the Messiah. These last black waters are, in the interpretation, succeeded simply by bright waters, representing the blessedness of the Messianic time. Baruch, having heard the words of the angel, expressed his wonder at the goodness of God. He is informed that, though he must depart from the  earth, he shall not die. But before his removal he must go and instruct the people.

We are next told (ch. 77) how Baruch went to the people and admonished them to be faithful, holding out hopes that their brethren might return from the captivity. The people promised to remember the good that God had done to them, and requested him to write a letter before his departure to their brethren in Babylon. He promised to do so, and send the epistle by the hands of men, and also to forward a letter to the nine and a half tribes by means of a bird. Accordingly, he sat alone under an oak and wrote two letters. One he sent by three men to Babylon, and the other to the tribes beyond the Euphrates by an eagle which he called. He charged the eagle not to pause till he reached his destination, and, to encourage him, reminded him of Noah's dove, of Elijah's ravens, and how “Solomon, in the time of his reign, whithersoever he wished to send or to seek anything, commanded a bird, and it obeyed him as he had commanded it.” Then the letter is subjoined (ch. 77-86). It consists of a general exhortation to the captive tribes to be faithful, in the hope of being soon restored to a happier lot. The last chapter (87) relates how he folded and sealed the letter, tied it to the eagle's neck, and despatched it.

(II.) Author, Date, etc. — The work, according to its title in the MS. in which it has been preserved, was “translated from Greek into Syriac.” Notwithstanding the Hebraic coloring of its thought and language, it may very well have been written originally in Greek. There can be no doubt that it was written by a non-Christian Jew. Though it is rich in Messianic passages, no expression betrays a Christian hand. The book is pervaded by the strong and exclusive feeling of a Jew, confident, amid the most terrible humiliation, in the divine election of his race. It bears a strong resemblance in general structure, and even in particular thoughts and expressions, to the fourth book of Ezra. We must, of course, assign it a similar time and authorship to the epistle of Baruch above noticed, which Ewald locates in the reign of Domitian (Gesch. Isr. 7:84 sq.). This is confirmed by allusions to the destruction of the Temple (ch. 39), and the references to Daniel's “times” as if fulfilled. See Drummond, The Jewish Messiah (Lond. 1877), p. 117 sq. SEE BARUCH.

9. The Fourth Book of Ezra (the first according to the Ethiopic and Arabic) is, from its apocalyptic character, styled by Nicephorus (Song  of Solomon 3:4) the Apocalypse of Ezra (Α᾿ποκάλυψις Ε᾿σδρᾶ). SEE ESDRAS, SECOND BOOK OF.

10, 11. The Apocalypse of Zephaniah and that of Zechariah are referred to by Jerome (Ep. ad Pammach.), and cited as lost apocryphal books in an ancient MS. of the Scriptures in the Coislinian Collection (ed. Montfaucon, p. 194).

II. Pseudo-Revelations Purporting to Refer to Christian Characters. — Of these the most important are the following:

1. The Apocalypse of St. Peter is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3:3, 25), and was cited by Clement of Alexandria, in his Adumbrations, now lost (Euseb. loc. cit. 6:14). Some fragments of it have, however, been preserved by Clement, in his Selections firom the Lost Prophecies of Theodotus the Gnostic, and are published in Grabe's Spicilegium (i, 74 sq.). From these we can barely collect that this apocalypse contained some melancholy prognostications, which seem to be directed against the Jews, and to refer to the destruction of their city and nation. This work is cited as extant in the ancient fragment of the canon published by Muratori, a document of the 2d or 3d century, with this proviso, that “some of us are unwilling that it be read in the Church,” as is perhaps the signification of the ambiguous passage, “Apocalypsis Johannis et Petri tantum recipimus; quam quidam ex nostris legi in ecclesia nolunt.” Eusebius designates it at one time as “spurious,” and at another as “heretical.” From a circumstance mentioned by Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 7:19), viz. that it was read in some churches in Palestine on all Fridays in the year down to the 5th century, Lucke infers that it was a Jewish-Christian production (of the 2d century), and of the same family with the Preaching of Peter. It is uncertain whether this work is the same that is read by the Copts among what they call the apocryphal books of Peter.

There was also a work under the name of the Apocalypse of Peter by his Disciple Clement, an account of which was transmitted to pope Honorius by Jacob, bishop of Acre in the 13th century, written in the Saracenic language; but this has been conjectured to be a later work, originating in the time of the Crusades.

In the ancient Latin stichometry in Cotelerius (Apostolic Fathers), the Apocalypse of St. Peter is said to contain 2070 stichs, and that of John 1200. It is cited as an apocryphal book in the Indiculus Scripturarum after  tile Questiones of Anastasius of Nicaea, together with the Apocalypse of Ezra and that of Paul. There is in the Bodleian Library a MS. of an Arabic Apocalypse of St, Peter, of which Nicoll has furnished an extract in his catalogue, and which may possibly be a translation of the Greek apocalypse. SEE PETER.

2. The Apocalypse of St. Paul is mentioned by Augustine (Tiact. 98 in Ev. Joan.), who asserts that it abounds in fables, and was an invention to which occasion was furnished by 2Co 12:2-4. This appears from Epiphanius (Hoeres. 38:2) to have been an anti-Jewish Gnostic production, and to be identical with the Α᾿ναβατικόν of Paul, used only by the anti- Jewish sect of Gnostics called Cainites. It is said by Sozomen (Hist. Ecc 7:19) to have been held in great esteem. It was also known to Theophylact and (Ecumenius (on 2Co 12:4), and to Nicephorus in the 9th century (Son 3:4). Whether this is the same work which Dupin (Proleg. and Canon) says is still extant among the Copts is rendered more than doubtful by Fabricius (Cod. Apoc. ii, 954) and Grabe (Spicileg. i, 85). The Revelation of St. Paul, contained in an Oxford MS., is shown by Grabe (loc. cit.) to be a much later work. Theodosius of Alexandria (Ε᾿ρωτήματα περὶ προσωδιῶν) says that the Apocalypse: of St. Paul is not a work of the apostle, but of Paul of Samosata, from whom the Paulicians derived their name. The Revelation of St. Paul is one of the spurious works condemned by pope Gelasius, together with the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen.

3. There was an apocryphal Revelation of St. John extant in the time of Theodosius the Grammarian, the only one of the ancients who mentions it, and who calls it a pseudepigraphal book. It was not known what had become of it, until the identical work was recently published, from a Vatican as well as a Vienna manuscript, by Birch, in his Auctarium, under the title of “The Apocalypse of the Holy Apostle and Evangelist John the Divine.” From the silence of the ancients respecting this work, it could scarcely have been written before the 3d or 4th century. Lucke has pointed out other internal marks of a later age, as, for instance, the mention of incense, which he observes first came into use in the Christian Church after the 4th century (although here the author of the spurious book may have taken his idea from Rev 5:8; Rev 8:3); also of images and rich crosses, which were not in use before the “4th and 5th centuries.” The name patriarch, applied here to a dignitary in the Church, belongs to the same age. The time in which Theodosius himself lived is not certainly  known, but he cannot be placed earlier than the 5th century, which Lucke conceives to be the most probable age of the work itself. Regarding the object and occasion of the work (which is a rather servile imitation of the genuine Apocalypse), in consequence of the absence of dates and of internal characteristics, there are no certain indications. Birch's text, as well as his manuscripts, abounds in errors; but Thilo has collated two Paris manuscripts for his intended edition (see his Acta Thome, Proleg. p. 88). Assemani (Bibl. Orient. III, i, 282) states that there is an Arabic version among the Vatican MSS.

III. Pseudo-Revelations bearing Extracanonical Names. — Of these the following deserve special notice:

1. The Prophecies of Hystaspes were in use among the Christians in the 2d century. This was apparently a pagan production, but is cited by Justin Martyr, in his Apology, as agreeing with the Sibylline oracles in predicting the destruction of the world by fire. Clemens Alexandrinus (Strom. vi) and Lactantius (Instit. 7:15) also cite passages from these prophecies, which bear a decidedly Christian character.

2. The ancient romantic fiction entitled the Shepherd of Hermas is not without its apocalyptic elements. These, however, are confined to book 1:3, 4; but they are destitute of signification or originality. SEE HERMAS.

3. The Apocalypse of Cerinthus is mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. 3:28), and by Theodoret (Fab. Heret. ii, 3). Eusebius describes it as a revelation of an earthly and sensual kingdom of Christ, according to the heresy of the Chiliasts. Of the Revelations of St. Thomas and St. Stephen, we know nothing beyond their condemnation by pope Gelasius, except that Sixtus of Sienna observes that, according to Serapion, they were held in high repute by the Manichees; but in the works of Serapion which we now possess there is no allusion to this. There is, however, an unpublished MS. of Serapion in the Hamburg Library, which is supposed to contain a more complete copy of his work. SEE CERINTHUS.

4. The Sibylline Oracles is the title of an apochryphal work, evidently of Christian origin, of the early centuries of our aera, written as a sort of parody on the famous Roman traditionary books of that name. SEE SIBYLLINE ORACLES

## Revenge[[@Headword:Revenge]]

             (נְקָמָה, ἐκδίκησις) means the return of injury for injury, or the infliction of pain on another in consequence of an injury received from him further than the just ends of reparation or punishment require. Revenge differs materially from resentment, which rises in the mind immediately on being injured; but revenge is a cool and deliberate wickedness, and is often executed years after the offence is given. By some it is considered as a perversion of anger. Anger, it is said, is a passion given to man for wise and proper purposes, but revenge is the corruption of anger, is unnatural, and therefore ought to be suppressed. It is observable that the proper object of anger is vice; but the object, in general, of revenge, is man. It transfers the hatred due to the vice to the man, to whom it is not due. It is forbidden by the Scriptures, and is unbecoming the character and spirit of a peaceful follower of Jesus Christ. SEE ANGER.

## Revenues Of The Church[[@Headword:Revenues Of The Church]]

             It is clearly taught in the New Test. that it is the duty of Christians to give temporal support to their teachers. The general principle was laid down by our Lord (Luk 10:7) that the laborer is worthy of his hire. Paul says, “Even so hath the Lord ordained that they which preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel” (1Co 9:14). The following passages treat of the relation which subsists between the ministers and the Church in this respect: Act 18:3; Act 24:17; 2Co 11:7-8; 2Co 12:13; Php 4:16-18; 1Ti 6:5; Tit 1:11. So we see that the Church is bound to provide for the maintenance of its pastors; but, at the same time, the pastor is to act in a liberal spirit, and not to make unnecessary demands upon the Church. These principles were carried out in the apostolic times and subsequently. Fixed stipends were not paid in early times because the Church did not possess property, and therefore the contributions were voluntary. These voluntary offerings were of two sorts:

1. The weekly or daily oblations that were made at the altar;

2. The monthly oblations that were cast into the treasury of the Church. And then arose the custom of dividing up the monthly contribution and paying the clergy their share, according to their order. Another sort of revenue was such as arose annually from the lands and possessions given to the Church, which were greatly increased in the time of Gonstantine, who  authorized the bequeathing of property to the Church. A third source of revenue was the granting to the clergy an allowance out of the public money. Constantine both gave the clergy particular largesses, as their occasion required, and also settled upon them a standing allowance out of the exchequer. A fourth source of revenue was the estates of martyrs and confessors dying without heirs, which were settled upon the Church by Constantine. Still later rulers (Theodosius the younger and Valentinian III) settled upon the Church the estates of clergymen dying without heirs. Besides these sources of revenue, there were others, such as the donation of heathen temples and sometimes their revenues, heretical conventicles and their revenues, the temporal estates of clergymen or monks who became seculars again. Great care, however, at first was taken not to receive estates donated to the Church to the great detriment of others. Respecting the ancient way of managing and distributing these revenues, we may remark that the revenues of the whole diocese were in the hands of the bishop, and by his care distributed among the clergy. As a safeguard against mismanagement, he was obliged to give an account of his administration in a provincial synod; after a while this rule obtained in the Western Church. The division was usually into three or four parts-one to the bishop, a second to the rest of the clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth to the necessary uses of the Church. Suspension from participation in the revenues was one method of punishment visited upon the clergy. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. bk. v, ch. 6 p. 1-6.

## Reverence[[@Headword:Reverence]]

             (usually some form of יָרֵא, φοβέομαι, to fear), a respectful, submissive disposition of mind arising from affection and esteem, from a sense of superiority in the person reverenced. Hence children reverence their fathers even when their fathers correct them by stripes (Heb 12:9); hence subjects reverence their sovereign (2Sa 9:6); hence wives reverence their husbands (Eph 5:33); and hence all ought to reverence God. We reverence the name of God, the house of God, the worship of God, etc.; we reverence the attributes of God, the commands, dispensations, etc., of God; and we ought to demonstrate our reverence by overt acts, such as are suitable and becoming to time, place, and circumstances. For though a man may reverence God in his heart, yet unless he behave reverentially and give proofs of his reverence by demeanor, conduct, and obedience, he will not easily persuade his fellow-  mortals that his bosom is the residence of this divine and heavenly disposition; for, in fact, a reverence for God is not one of those lights which burn under a bushel, but one of those whose sprightly lustre illuminates .wherever it is admitted. Reverence is, strictly speaking, perhaps the internal disposition of the mind, φόβος (Rom 13:7); and honor, τιμή, the external expression of that disposition.

## Reverend[[@Headword:Reverend]]

             a title prefixed by courtesy to the name of any clergyman, though “clerk “(clericus) is the legal and strictly proper description of clergymen, and is, in official documents, placed after (as “Reverend” is before) their names. In the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal and Roman Catholic churches the title is given to ecclesiastics of the second and third orders, the bishops being styled “right reverend.” In some churches ordained abbesses and prioresses are called “reverend mothers.”

## Revesz, Emeril[[@Headword:Revesz, Emeril]]

             a Reformed theologian of Hungary, was born in 1826. He studied at Debreczin and Buda, and after spending some time for literary purposes in Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, and Germany, became pastor of two country congregations in succession, but was removed in 1856 to Debreczin, where he labored until his death, February 13, 1881. His learning and character made him the leader in the Reformed Church of Hungary. When, on September 1, 1859, the emperor of Austria issued the famous "Patent," which was followed by the edict issued by the minister of public worship, the Protestants of Hungary felt grieved, for the object of the "Patent" and the edict was nothing less than a complete reorganization of the Reformed Church, involving the destruction of self government and the transference of ecclesiastical legislation to the civil authority. This attempt to deprive the Reformed Church of her inherent rights aroused the spirit of self-defence against the intrusion of the secular power, and Resvsz came forward with his A Protestans Eghazalkotmany, etc., i.e., Fundamental Principles of the Protestant Church Constitution According to the Statements of the Leading Reformers, Confessions, and Church Organizations (1856 ), which appeared as a reply to the order issued by the Austrian imperial cabinet. In this work he sets forth the views of the Reformers, especially Calvin, regarding the Church's inherent and indefeasible right of self-government, and delineates the organizations of the German, Swiss, French, and Scottish Reformed churches. His next production was Opinion Regarding. the Chief Points of the Hungarian Protestant Church Constitution (1857). The Hungarian Reformed Church protested against the intrusion of the secular power, and appealed to a national free synod. All who dared to speak publicly against the edict and among these was Revesz were summoned before the civil courts, and some were even committed to prison. A great deputation of Protestants was sent (January 25, 1860) to the emperor at Vienna, with a petition for the withdrawal of the "Patent" and the edict. The leading spirit in this movement was Revesz. On May 15, 1860, the "Patent" was withdrawn, and amnesty was granted to all who were suffering for their opposition to the decrees. Another struggle began when, under the new constitution, in  1868, the Hungarian parliament hurriedly passed the law for the secularization of the elementary schools. Revesz, with his usual deep and wide insight, and true Protestant instincts, stood forth to criticise and assail the law on its dangerous side. With the view of enlightening and directing public opinion, as well as vindicating the right of the Protestant Church to manage her own schools, a right secured by constitutional law, he started a scientific monthly magazine in 1870, called the Hungarian Protestant Observer (Magyar Protestans Figyelmezo). A still brighter career was reserved by Providence for the Observer in the field of polemics. The views of the German so-called "Protestant Union" found many advocates in Hungary. among the professors of divinity and ministers. The "modern," or rationalistic tendency, based on mere negations, and claiming unrestricted freedom in religion and doctrine, began to exercise its terrible influence in the professorial chairs, religious newspapers, and public meetings. After some preparatory skirmishes, the "Liberals" founded the "Hungarian Protestant Union" at Pesth, in October 1871, declaring its chief aim to be "to renew the religious-moral life in the spirit of Jesus, and to harmonize it with universal culture." This Protestant Union denied revelation, the divinity of Christ, and highly extolled Unitarianism. But when it had reached its height Revesz raised the banner of evangelicalism, and every number of his monthly review was eagerly read in both camps. The chief work by him against the negative theology appeared in a separate form, A Magyar Ooszagi Protestans Egyletrol, i.e., Confering the Hungarian Protestant Union, reprinted from the pages. of the Observer. It is an effective and conclusive defence of evangelical Protestantism. So severe was the attack on the so-called "new Reformers" that the rationalistic Unitarian Union soon lost its prestige, evangelical principles were saved, and the famous association silently dissolved. Besides the works already mentioned, Revesz published, Kalvin Elete es a Kalvinizmus, i.e., The Life of Calvin and Calvinism (Pesth, 1864). This is the first classic history of Calvin's life in Hungarian Joannes Sylvester Pannonius, a Hungarian Protestant Reformer (Debreczin, 1859): — Mathias Devay-Biro, the First Hungarian Reformer: his Life and Works (1863). In 1865 Revesz filled the chair of Church history, an office which he resigned in 1866, but a volume of general Church history is the fruit of this one year's professorship. In 1871 the Protestant faculty of theology at Vienna conferred on him the degree of doctor of theology. Revesz never accepted promotion to any of the higher positions in ecclesiastical government, wishing to remain a simple minister. For Herzog's Real-  Encyklopadie Revesz wrote in German the article on Devay and the Hungarian reformation. See Catholic Presbyterian Review, December 1881. (B.P.)

## Revised Version[[@Headword:Revised Version]]

             SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION

.

## Revision Of The Bible[[@Headword:Revision Of The Bible]]

             SEE AUTHORIZED VERSION.

## Revivals Of Religion[[@Headword:Revivals Of Religion]]

             a phrase commonly used to indicate renewed interest in religious subjects, or a period of religious awakening. It comes from revive (Lat. revivo), to live again, and is often improperly applied to excitements which can hardly be called religious, because they do not apprehend, or propose to revive, the real, inner, spiritual life of the soul, which alone constitutes true religion. Setting out with erroneous views as to the work to be effected, such excitements necessarily fall short of its accomplishment.

These words are also used to denote the conversion of sinners as well as the quickening of believers. This arises from the fact that the two events are generally (not always) coincident. Sinners, who withstand God himself, may resist the Church in her best estate; and they are sometimes converted when the Church, as a body, is spiritually asleep. Yet such is the influence of spiritual life, and such the usual sanction given by the Holy Ghost to its loving endeavors to save men, that a real revival of the Church leads directly to the conversion of oth ers. Therefore “a revival is simply an increase of the best desires, affections, and exertions of persons who are already pious and benevolent, such an increase as, by the blessing of  Heaven, awakens in the ungodly an anxiety for their salvation. When these evidences of increased engagedness in the cause of Christ are unequivocally manifested anywhere, it is too late for an impartial observer to doubt that a genuine revival of religion has there commenced.” To understand this subject in its bearings upon the different classes to be benefited, it is necessary to have just conceptions of religion itself, the means of its attainment and revival, and the evidences by which it is distinguished. These points, with some others necessarily involved, are indicated by the following propositions.

1. That all men unrenewed by the grace of God are sinners. Paul represents them as dead in trespasses and in sins, walking according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, having their conversation in the lusts of the flesh, fulfilling the desires of the flesh and of the mind, and as by nature children of wrath.

2. This being their condition-corrupt in heart and disobedient in practice — they need two important works effected in and for them; namely, the pardon of all their sins. exempting them from the penalty of the law, and the renewal of their souls in righteousness, conforming them to the moral image of God, and thus fitting them to do his will from the heart here, and enjoy the holiness of heaven hereafter.

3. That the atonement of Christ provided for just these results, as may be seen by the following announcements: “If we confesss our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness” (1Jn 1:9). “But ye are washed, but ye are sanctified, but ye are justified in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God” (1Co 6:11). And to show the absolute necessity of this double work, Jesus said to Nicodemus, “Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God” (Joh 3:3). Revivals which aim at anything short of this are not revivals of religion in the proper sense of that word. They may arouse the fears of men and improve their habits, but they do not save in the Gospel sense, nor will their results be satisfactory to the depraved and guilty sinner, or to any spiritual Church.

4. Another important fact to be remembered is, that this is the work of God. He only can forgive sins, or renew the heart. The object of a true revival is, therefore. not to absolve sinners, but to bring them to God; in other words, to persuade them to accept the terms of reconciliation, that he may save them. Pronouncing them converted on their avowing a “desire”  or “purpose” to seek the Lord is unauthorized, and exceedingly dangerous. We should instruct and encourage them to wait in the way of duty till God shall do the work, when then will need no absolution from man. Many, it is to be feared, have been misled right at this point, to their eternal sorrow. They have been taught to believe that religion is all their own work, a mere change of opinion or position; that they are to convert themselves. It is sometimes called a growth; whereas it is first a new creation, a new life, and adoption into the family of God by his own sovereign act. Like all other acts, it must be done at some specific time — in a moment. One must be born again before he can grow. If backslidden, he must repent and be forgiven as at the first, and have the old “joy of salvation” restored unto him.

5. When this work is accomplished, it will be verified, first, by the Holy Spirit witnessing to the fact as it witnesses in conviction to the sinner's guilt, condemnation, and danger; and, secondly, by its fruits, “love, joy, peace, long suffering,” etc., and aversion to former sins and associations. How does an awakened sinner know that he is a sinner? He feels that he is, and this is confirmed by the uniform conflict of his life and temper with the Word of God. How does a real convertknow that he is converted? Because he now feels the same assurance in his heart that he is a Christian which he felt before thathe was a sinner, and he knows that he is living a life of obedience, whereas, before, he lived in rebellion. He can say from the heart, with Paul, “Being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ,... and rejoice in the hope of the “glory of God” (Rom 5:1-2); and, with John, “We know that we have passed from death unto life because we love the brethren” (1Jn 3:14). Converts who stop short of a joyous experience of the love of God will go limping through life, if they do not utterly fall away.

6. The revival of this style of religion is best promoted by the inculcation of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, such as human depravity, natural and acquired; the sinfulness of men in rebellion against God, and in refusing to accept of offered mercy; the certainty of their loss of heaven, and the endurance of eternal punishment, if they do not repent; the amplitude of the atonement for every one who will deny himself, take aup his cross, and follow Christ, according to the light that is in and around him: the ability of sinners, by grace, to so repent and believe as to be saved; and the blessedness on earth and in heaven which God will bestow upon all who seek him with their whole heart.  As to the best manner of presenting these truths, there is room.for difference of opinion. Under ordinary circumstances, however, where the Word of God is freely circulated, their earnest, sympathetic, persuasive proclamation is more effective than any attempt to prove them. Many give infidelity too much credit, and spend their time and strength in defending to the understanding what they ought to preach to the heart. They controvert and argue where they should persuade and entreat. The people in the circumstances supposed generally believe the Gospel as really as their preachers, but neglect its claims from worldly considerations. These obstacles, need to be neutralized or removed. This can be more successfully done by showing their triviality in comparison with the tremendous interests at stake on the side of religion than by the explosion of heretical sentiments which their hearers would be glad to have true, but in which they have little confidence.

The most effective suggestion that we can make on this point is, perhaps, that the preacher aim to promote the revival of his Church and the conversion of sinners. Those who fail to do so seldom win souls to Christ. Revivals are not produced by such indifference. Says the immortal Richard Baxter to pastors: “If your heart is not set on the end of your labors, and if you do not long to see the conversion and edification of your hearers, and study and.preach in hope, you are not likely to see much success. It is a sign of a false, self-seeking heart when a person is contented to be still doing without seeing any fruit of his labor... He never had the right ends of a preacher in view who is indifferent whether he obtains them or not; who is not grieved when he misses them, and rejoices when he can see the desired issue.”

With this aim, and a proper understanding of human nature and the Gospel, one will not seriously err in the selection of subjects. Nor will he preach so much about the people as to them. Effective efforts have always been characterized by their directness. Said Nathan to David, “Thou art the “man;” and Joshua to Israel, “Choose you this day whom you will serve.” When Peter preached on the day of Pentecost, “Let the house of Israel know assuredly that God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ,” his hearers were “pricked. in their hearts, and said, Men and brethren, what shall we do?”

But revivals must not be left alone to preachers, or preaching. Every talent of the Church should be enlisted in all appropriate ways. Testimony as to  personal experience is a powerful agency, and should be largely employed in private, and often in public. The same is true of lay instruction, exhortation; and persuasion. When these means fail, the object may be gained by a tract or book. The printed page has won grand fields inaccessible to living agencies, and where these have toiled in vain. Prayer is another powerful means of revivals, which often prevails where everything else fails. Their history glows with the wonders of its power. Singing Gospel truths in an impressive manner is often effective. It attracts and softens many who care little for preaching- or prayer. It has always been prominent in this work, but never more successful than at the present time.

7. Revivals are necessary from many considerations. First, because, as a matter of fact, most Christians do backslide more or less from their first love. The history of God's ancient people is little more than a consecutive account of their backslidings and recoveries. The apostolic age was clouded by similar defections, and followed by the “Dark Ages.” The slumbers of that long night were unbroken until the revival trumpet of Luther was heard from Wittenberg calling for reform. Even the Puritans of New England declined. Says Mr. Tracy, in speaking of their condition at the commencement of the great revival under Edwards, Whitefield, and others, “Such had been the downward progress in New England that there were many in the churches, and even some in the ministry, who were yet lingering among the supposed preliminaries to conversion. The difference between the Church and the world was vanishing away, and yet never, perhaps, had the expectation of reaching heaven at last been more general or confident.” That revival changed all this for the time, but in less than half a century there was another sad relapse. When the Wesleys and Whitefield awoke to the claims of religion in England, the new birth was a dead letter, and conversions were scarcely known; while drinking, gambling, cock-fighting, and every species of popular vice were patronized by the Church and many of the clergy.

In view of these facts, what would have become of religion but for revivals? Had Joshua, and David, and Josiah, and Ezra, and Luther, and Edwards, the Wesleys, Whitefield, and other revivalists, clung to established customs, and opposed innovations, as some did, and as others do now, the name of God would hardly have been preserved from oblivion.  The same tendency is observable in individuals and some churches now. They are in close fellowship with sin and the world, without God, and without any well-grounded hope.

Revivals are also necessary because there is no other cure for the evils to be remedied. Spiritual life can never spring out of the dead, worldly policy which eschews revivals: reason, common-sense, and history are all against it. We may fill the Church with man-made converts, who have been coaxed into a profession of religion without having the first elements of a Christian character; but that is not God's work, nor is it religious; it is rather an attempt to cover the wolf in sheep's clothing, to be stripped of his false pretence when it is too late to repent and be saved. Nearly all the religion of the ages is attributable to revivals. Every device to supersede their necessity has failed. It may be added with special emphasis that revivals are necessary to the triumph of moral reforms. Experience has taught many that they cannot reform without the grace of God. Such were their habits of licentiousness, profanity, intemperance, fraud, sinful amusements, etc., that all attempts at reform were fruitless until they came to God for salvation. Then they found deliverance, not from the habit only, but from all disposition to follow it. This is the only solid basis of reform, when bad appetites, passions, and habits are fully established. God only can save in these extreme cases.

8. Revival measures require great courage, zeal, and decision in their leaders to make them most effective. Because, first, they generally encounter opposition from without, and often from professors of religion. It may be silent, but still it is real and hurtful. Sometimes it takes the form of friendship, as in the case of Nehemiah and Sanballat, and suggests damaging complications, which require clear perception and invincible firmness. At others it is outspoken and threatening, which is less hurtful. But not unfrequently genuine but misguided friends of the work have to be restrained to prevent their hindering what they fain would help. To do this successfully often requires much decision and tact. But it must be done. A few weak and fanatical people have sometimes been allowed to neutralize the best efforts. But there seems to be little danger from that quarter at the present time. These measures suffer more from spiritual death than from overaction. And yet with some there is so much dread of excitement that they hardly dare to light the fires of revival for fear of an explosion. These circumstances call for courage to venture. But many who wish well to the cause have no faith in God or man. They cannot see how success isto be  achieved, and therefore they hesitate to attempt it. Here is another call for courage. Many of the great revivals of the ages commenced with one man. He alone believed, and worked it up; but when it became manifest that God was with him, others rallied to his support. In the progress of the work this same unbelief, during every little reverse, is prompt to predict that it is going to stop. This calls for more faith in the leader, who will do well to review the book of Nehemiah. Then churches sometimes get weary, and want their evenings for rest, business, or recreation, and propose to suspend the meetings. A proper zeal will suggest some little modificatioh of measures, and strike for new achievements. Revivals have been successfully carried on for years under this policy; not so much by holding meetings every evening as by making every meeting, whether regular or extra, to advance the work.

Literature. — Thoughts on the Revival of Religion in New England [1740]; to which is prefixed A Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in Northampton, Mass. [1735] (N. Y.); Porter, Revivals of Religion, showing their Theory, Means, Obstructions, Importance, and Perversions, with the Duty of Christians in regard to them (N.Y. and Cincinnati, 1877); Finney, Lectures on Revivals of Religion (Oberlin, 0.1868); Fish, Handbook of Revivals,for the Use of Winners of Souls (Boston, 1874). See North Brit. Rev. Nov. 1860; Mercersb. Rev. Jan. 1872. (J. P.)

## Revocatus[[@Headword:Revocatus]]

             was a Christian martyr under Severus, a catechumen of Carthage, and a slave. On the day appointed for the execution, he was led to the amphitheatre, and, having denounced God's judgment upon his persecutors, was ordered to run the gantlet between the hunters. He was then destroyed by wild beasts, A.D. 205. — Fox, Book of Martyrs.

## Revolution[[@Headword:Revolution]]

             The name given to that change in the civil and ecclesiastical constitution of England which took place when James II had been expelled from the throne in the year 1688, and his son-in-law, William, prince of Orange, was elected by the voice of the people. The immediate occasion of the Revolution was a fallacious proclamation issued by James, under the pretence of extending toleration; but the true object of which was to place all the offices of trust in the hands of the papists, whose hopes had been revived by the death of Charles II. Some Protestant Dissenters were  imposed upon by this specious pretence; but the sagacity of the bishops justly apprehending the intended consequences, they strenuously contended and petitioned against the proclamation, and alarmed the fears of Protestants throughout the kingdom.

## Revolution Settlement[[@Headword:Revolution Settlement]]

             The settlement of the Church of Scotland under William and Mary is socalled. It was dictated by policy, and did not restore the platform of 1638, but adopted the ratification of 1592. Its object was to restore peace and order, to put an end to agitation, and by the appearance of moderation to curb extremes, to take away all pretext for violence, and induce all classes of the people to exhibit a loyal spirit to the new occupants of the British throne. SEE SCOTLAND, CHURCH OF

.

## Rex Christe Factor Omnium[[@Headword:Rex Christe Factor Omnium]]

             is the beginning of a hymn ascribed to Gregory the Great (q.v.). Luther is said to have pronounced this to be the best hymn. We subjoin the first verse in both Latin and English:

“Rex Christe, factor omnium,

Redemptor et credentium,

Placare votis supplicum Te laudibus colentium.”

“O Christ, our king, Creator, Lord,

Saviour of all who trust thy Word,

To them who seek thee ever near,

Now to our praises bend thine ear.”

This is the translation as given in the Lyra Domestica p. 266. Into German it has been translated by Simrock, in his Lauda Sion Salvatorem, p. 91, “Christ, Konig, Schopfer aller Welt;” by Rambach, in his Anthology, I, 113, “Christus, Konig aller Welt;” by Kinigsfeld, in his Hymnen u. Gesange, i, 72, “Christ, Konig, Schopfer aller Welt,” which is also adopted by Bassler, in his Auswahl altchristlicher Gesinge, p. 67, and by Fortlage, in his Gesange christl. Vorzeit, p. 76, “O Christus, Herr der Majestat.” Besides these translations, Koch enumerates a number of others (Opp. i, 74). (B. P.)

## Rey, Claude[[@Headword:Rey, Claude]]

             a French prelate, was born at Aix, Nov. 27, 1773. In 1800 he concluded his theological studies at the Seminary of St. Sulpice at Paris, and became secretary to the vicar-general. In 1816 he was titular canon of Aix, and prebend in 1821. In consequence of the stand he took concerning the new heads of the State, not considering it necessary to omit mentioning them in the public prayers, of the Church, he was obliged to defend his position by a pamphlet. Notwithstanding this controversy, he was made capitulary vicar-general, Nov. 24, 1830. In 1831 he was appointed bishop of Dijon. This was the first bishop appointed by Louis Philippe, whose claim to the throne was held by the high clergy to be illegitimate. The court of Rome hesitated to confirm the appointment, but finally Gregory XVI preconized Rey, and authorized that he should be consecrated by a single bishop, assisted by two dignitaries. But such was the feeling against the proceeding that for a long time no one would consent to consecrate him. At last the ceremony was performed by the bishop of Carthagena. The episcopacy of Rey lasted for six years, and was a constant contest for the rights of his position. A remonstrance was at last issued against his exercising his public functions, and he was forced to resign. He left Dijon, June 21,1838, and retired to Aix as canon of the Church of St. Denis, where he died, Aug. 17,1858. His writings are, Prieres pour la Consecration d'un Eveque (1808): — Precis Historique de Notre Dame d'Aix (Aix, 1816): — Reflexions sur les Affaires Ecclesiastiques du Diocese de Dijon, etc. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Reyes, Nathan Abbot[[@Headword:Reyes, Nathan Abbot]]

             a minister of the German Reformed Church, was born at Toilton, N. H., Dec. 26, 1807. He graduated at Dartmouth College with honor in 1835, and afterwards studied theology at Andover and at Lane seminary. Having been appointed by the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions as. a missionary to Syria, he sailed for Beirut in 1840. Political and other disturbances, together with his impaired health, induced him to return, which he did, with the approbation of the board, in 1844. He now spent some time in ministerial labor in Charlemont and South Royalton, Mass.; and in the spring of 1847 was called to the pastorate of the German Reformed Church in Lancaster, Pa., in whose service he continued till 1855, when he resigned and took charge of a church in Princeton, Ill., and after one year was called to Griggsville, Ill. Before his removal, however,  he was called away by death, March 31, 1857. He was a man of fine talents, good education, warm zeal, and excellent life.

## Reymond, Henri[[@Headword:Reymond, Henri]]

             a French prelate, was born at Vienne, Dauphine, Nov. 21, 1737. He studied in the Jesuit college of his native village, was ordained priest, and became vicar of St. George's at Vienne. At the time of the Revolution he embraced the popular ideas, and in 1792 was elected bishop of Isere. During the Reign of Terror he was arrested and kept in close confinement for nearly a year. He took part in the council of 1797, and was charged with publishing its acts. In 1802 he signed the formula of retraction required by the pope, and was consecrated bishop of Dijon. During the empire he advocated the cause of Napoleon, which caused his removal by Louis-XVIII, but he afterwards returned to his diocese. He died at Dijon, Feb. 20, 1820. His principal writings are. Droits des Cures et des Paroisses, etc. (Paris, 1776): — Droits des Pauvres (ibid. 1781): — Observations sur l'Enseignement Elementaire de la Religion (1804): — a Memoire Justificatio of his own life, printed in the Chronique Religieuse. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Reyna, Cassiodoro De[[@Headword:Reyna, Cassiodoro De]]

             a Spanish Hebraist, was born at Seville. He embraced the ecclesiastical life, but renounced it upon leaving his native country. He established himself in Frankfort and engaged in business, which he abandoned to take charge of a French congregation in London. From thence he went to Antwerp, and again lived in Frankfort, where he openly avowed his acquiescence in the Confession of Augsburg. It is supposed he was living at Basle when his version of the Scriptures in Spanish was published. In the preface to this work he makes himself appear a Catholic, in order to secure a greater sale for the book. The title is La Biblia, que es los Sacsros Libros del . y N. Testanmento, trasladada en Espanol (Basle, 1569, 4to). Ieyna pretended to have translated directly from the Hebrew, but it is said that he never saw any original except the Latin version of Pagnini. A new edition was prepared by Cyprian de Valera (Amst. 1596). Another work of Reyna is Annotationes in Loca Selectiora Evangelii Joannis (Frankfort, 1573). Reyna died at Frankfort, March 15, 1594. See Antonio, Bibl. Nova Hispana; Lelong, Bibl. Sacra. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, s.v.

## Reynolds, Edward[[@Headword:Reynolds, Edward]]

             D.D., an English prelate, was born in Southampton, November, 1599. In 1615 he became postmaster of Merton College, and in 1620 probationer fellow. He was made preacher at Lincoln's Inn, and rector of Braynton, in Northamptonshire; but in the rebellion of 1642 he sided with the Presbyterians. In 1643 he was one of the Westminster Assembly divines, and took the covenant. In 1648 he became dean of Christ Church and vice- chancellor of the University of Oxford. He refused the Engagement (1651) and was ejected from his deanery; was vicar of St. Lawrence's, Jewry, London; restored to his deanery in 1659, and in 1660 was made chaplain to Charles II. In the same year he was elected warden of Merton College, and made bishop of Norwich. He died in July 4667. He published Sermons, Theological Treatises, Meditations, etc.

## Reynolds, Ignatius Aloysius, D.D[[@Headword:Reynolds, Ignatius Aloysius, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic-ecclesiastic, was born near Bardstown, Kentucky, August 22, 1798, and educated at St. Mary's College, Baltimore, Maryland. He became a priest, and was successively vicar-general of Kentucky, rector of St. Joseph's College, and president of Nazareth Female. Institute of Kentucky. He was consecrated bishop of Charleston, S.C., March 18, 1844, and died in that city, March 6, 1855.

## Reynolds, Joshua[[@Headword:Reynolds, Joshua]]

             (Sir), considered the founder of the English school of painting as regards its special characteristics, was born at Plympton, in Devonshire (where his father was rector), July 16. 1723. He was intended for the medical profession, but was induced by the perusal of Richardson's Essays on Painting, etc., to take up painting as a profession. A handsome edition of these essays was in 1773 dedicated to Sir Joshua by Richardson's son, comprising The Theory of Painting, Essay on the Art of Criticism, and The Science of a Connoisseur. Reynolds's first master was Hudson, the portrait-painter, with whom he was placed in 1741. He first set up as a portrait-painter at Devonport, but in 1746 settled in London, in St. Martin's Lane. In 1749 he accompanied Commodore Keppel in the Centurion to the Mediterranean, and remained altogether about three years in Italy. He commenced business again in London in 1752, and soon became the most prominent painter of the capital. In 1768, when the Royal Academy was established, Reynolds was unanimously elected president at the first meeting of the members, Dec. 14 of that year, and he was knighted by George III in consequence. In 1784 he succeeded Allan Ramsay as principal painter in ordinary to the king; and, after an unrivalled career as a portrait-painter, died at his house in Leicester Square, Feb. 23, 1792. He was buried with great pomp in St. Paul's Cathedral, where a fine statue by Flaxman is placed immediately below the dome, in honor of his memory. His large fortune, about £80,000, was inherited by his niece, Miss Palmer, who became afterwards marchioness of Thomond. His collection of works  of art sold for nearly £17,000. Sir Joshua Reynolds, notwithstanding his careless and feeble drawing, was indisputably a great painter; some of his portraits are among the first masterpieces of the art, whether as simple portraits or as fancy pieces; as, for instance, Lord Heathfield, in the National Gallery of the former class, and Mrs. Siddons as the Tragic Muse, at Dulwich, of the latter. His pictures are necessarily very numerous. Their chief excellence is their natural grace, fulness of expression; substantial character, and frequently a charming richness of color and light and shade. Among the most remarkable are The Cardinal and Christian Virtues. Nativity, and Holy Family. His eulogium cannot be better expressed than in the words of Burke: “He was the first Englishman who added the praise of the elegant arts to the other glories of his country... The loss of no man of his time can be felt with more sincere, general, and unmixed sorrow.” Sir Joshua has bequeathed to posterity, besides his paintings, fifteen elegant and valuable Discourses, of which a magnificent edition, edited by John Burnet, was published by James Carpenter in 1842. A later edition was published (Hudson, O. 1853, 12mo); and his Life and Discourses (N. Y. 1859, 12mo). There is a full Life of Reynolds by Northcote (Lond. 1819, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Reynolds, Walter[[@Headword:Reynolds, Walter]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was the son of a baker, born in Windsor. Of all the primates who have occupied the see of Canterbury, few seem to have been less qualified to discharge the duties devolving upon a metropolitan than he. He was not equal to the situation as regards his talents learning, piety, or his virtues. He was elected to the see of Worcester, and was duly consecrated at Canterbury, by archbishop Winchelsey, October 13, 1308. Here he was a failure, but he had some friends, and it is due to them that, January 4, 1314, he was translated to the see of Canterbury, and was also made chancellor. He died a despised old man, November 16, 1327. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 3:455 sq.

## Reynolds, William Morton, D.D[[@Headword:Reynolds, William Morton, D.D]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Little Falls Forge, Pa. He entered. the ministry in early manhood, being at first identified with the Lutheran Church; was professor of Latin in Pennsylvania College for several years; afterwards president of Capital University, Columbus, Ohio; and was also at one time president of Illinois State University, Springfield. He changed his ecclesiastical relations about 1863, entering the Protestant Episcopal Church, and was connected with the diocese of Illinois. During the last five years of his life he was rector successively at Harlem and. Oak Park, Ill. He died at Chicago, September 5, 1876, aged sixty-four years. See Lutheran Observer, September 15, 1876.

## Reys, Manoel Dos[[@Headword:Reys, Manoel Dos]]

             a Portuguese Jesuit, was taught at Coimbra, and preached with great power and success. He died at Braga, April 21, 1699. His Sermons were printed at Evora (1717-24).

## Rezeph[[@Headword:Rezeph]]

             (Heb. Re'tseph, רֶצֶפ, a hot stone, as in 1Ki 19:6; Sept. ῾Ρασἐφ, ῾Ραφείς, v. r. ῾Ραφέθ ), one of the places which Sennacherib mentions, in his taunting message to Hezekiah, as having been destroyed by his predecessor (2Ki 19:12; Isa 37:12). He couples it with Haran and other well-known Mesopotamian spots. It is supposed to be the same that Ptolemy mentions under the name of Rhesopha ( ῾Ρησώφα) as a city of Palmyrene (Geog. v, 15); and this, again, is possibly the same with the Rasapha which Abulfeda places at nearly a day's journey west of the Euphrates. The name is still a common one, Yakut's Lexicon quoting these two and seven other less important towns so called. SEE SENNACHEIRIB

## Rezia[[@Headword:Rezia]]

             (Heb. Ritsyah', רַצְיָה, delight; Sept. ῾Ρασιά), the third named of three sons of Ulla, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:39). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618.

## Rezin[[@Headword:Rezin]]

             (Heb. Retsin', רְצַין, firm, perhaps prince), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. ῾Ρασίν, ῾Ραασσών.) A king of Damascus, contemporary with Pekah in Israel, and with Jotham and Ahaz in Judaea. The policy of Rezin seems to have been to ally himself closely with the kingdom of Israel, and, thus strengthened, to carry on constant war against the kings of Judah. He attacked Jotham during the latter part of his reign (2Ki 15:37); but his chief war was with Ahaz, whose territories he invaded, in company with Pekah, soon after Ahaz had mounted the throne (B.C. cir. 740). The combined army laid siege to Jerusalem, where Ahaz was, but “could not prevail against it” (Isa 7:1; 2Ki 16:5). Rezin, however, “recovered Elath to Syria” (2Ki 16:6); that is, he conquered and held possession of the celebrated town of that name at the head of the Gulf of ‘Akabah, which commanded one of the most important lines of trade in the East. Soon after this he was attacked by Tiglath-pileser II, king of Assyria, to whom Ahaz in his distress had made application. His armies were defeated by the Assyrian hosts; his city besieged and taken; his people carried away captive into Susiana; and he himself slain (2Ki 16:9; comp. Tiglath-pileser's own inscriptions, where the defeat of Rezin and the destruction of Damascus are distinctly mentioned). This treatment was probably owing to his being regarded as a rebel, since Damascus had been taken and laid under tribute by the Assyrians some time previously (Rawlinson, Herodotus, 1, 467).

2. The head of one of the families of the Nethinim who returned from Babylon (Ezr 2:48; Neh 7:50). B.C. ante 536.

## Rezon[[@Headword:Rezon]]

             (Heb. Rezon', רְזוֹן, prince; Sept. ῾Ραζών v. r. Ε᾿σρώμ), the son of Eliadah, a Syrian, who, when David defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, put himself at the head of a band of freebooters and set up a petty kingdom at Damascus (1Ki 11:23). B.C. post 1043. Whether he was an  officer of Hadadezer, who, foreseeing the destruction which David would inflict, prudently escaped with some followers, or whether he gathered his band of the remnant of those who survived the slaughter, does not appear. The latter is more probable. The settlement of Rezon at Damascus could not have been till some time after the disastrous battle in which the power of Hadadezer was broken, for we are told that David at the same time defeated the army of Damascene Syrians who came to the relief of Hadadezer, and put garrisons in Damascus. From his position at Damascus he harassed the kingdom of Solomon during his whole reign. With regard to the statement of Nicolaus in the 4th book ef his history, quoted by Josephus (Ant. 7:5, 2), there is less difficulty, as there seems to be no reason for attributing to it any historical authority. He says that the name of the king of Damascus whom David defeated was Hadad, and that his descendants and successors took the same name for ten generations. If this be true, Rezon was a usurper, but the origin of the story is probably the confused account of the Sept. In the Vatican MS. of the Sept. the account of Rezon is inserted in 1Ki 11:14 in close connection with Hadad, and on this Josephus appears to have founded his story that Hadad, on leaving Egypt, endeavored without success to excite Idumea to revolt, and then went to Syria, where he joined himself with Rezon, called by Josephus Raazarus ( ῾Ραάζαρος), who, at the head of a band of robbers, was plundering the country (Ant. 8:7, 6). It was Hadad, and not Rezon, according to the account in Josephus, who established himself king of that part of Syria and made inroads upon the Israelites. In 1Ki 15:18, Benhadad, king of Damascus in the reign of Asa, is described as the grandson of Hezion; and from the resemblance between the names Rezon and Hezion, when written in Hebrew characters, it has been suggested that the latter is a corrupt reading for the former. For this suggestion, however, there does not appear to be sufficient ground, though it was adopted by Sir John Marsham (Chron. Can. p. 346) and Sir Isaac Newton (Chronol. p. 221), as well as by some later translators and commentators (Junius, Kohler, Dathe, Ewald). Against it are,

(a) that the number of generations of the Syrian kings would then be one less than those of the contemporary kings of Judah. But then the reign of Abijam was only three years, and, in fact, Jeroboam outlived both Rehoboam and his son.

(b) The statement of Nicolaus of Damascus (Josephus, Ant. 7:5, 2) that from the time of David for ten generations the kings of Syria were one  dynasty, each king taking the name of Hadad, “as did the Ptolemies in Egypt.” But this would exclude not only Hezion and Tabrimoln, but Kezon, unless we may interpret the last sentence to mean that the official title of Hadad was held in addition to the ordinary name of the king. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, 1, 271) makes Hezion contemporary with Rehoboam, and probably a grandson of Rezon. The name is Aramaic, and Ewald compares it with Rezin.

## Rhabanus[[@Headword:Rhabanus]]

             (more properly Rabanus) MAURUS, a distinguished German theologian and prelate, was born of French parents, named Raban, at Mentz, about 776. On the completion of his early studies at Fulda, in Hesse, he was there made a deacon in 801; and he betook himself to Tours the following year to enjoy the tuition of the famous Alcuin, who is said to have surnamed him the Moor, from his dark complexion. It is also apparent from his writings that he had in his youth made a pilgrimage to Palestine. In his twenty-fifth year he became head of the convent school at Fulda, where his successful teaching drew around him many pupils, and not a few of the nobility intrusted him with the education of their sons. In 822 he was consecrated abbot; but he still directed the seminary, which supplied many able teachers for the Frankish and German churches. On a complaint of the monks that his absorption in literary pursuits hindered the discharge of his more active conventual duties, he retired in 842. He was, however, drawn out of this voluntary seclusion, in 847, by being made archbishop of Mentz, whence he is supposed by some to have received the epithet of Magnentius. In this situation he was the opposer and persecutor of Gottschalk (q.v.), who advocated the doctrine of predestination. Rabanus founded the monastery of Mont St. Pierre, and rebuilt that of Klingemunster. In 850 he showed great devotion in relieving the poor who had suffered from a flood. In 852 he presided at a council held in his metropolis. He died Feb. 4, 856. His influence was great among the churches in the diffusion of practical piety, and he had several illustrious disciples. His erudition and general attainments were respectable for the age in which he lived, and, as a lecturer, he instructed his scholars in general literature and science as well as theology. He wrote commentaries on all the canonical books and many of the Apocryphal ones, and left behind him numerous treatises, sermons, and letters. His Opera Omnia were edited by Henin and Colvener (Cologne, 1627, 6 vols. fol.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v., and the literature there cited; also, Johann, De Vita ac Doctrina Rhab. Mauri Magn. (Jen. 1724); Schwarz, De Rabano Mauro (Heidelb. 1811); Dahl, Leben. u. Schr. d. Rab. Maur. (Fulda, 1828); Kunstman, Ueb. Hraban, Maur. (Mainz, 1841).

## Rhabdos Ek Tes Rhizes[[@Headword:Rhabdos Ek Tes Rhizes]]

             ( ῾Ράβδος ἐκ τῆς ῥίζης, a stem out of the root) is the beginning of one of the odes of St. Cosmas, surnamed “the Melodist,” also “Hierosolymitanus,” and sometimes “Hieropolites.” Like his foster-brother John of Damascus, Cosmas became a monk of St. Sabas, and, against his will, was consecrated bishop of Maiuma, near Gaza, by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, about A.D. 745. He led a holy life, and died in good old age about 760. Cosmas was the most learned of the Greek poets. He wrote an the Nativity, the Transfiguration, and the Purification, and on Gregory Nazianzen. His fondness for types, boldness in their application, and love of aggregating them make him the Oriental Adam of St. Victor. His hymns are much used and praised in the Eastern Church, and he is commemorated on Oct. 14. We subjoin the first stanza of this ode in Neale's translation:

Thou, Flower of Mary born,

From that thick shady mountain

Cam’st glorious forth this morn:

Of her, the ever Virgin,

Incarnate wast thou made,

The immaterial Essence —

The God by all obeyed!

Glory, Lord, thy servants pay

To thy wondrous might today!”

Comp. Neale, Hymns of the Eastern Church, p. 127 sq.; Miller, Singers and Songs of the Church, p. 16. (B.P.)

## Rhadamanthus[[@Headword:Rhadamanthus]]

             in Greek mythology, son of Jupiter and Eniropa, and brotlier of Minos, king of Crete. was a person ,of such justice that he was fabled to be one of the three judges in the infernal regions.

## Rhanatosan Hemin Anothen[[@Headword:Rhanatosan Hemin Anothen]]

             ( ῾Ρανάτωσαν ἡμῖν ἄνωθεν) is the beginning of the sixth ode by St. Joseph of the Studium, or the “Hymnologist” (q.v.), of which the following stanza is the translation of Neale:

“Rain down, ye heav'ns, eternal bliss!

The cherub-cloud today

Bears Jesus where his Father is,

Along the starry way.”

See Neale's Hymns of the Eastern Ch. p. 229 sq. (B.P.)

## Rhea, Samuel Audley[[@Headword:Rhea, Samuel Audley]]

             a Presbyterian missionary, was born in Blountville, East Tenn., Jan. 23, 1827. He graduated at the University of East Tennessee in 1847, after which he entered the Union Theological Seminary, New York, at which institution he graduated in 1850, and was ordained Feb. 2, 1851. After his ordination he was appointed missionary to Gawar, Persia, where he labored faithfully for eight years, at the expiration of which time he removed to Seir, another part of the Persian field, where he remained but a year in consequence of declining health. Being advised by his physician to return to the United States, he came to his former home, and on recovering his health returned to his post. From this place he went to Oroomiah, where he labored with zeal and success till his death, Sept. 2, 1865. (W.P.S.)

## Rhees, Morgan John (1)[[@Headword:Rhees, Morgan John (1)]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Glamorganshire, Wales, Dec. 8, 1760. He devoted himself at first to teaching; but having studied theology in the Baptist College at Bristol, he entered the ministry. His liberal views led him to France at the beginning of the revolution in that country, but, disappointed by its excesses, he came back and began expounding his particular views in a quarterly entitled The Welsh Treasury. This brought him into some difficulties with the authorities, and he emigrated to the United States in 1794 as the protector of a Welsh colony. Here he traveled through the Southern and Western states, preaching with remarkable success. Having, in connection with Dr. Benjamin Rush, purchased a tract of land in Pennsylvania, to which he gave the name of Cambria, he planned the capital of the county, which he called Beulah, and settled there with a company of Welsh emigrants in 1798. He remained for several years, acting as pastor of the church at Beulah, but finally removed to Somerset, Somerset Co., where he died, Sept. 17, 1804. One of his sons was M.J. Rhees, D.D. (q.v.). His earlier productions were published in the Welsh language, and but few of them have been translated. He published a few Orations and Discourses in this country, which evince great vivacity and eloquence. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulp. 6:344.

## Rhees, Morgan John (2), D.D.[[@Headword:Rhees, Morgan John (2), D.D.]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Somerset, Somerset Co., Pa., Oct. 25, 1802. He devoted himself at first to law, began practicing in May, 1826,  and gave promise of great success in that profession; but, directing his attention to the study of theology, he acted for a time as temperance agent, and was finally ordained Sept. 9, 1829, and on April 1, 1830, became pastor of the churches at Bordentown and Trenton, N.J. Here he was also one of the founders of the New Jersey State Convention for missionary purposes in 1829, of which he became secretary, besides being chairman of the executive committee of the State Temperance Society, and editing for a time the Temperance Reporter. He closed his connection with the church at Bordentown in 1833, retaining that at Trenton. In 1840 he also resigned the latter to become corresponding secretary of the American Baptist Publication Society, in which position his services proved very useful. In 1843 he became pastor of the Second Baptist Church at Wilmington, Del., where he remained until 1850, when he accepted a call from the First Baptist Church of Williamsburgh, L.I. and here, still acting as recording secretary of the Board of the Missionary Union and the American and Foreign Bible Society, death closed his useful career, Jan. 15, 1853. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:780.

## Rhegium[[@Headword:Rhegium]]

             ( ῾Ρήγιον, prob. from ῥήγνυμι, alluding to the abrupt character of the coast). The mention of this Italian town (which was situated on the Bruttian coast, just at the southern entrance of the Strait of Messina) occurs quite incidentally (Act 28:13) in the account of Paul's voyage from Syracuse to Puteoli, after the shipwreck at Malta. But, for two reasons, it is worthy of careful attention. By a curious coincidence the figures on its coins are the very “twin-brothers” which gave the name to Paul's ship. SEE CASTOR AND POLLUX. Again, the notice of the intermediate position of Rhegium; the waiting there for a southerly wind to carry the ship through the strait; the run to Puteoli with such a wind within the twenty-four hours, are all points of geographical accuracy which help us to realize the narrative. As to the history of the place, it was originally a Greek colony: it was miserably destroyed by Dionysius of Syracuse; from Augustus it received advantages which combined with its geographical position in making it important throughout the duration of the Roman empire. It was prominently associated, in the Middle Ages, with the varied fortunes of the Greek emperors, the Saracens, and the Romans; and still the modern Reggio is a town of 10,000 inhabitants. Its distance across the  strait from Messina is only about six miles, and it is well seen from the telegraph station above that Sicilian town. See Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul, 2, 349; Lewin, St. Paul, 2, 217; Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

## Rhegius Urbanus[[@Headword:Rhegius Urbanus]]

             SEE REGIUS.

## Rheinwald, George Friedrich Heinrich[[@Headword:Rheinwald, George Friedrich Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born May 20, 1802, at Scharnhausen, near Stuttgard, and died at Bonn in 1849, doctor and- professor of theology. He is the author of, Die kirchliche Archaologie (Berlin, 1830): — De Pseudodoctoribus Colossensibus Commentatio Exegetico: — Historica (Bonn, 1834): — Commentar uber den Brief Pauli an die Philipper (Berlin, 1827): — Abelardi Dialogus inter Philosophum et Christianum (1831): — Abelardi Epitome Theologiae Christianae (1835): — and edited Allgemeines Repertorium fur die theologische Literatur und kirchliche Statistik, volume 1-47 (1833-44). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:11, 263, 572, 608, 878, 879; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rhemish Testament[[@Headword:Rhemish Testament]]

             a Romish version of the New Test., printed at Rheims, France, in 1582, accompanied with copious notes by Roman Catholic authors. This version, like the Douay Old Test., with which it is generally bound up, was translated from the Latin Vulgate. SEE DOUAY BIBLE.

## Rhemoboth[[@Headword:Rhemoboth]]

             SEE SARABAITES.

## Rhenferd, Jakob[[@Headword:Rhenferd, Jakob]]

             a German Orientalist, was born at Mühlheim, in the duchy of Berg, Aug. 15, 1654. The son of a Protestant minister, he studied theology at Ham, Groningen, and at Amsterdam. From 1678 to 1680 he was rector of the gymnasium at Franeker, and then returned to Amsterdam to perfect his knowledge of Hebrew, Arabic, and Persian. In 1683 he became professor of Oriental languages at Franeker, which position he held during the remainder of his life. He was a man of great penetration, sound judgment, and possessed a great memory. Rhenferd died Oct. 7, 1712. Of his works we mention, De Antiquitate Literarum Judaicarum (Franeker, 1694): — Observationes ad Loca Hebroea Novi Testamenti (ibid. 1705-7): — De Arabarchis Ethnarchis Judoeorum (ibid. 1702): — Rudimenta Grammaticoe Harmonicoe Linguarum Hebroeoe, Chaldaicoe, Syriacoe, et Arabicoe (ibid. 1706). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v. Besides editing a Syntagma of dissertations by different writers, De Stylo Novi Testamenti (1701, 4to), he published several learned dissertations. These have been collected and issued in one vol. 4to, with a preface by D. Mill, and an “Oratio Funebris” by professor Andala, under the title Jac. Rhenferdi Opera Philologica, Dissertationibus Exquisitissimi Argumenti Constantia (Traj. Rhen. 1722). Besides discussing such Biblical subjects as the style of the Apocalypse, the meaning of the phrase ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων in the New Test., the meaning of several passages in the same, the author treats largely on points of Jewish literature and archaeology, and takes up the subject of the Palmyrene and Phoenician dialects, and other points of interest to Oriental scholars.

## Rhesa[[@Headword:Rhesa]]

             ( ῾Ρησά) is a name given in the genealogy of Christ (Luk 3:27) as that of a son of Zorobabel and father of Joanna, being evidently the same with RIPHAIAH SEE RIPHAIAH (q.v.), given in the Old. Test. (1Ch 3:19-21) as the son of Zerubbabel and father of Hananiah. Lord Hervey fancifully conjectures that Rhesa is no person, but merely the title Rosh, i.e. “prince,” originally attached to the name of Zerubbabel, and gradually introduced as an independent name into the genealogy (Genealogies, etc., p. 111, 114, 356-360). SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Rhesa, L. Jedemin[[@Headword:Rhesa, L. Jedemin]]

             a German doctor and professor of theology, was born June 9, 1777, at Carwitha, near Memel. In 1800 he was appointed garrison chaplain at Königsberg; in 1807 he lectured as privat-docent at the university there, and in 1810 was appointed extraordinary professor of theology. From 1812 to 1815 he acted as army chaplain, and after 1818 he lectured as professor in ordinary and doctor of theology, being at the same time a member of the consistory in Königsberg. Rhesa died Aug. 30, 1840, leaving some very important pamphlets bearing on the Lithuanian version of the Scriptures, as, Geschichte der litthauischen Bibel, ein Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte der nordischen Völker (Königsberg, 1816): — Philosophisch-kritische Anmerkungen zur litthauischen Bibel (ibid. 1816-24, 2 parts). Besides these, he wrote: De Primis, quos dicunt Sacror. Reformatorib. in Prussia (ibid. 1823): — and De Primis Vestigiis Religionis Christ. inter Lithuanos Propagatoe (ibid. 1819). See Winer, Handb. der theolog. Literat. 1, 809, 837; 2, 731; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. 2, 1061. (B.P.)

## Rhetorians[[@Headword:Rhetorians]]

             An Alexandrian sect of this name is mentioned by Philaster as founded by Rhetorius, and maintaining the opinion that there was no harm in any heresy whatever (Philast. Hoer. 91). Augustine remarks that this seems so absurd that he considers it incredible (Aug. Hoer. 72). Philaster is the original authority for the existence of such a sect, but Predestinatus speaks of them as if they were not unknown to him, adding to Philaster's statement that they advocated Christian fellowship with all who believed in the Incarnation (Praedest. Hoer. 72). Even before Philaster's time Athanasius mentions a person named Rhetorius, whom he accuses of  holding the opinion that doctrines are of no consequence, and that all heretics are right in their own way (Contr. Apollin. 1, 6). And at a later date St. John Damascene enumerates the γυώσιμαχαι as the eighty-eighth in his catalogue of heresies, who, it seems probable, were “knowledge (or theology) haters” in the sense of being anti-dogmatists, who had arisen from reaction against the subtleties of the Gnostics, the Antiochean and the Alexandrian schools of theologians, and who are identical with the Rhetorians of Philaster.

## Rhinoceros[[@Headword:Rhinoceros]]

             SEE UNICORN.

## Rhinsbergers[[@Headword:Rhinsbergers]]

             SEE COLLEGIANTS.

## Rho, Giacomo[[@Headword:Rho, Giacomo]]

             brother of Giovanni, was born at Milan, Italy, in 1593. At the age of twenty he joined the order of St. Ignatius, and, after being ordained priest, he accompanied Nicolas Trigault to China. Being detained at Macao, he aided in defending the town against the Dutch, and in surrounding it with new fortifications (1622). He afterwards penetrated into the province of Shan-si, in 1624, where he preached in the native language with fluency. In 1631 he was ordered to Pekin, where he was employed, with P. Adam Schall, in drawing up the imperial calendar. Rho died in China, April 27, 1638. He left only one work, in Italian — an account of his voyage — entitled Lettere della sua Navigazione e delle Cose dell' Indie (Milan, 1620), but he is said to have composed many works in Chinese on religion, astronomy, and mathematics. See Kircher, China Illustrata.

## Rho, Giovanni[[@Headword:Rho, Giovanni]]

             an Italian Jesuit, was born at Milan in 1590. In 1606 he was admitted to the Society of Jesus, taught rhetoric at Brera, and, after a time, desired to go as a missionary to India. But his superiors refused to grant his request, and he continued during his whole life to teach in the different cities of Italy. Rho was, near the close of his life, made superior of a convent at Milan, and finally died at Rome, Nov. 9, 1662. He left several works, among them, Martyrium Trium Beatorum e Soc. Jesu, Pauli Michi, Joh. Goto, et  Jac. Ghisai. (Florence, 1628): — Interrogationes Apologeticoe (Lyons, 1641): — and orations on various ecclesiastical subjects.

## Rhoda[[@Headword:Rhoda]]

             ( ῾Ρόδη, Rose), the name of a servant-maid who announced Peter's arrival at the door of Mary's house after his miraculous release from prison (Act 12:13). A.D. 44. SEE PORTER.

## Rhode, Johann Gottlieb Heinrich[[@Headword:Rhode, Johann Gottlieb Heinrich]]

             a Protestant theologian, was born in 1762, and died at Breslau, August 28, 1837. He wrote, Ueber religiose Bildung, Mythologie und Philosophie der Hindus (Leipsic, 1827, 2 volumes): — Die heilige Sage und das gesammte Religionssystem der alten Bactrer, Meder, Perser und des Zendvolkes (Frankfort, 1820): — Gregorii Barhebraei Scholia in Psalmum et xviii Edita, Translata, etc. (Breslau, 1832): — Prolegomenorum ad Quaestionum de Evangelio Apostoloque Marcionis Denuo Instituendam Caput 1-3 (1834). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:519, 521; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rhodes[[@Headword:Rhodes]]

             ( ῾Ρόδος, rosy), an island in the Mediterranean, near the coast of Asia Minor, celebrated from the remotest antiquity as the seat of commerce, navigation, literature and the arts, but now reduced to a state of abject poverty by the devastations of war and the tyranny and rapacity of its Turkish rulers.

I. Scriptural Notices. — The Sept. translators place the Rhodians among the children of Javan (Gen 10:4), and in this they are followed by Eusebius, Jerome, and Isidore; but Bochart maintains that the Rhodians are too modern to have been planted there by any immediate son of Javan, and considers that Moses rather intended the Gauls on the Mediterranean towards the mouth of the Rhone, near Marseilles, where there was a district called Rhodanusia, and a city of the same name. They also render Eze 27:15, “children of the Rhodians,” instead of, as in the Hebrew, “children of Dedan” Calmet considers it probable that here they read “children of Redan, or Rodan,” but that in Gen 10:4 they read “Dedan,” as in the Hebrew. In the time of the consolidation of the Roman power in the Levant we have a notice of Jewish residents in Rhodes (1Ma 15:23). Paul touched there on his return voyage to Syria from the third missionary journey (Act 21:1). It does not appear that he landed from the ship. The day before he had been at Cos, an island to the northwest; and from Rhodes he proceeded eastwards to Patara, in Lycia. It seems, from all the circumstances of the narrative, that the wind was blowing from the northwest, as it very often does in that part of the Levant. Two incidents in the life of Herod the Great connected with Rhodes are well worthy of mention here. When he went to Italy, about the close of the last republican struggle, he found that the city had suffered much from Cassius, and gave liberal sums to restore it (Josephus, Ant. 14,  4, 3). Here, also, after the battle of Actium, he met Augustus and secured his favor (ibid. 15, 6, 6).

II. History. — Rhodes was an ancient Dorian settlement made, probably, soon after the conquest of Peloponnesus; but in process of time the different races became fused together and were distinguished for commercial enterprise. They built the superb city of Rhodes at the northern extremity of the island, and thus took advantage of the magnificent harbor which the earlier settlers had overlooked. After this it prospered greatly and passed through various fortunes in a political respect, becoming for a time connected with the Carian dynasty, then with the Persian empire, and at a later period it became famous for a memorable siege it sustained against the arms of Demetrius Poliorcetes, from whom it obtained honorable terms of peace. The citizens now set themselves to clear the Aegean Sea of pirates, an enterprise in which they completely succeeded; and it was to their exertions that merchants owed the safety of their ships and the possibility of extending their commerce. The mercantile tastes and honorable character of this people procured them the goodwill of all the civilized world. They possessed in perfection those virtues in which the rest of the Greeks were so lamentably deficient. They were upright, conscientious, and prudent. While they cultivated trade they did not neglect science, literature, and art; and, though the time of their prosperity was subsequent to the decline of the intellectual supremacy of Greece, the Rhodian era was a long and a happy one. The people formed an alliance with Rome, and maintained throughout the Roman period their independence; and, while they faithfully kept every article of their treaties, they avoided anything like servility. In the time of Antoninus Pius Rhodes was not only free itself, but extended the advantages of its free constitution to many of the surrounding islands and a considerable district in Caria on the opposite coast. Nor was Rhodes by any means despicable in literary reputation. Cleobulus, reckoned among the seven sages, was a Rhodian; Callimachus and Apollonius were eminent as poets; and eloquence was understood and cherished in Rhodes when it was all but extinct in every other part of Greece. Cicero went to study here, and the young Roman nobles made Rhodes their university as they had formerly done with Athens.  Under Constantine it was the metropolis of the “Province of the Islands.” It was the last place where the Christians of the East held out against the advancing Saracens; and subsequently it was once more famous as the home and fortress of the Knights of St. John. The most prominent remains of the city and harbor are memorials of those knights.

In modern times Rhodes has been chiefly celebrated as one of the last retreats of this military order, under whom it obtained great celebrity by its heroic resistance to the Turks; but in the time of Soliman the Great a capitulation was agreed upon and the island was finally surrendered to the Turks, under whom it has since continued. It is now governed by a Turkish pasha, who exercises despotic sway, seizes upon the property of the people at his pleasure, and from whose vigilant rapacity scarcely anything can be concealed. Under this iron rule the inhabitants are ground to poverty and the island is becoming rapidly depopulated.

III. Description and Remains. — Rhodes is immediately opposite the high Carian and Lycian headlands at the southwest extremity of the peninsula of Asia Minor. It is of a triangular form, about forty-four leagues in circumference, twenty leagues long from north to south, and about six broad. In the center is a lofty mountain named Artemira, which commands a view of the whole island; of the elevated coast of Carmania, on the north; the archipelago, studded with numerous islands, on the northwest; Mount Ida, veiled in clouds, on the southwest; and the wide expanse of waters that wash the shores of Africa on the south and southeast. It was famed in ancient times and is still celebrated for its delightful climate and the fertility of its soil. The gardens are filled with delicious fruit, every gale is scented with the most powerful fragrance wafted from the groves of orange and citron trees, and the numberless aromatic herbs exhale such a profusion of the richest odors that the whole atmosphere seems impregnated with spicy perfume. It is well watered by the river Candura and numerous smaller streams and rivulets that spring from the shady sides of Mount Artemira. It contains two cities — Rhodes, the capital, inhabited chiefly by Turks and a small number of Jews; and the ancient Lindus, now reduced to a hamlet, peopled by Greeks who are almost all engaged in commerce. Besides these there are five villages occupied by Turks and a small number of Jews, and five towns and forty-one villages inhabited by Greeks. The whole population was estimated by Savary at 36,500; but Turner, a later traveler, estimates them only at 20,000, of whom 14,000 were Greeks and 6000 Turks, with a small mixture of Jews residing chiefly in the capital.

The city of Rhodes is famous for its huge brazen statue of Apollo, called Colossus, which stood at the mouth of the harbor, and was so high that ships passed in full sail between its legs. It was the work of Chares of Lindus, the disciple of Lysippus; its height was one hundred and twenty-six feet, and twelve years were occupied in its construction. It was thrown down by an earthquake in the reign of Ptolemy III, Euergetes, king of Egypt, after having stood fifty-six years. The brass of which it was composed was a load for nine hundred camels. Its extremities were sustained by sixty pillars of marble, and a winding staircase led up to the top, whence a view might be obtained of Syria and the ships proceeding to Egypt in a large looking glass suspended to the neck of the statue. There is not a single vestige of this celebrated work of art now remaining. The present antiquities of Rhodes reach no further back than the residence of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem. The remains of their fine old fortress, of great size and strength, are still to be seen. The cells of the Knights are entire, but the sanctuary has been converted by the Turks into a magazine for military stores. The early coins of Rhodes bear the conventional rose flower, with the name of the island, on one side, and the head of Apollo, radiated like the sun, on the other. It was a proverb that the sun shone every day in Rhodes.

See Meursius, De Rhodo (Amst. 1675); Coronelli, Isola di Rodi (Ven. 1702); Paulsen, Descriptio Rhodi (Gott. 1818); Rost, Rhodus (Alton. 1823); Menge, Vorgeschichte von Rhodus (Cologne, 1827); and especially Rottier, Les Monuments de Rhodes (Brussels, 1828); Ross, Reisen nach Rhodos (Halle, 1852); Berg, Die Insel Rhodus (Brunswick, 1861).

## Rhodes, Alexandre de[[@Headword:Rhodes, Alexandre de]]

             a French missionary, was born at Avignon, March 15, 1591. In 1612 he was admitted to the Order of Jesuits at Rome, and after long solicitation received permission to go to India as a missionary. In the spring of 1619 he left Lisbon, but on arriving at Goa was detained under various pretexts until 1623, when he went on to Macao. He desired to penetrate into Japan, and devoted a year to the study of the language; but the great severity which was exercised against Christians obliged him to abandon his project. He went into Cochin-China, and at the end of six months began to preach in the native idiom. In 1627 he passed into Tonquin, and gained the confidence of the king; but the jealousy of courtiers destroyed the fruits of his labor. An edict was launched against the Christian religion, and Rhodes  was expelled. He returned to Macao and remained ten years, teaching and traveling through the province of Canton. He still desired to return to Cochin-China, and was again met by persecution — this time barely escaping with his life, being sentenced to perpetual banishment (1646). On his way to Europe he was imprisoned at Java, which changed his plan of travel. He embarked for Macassar, visited Bantam and Savata, and in 1648 traveled through the whole kingdom of Persia as well as Armenia, and finally left Smyrna for Genoa. The three years following he spent quietly at Rome, but his passion for travel caused him to start on a second expedition to Persia at the head of a new missionary enterprise. He died in that country Nov. 5, 1660. Rhodes's writings are chiefly narratives of travel, and are generally correct. We may mention, Relazione di Felici Successi della Santa Fede nel Regno di Tunchino (Rome, 1650): — Dictionarium Annamiticum, Lusitanum, et Latinum (ibid. 1651): — Sommaire des divers Voyages et Missions Apostoliques du P. A. de Rhodes, etc. (Paris, 1653). See Sotovel, Bibl. Script. Soc. Jesu:

## Rhodes, Georges de[[@Headword:Rhodes, Georges de]]

             brother of Alexandre, was born at Avignon in 1597. He embraced the rule of St. Ignatius at Lyons in 1613, taught rhetoric in the College of Notre Dame in that city, and was its director for twenty-seven years. He died May 17, 1661. Of his writings we have, Disputationes Theologicoe Scholasticoe (Lyons, 1661, 1671, 1676): — Philosophia Peripatetica (ibid. 1671).

## Rhodocus[[@Headword:Rhodocus]]

             ( ῾Ρόδοκος), a Jew who betrayed the plans of his countrymen to Antiochus Eupator. His treason was discovered, and he was placed in confinement (2Ma 13:21).

## Rhodon[[@Headword:Rhodon]]

             SEE ROSE.

## Rhodus[[@Headword:Rhodus]]

             (1Ma 15:23). SEE RHODES.

## Rhoetus[[@Headword:Rhoetus]]

             in Greek mythology,

(1) was king of the Marrubians, a son of Phorcys, and father to Anehemolus, of whom Virgil says that he defiled the bed of his stepmother Casperia.

(2) A centaur present at the wedding of Pirithous, who was wounded by Dryas, and fled.

(3) A giant who was killed by Bacchus.

## Rhopalus[[@Headword:Rhopalus]]

             in Greek mythology, was one of the numerous sons of Hercules. His son was named Phaestus, and built a city in Crete, to which he gave his own name.

## Rhythia[[@Headword:Rhythia]]

             in Greek mythology, was a nymph beloved of Apollo, by whom she became the mother of the Corybantes. An ancient town on the northeast coast of Crete derives from her its name — Rhytion.

## Riario, Raphael Galeotto[[@Headword:Riario, Raphael Galeotto]]

             an Italian prelate, better known as cardinal Riario, was born at Savona, May 3, 1451. He was in great favor with Sixtus IV, who raised him to the rank of cardinal in 1477, and afterwards conferred upon him several bishoprics and archbishoprics, together with the abbeys of Monte-Casino and Cava. During the fetes which celebrated his elevation to the cardinalate, Lorenzo de' Medici and his son were assassinated. The new cardinal did not escape the wrath of the Florentines, though he knew nothing of the plot, and was obliged to take refuge near the altar at which he was officiating. Under Alexander VI he took refuge in France, in his see of Treguier, but returned to Italy on the election of Pius III. He afterwards entered into a conspiracy with cardinal Petrucci against Leo X, who generously pardoned his offense. It is said that cardinal Riario was the first to introduce theatrical representations in Rome. He died July 7, 1521. See Annal. Eccl. 1472-84; Panvinio, Vita di Sisto IV; Infessura, Diario Rom.; Ammanati, Epistola 548 ad Fr. Gonzagam, p. 821.

## Rib[[@Headword:Rib]]

             (צֵלָע, tseld, Genesis 2, 21, 22, a side, as often rendered; Chald. עֲלִע, Dan 7:5), the part of Adam taken to form his wife (Genesis ut sup.). SEE EVE.

In the expression “fifth rib” (2Sa 2:23; 2Sa 3:27; 2Sa 4:6; 2Sa 20:10), the original has simply fifth (חֹמֶשׁ, chomesh, “fifth part” in Gen 47:26).

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

             in architecture, is a projecting band on a ceiling, etc. In Middle-age architecture ribs are very extensively employed to ornament ceilings, both fiat and vaulted; more especially the latter, when groined. In the earliest Norman vaulting the ribs generally consist of mere flat bands crossing the vault at right angles, the groins as well as the apex being left perfectly plain. As the style advances the ribs become molded, and are also applied to the groins, and are sometimes enriched with zig zags and other ornaments peculiar to the style, with carved bosses at the inter sections, as in the churches of Iffley, Oxfordshire, and Elkstone, Gloucestershire.

In Early English vaulting, and that of all subsequent periods, the groins are invariably covered by ribs, and the intersections are generally ornamented with bosses or other decorations, as is the case in the chapter house at Oxford. In the Early English style it is seldom that more ribs are used than those which cross the vault at right angles (cross-springers) and the (diagonal) ribs upon the groins, with sometimes one at the apex.

In the Decorated style additional ribs are introduced between the diagonal and cross-springers following the curve of the vault, and frequently also in other parts running in different directions, and uniting the whole into a kind of network, as at Tewkesbury Abbey, Gloucestershire. The apex of the vault is almost invariably occupied by a rib, which is often slightly curved upwards between the bosses. When they are numerous, it is not unusual to find that the more important ribs are of larger size than the others. In this style the ribs are sometimes ornamented with the characteristic ornament, the ball flower.

In ordinary Perpendicular vaulting, ribs are applied much in the same way as in the preceding style, but they are sometimes employed in greater profusion and in more complicated arrangements, by which the effect is by no means always improved, as at St. Mary Redcliffe Church, Bristol. In fan tracery vaulting the ribs radiate from the springing of each pendentive, and  generally become multiplied as they rise upwards, so that the whole surface is covered with tracery, which is usually enriched with featherings and other decorations.

Many churches, and some other ancient buildings, have raised ceilings, of wood or plaster, formed on the undersides of the timbers of the roof. A few of these, which are as old as the Decorated and Early English styles, are sparingly ornamented with small ribs; there is generally one along the top and others crossing it at considerable intervals. In some instances the ribs are more numerous in both directions, so as to divide the surface into rectangular compartments, or panels.

In the Perpendicular style ceilings of this kind are almost invariably formed in cants, which are divided into squares by small ribs with bosses, shields, or flowers at the intersections. Flat ceilings also, which are common in this style, are frequently divided into squares, and sometimes into other patterns, by molded ribs. In the time of queen Elizabeth and James I, ribs were much used on plaster ceilings, and were often arranged with considerable intricacy: at this period the intersections were usually either plain, or ornamented with small pendants. In some districts the purlins of a roof are called ribs.

## Ribadeneira, Pedro[[@Headword:Ribadeneira, Pedro]]

             a zealous Jesuit, pupil of Loyola, and industrious writer, was born at Toledo, Nov. 1, 1527. He was sent to Rome while young, and received by Lovola into his order in 1540, before it had been confirmed by the pope. In 1542 Ribadeneira removed to Paris for further studies in philosophy and theology, and three years later to Padua, where he completed his studies.  In 1549 he became teacher of rhetoric at Palermo. In 1552 he returned to Rome and labored effectively for the instituting of the Collegium Germanicum. Loyola sent him to Belgium in 1555, in order to promote the interests of Jesuitism, more particularly to secure permission of Philip II to introduce the order. He succeeded in his mission, and contributed by direct labors as a preacher at Louvain, and by defending the order against attacks of the Sorbonne, towards the realizing of that project. In 1559 he was appointed proepositus of the Collegium Germanicum, and in 1560, after having taken the four vows of his order, proepositus for the province of Tuscany. In 1563 he was commissary of the order in Sicily, and afterwards assistant to the generals Lainez and Francis Borgia. He attended the second general assembly of his order as the representative of Sicily, and the third as the representative of Rome, and subsequently was made overseer of all the houses of the Jesuits in Rome. Physical sufferings led to his return to Spain in 1584, and to the occupation of a writer in behalf of his order as his chief work. He was engaged in collecting the materials for a work intended to describe the services of the Jesuits in Spain and India when he died, at Madrid, Oct. 1, 1611. His head was found in an uninjured state, it is said, as late as 1633. As a thinker, Ribadeneira was characterized by credulity; as a writer, by a diffuse story-telling style in the manner of the old legends, whence his name was sarcastically transformed into Peter de Badineria, i.e. “chatterer.” His works were numerous, and are fully given in Zettler's large Universal-Lexikon. They are ascetical or biographical in nature, though frequently devoted specifically to the interests of his order. We mention his Lives of Ignatius de Loyola, Borgia, Lainez, and Salmeron: — the Flos Sanctorum (transl. into English, 1669) — all in numerous editions: — the Hist. du Schisme de l'Angleterre (Valencia, 1588): — Le Prince Chretien, a defense against Machiavelli (Antw. 1597, etc.): — Catalogus Scriptorum Soc. Jesu — a catalogue of Jesuit writers, their provinces, colleges, houses, etc. (ibid. 1608); also translations from Albert the Great and Augustine into Spanish. SEE ALEGAMBE.

## Ribai[[@Headword:Ribai]]

             (Heb. Ribay', רַיבִי,pleader [with Jehovah; Sept. ῾Ριβα‹, ῾Ρηβαί), the father of Ittai, one of David's mighty men of the tribe of Benjamin (2Sa 23:29; 1Ch 11:31). B.C. ante 1020.

## Ribalta, Francisco[[@Headword:Ribalta, Francisco]]

             an eminent Spanish painter, was born at Castellon de la Plana in 1551. He studied the works of Raphael and Sebastian del Piombo in Rome, and settled in Valencia. His design, color, and composition are highly commended. Among his works are a Last Supper, a Holy Family, and The Entombment of Christ. He died in 1628.

## Riband[[@Headword:Riband]]

             (Num 15:38). SEE LACE.

## Ribas, Juan De[[@Headword:Ribas, Juan De]]

             a Spanish ecclesiastic, was born at Cordova in 1612. He belonged to the Order of Dominicans, and taught for many years in the convent of St. Paul at Cordova. His death occurred Nov. 4, 1687. Besides sermons and some ascetic treatises, he wrote, Sueldo al Cesar y a Dios su Gloria (1663, fol.): this appeared under the name of Jose de Zais. Many writers have attributed to Ribas the work entitled Teatro Jesuitico, etc. (Coimbra, 1654, 4to), which bears the name of Francisco de la Piedad. This treatise speaks with great severity of the Jesuits, and was burned by order of the Inquisition. Ribas denied the authorship of the work, but was known to have written others against the Jesuits, one of which is entitled Barragan botero. See Echard, Script. Ord. Proedicat.; Goujet, in Moreri's Dict. Hist.; Peignot, Dict. des Livres Condamnes, 2, 154; Brunet, Manuel du Libraire.

## Ribash[[@Headword:Ribash]]

             SEE ISAAC BEN-SHESHETH.

## Ribbeck, Conrad Gottlieb[[@Headword:Ribbeck, Conrad Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was, born at Stolpe, Pomerania, March 21,1759. He studied at Halle, was in 1779 teacher at his native place, in 1786 pastor at Magdeburg, in 1805 at Berlin, and died June 28, 1826, doctor of theology and member of the superior consistory. He published ascetical and homiletical works, for which see Doring, Die deutschen Kanzebedner, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:495; 2:92, 148, 163, 168, 175, 177, 202, 205, 207, 232, 294, 331. (B.P.)

## Ribera, Francisco[[@Headword:Ribera, Francisco]]

             a Spanish Jesuit and commentator, was born at Segovia in 1537, and was educated at Salamanca. He became a Jesuit in 1570, and from that time was employed in interpreting the Scriptures, filling the chair of professor of divinity in the seminary at Salamanca until his death, in 1591. He wrote commentaries on the minor prophets, on John (Gospel arid Epistles), Apocalypse, and Epistle to Hebrews; also a treatise De Templo, etc.; and a Life of St. Theresa.

## Ribera, Jose[[@Headword:Ribera, Jose]]

             called Spagnoletto, a Spanish painter and engraver, was born at San Felipe, Jan. 12, 1588. In his youth he was sent to the capital of his native province to receive a classical education, but did not give himself to that exclusively. His love for art gradually drew him away from all else, and he studied painting under various masters. It is supposed that his peculiar and rather harsh style was gained while under the instruction of Michael Angelo Caravaggio at Naples. Later he went to Rome, to Parma, and other cities of Italy, studying and working with diligence. He finally settled in Naples, was made court painter, and received many favors. In 1630 he was made member of the Academy of St. Luke, and in 1644 received from the pope the decoration of the Order of Christ. He died at Naples in 1656. The works of Ribera deserve a place among those of the best engravers and etchers. Of his works in this style may be mentioned, The Martyrdom of St. Bartholomew: — Silenus, and a portrait of John of Austria. His paintings are numerous; in the Louvre is The Adoration of the Shepherds, and among many in Naples a Deposition from the Cross: this is remarkable for a harmony and vigor of tone hardly equaled by his other works. See Cean [Bermudez], Diccionario Historico; Quillet, Dictionnaire des Peintres Espognols; Caballero, Observaciones sobra la Patria de Ribera (Valencia, 1824, 4to).

## Riblah[[@Headword:Riblah]]

             (Heb. Riblah', רַבְלָה,fertility; Sept. Δεβλαθᾶ or Βηλά, v.r. ῾Ρεβλαθᾶ, ῾Ραβλαάμ, Α᾿βλαᾶ, etc.), the name probably of two places.

1. One of the landmarks on the eastern boundary of the land of Israel, as specified by Moses (Num 34:11). Its position is noted in this passage with much precision. It was between Shepham and the sea of Cinnereth, and on the “east side of the spring.” There is but one other incidental notice in Scripture tending to fix the site of Riblah; it is said to be “in the land of Hamath” (2Ki 23:33; 2Ki 25:21; Jeremiah 52, 9). The land of Hamath lay on the north of the ancient kingdom of Damascus. SEE HAMATH. It embraced the plain on both sides of the Orontes, extending from the city of Hamath southward to the fountain of the Orontes. This position, however, seems inconsistent with the preceding, inasmuch as  Hazar-enan, the starting-point from the extreme north of the east border, lay at a considerable distance to the east of Hamath (the order given being thus: “entrance to Hamath, Zedad, Ziphron, Hazar-enan,” Num 34:8-9), so that a line drawn towards the Sea of Cinnereth (Lake of Tiberias) should have gone (one would think) a good deal to the east of Riblah; and the Riblah of the boundary line also seems to have been greatly nearer the Galilaean lake than the Riblah on the Orontes was, since Riblah was the town in the list nearest to the lake. The renderings of the ancient versions and the Targums only serve to confuse the passage. In the Sept. the division of the Hebrew words is even mistaken. Thus הרבלה משפםis rendered ἀπὸ Σεπφαμὰρ Βηλά, joining the two first letters of the second word to the first word.

The Vulg., too, without any authority, inserts the word Daphnim; and Jerome affirms that Riblah is identical with Antioch (Onomast. s.v. “Reblatha”). In his commentary on Ezekiel he is still more explicit. He says, “From the end, therefore, of the northern side-that is, from the temple (atrio) Enan — the border extends, according to the book of Numbers, to Sepham, which the Hebrews call Apamia, and from Apamia to Rebla, which is now called Antioch of Syria. And that it may be known that Rebla means that city which is now the noblest in Coele-Syria, the words contra fontem are added, which, it is manifest, signify Daphne” (Opera, 5, 478. ed. Migne). This singular view appears to be taken from the Targums (Bochart, Opera, 1, 431). Some suppose that the Daphne here mentioned was the place near the Lake of Merom of which Josephus speaks (War, 4, 1,1); and that therefore Ain may mean one of the fountains of the Jordan. With this agrees Parchi, the Jewish traveler in the 13th and 14th centuries, who expressly discriminates between the two (see the extracts in Zunz, Benjamin, 2, 418), and in our own day J.D. Michaelis (Bibel fur Ungelehrten; Suppl. ad Lexica, No. 2313) and Bonfrerius, the learned editor of Eusebius's Onomasticon. So likewise Schwarz (Palest. p. 28). But Dr. Porter has endeavored to draw the boundary line in consistency with the position of the Riblah or Ribleh above described (Hand-book for Syria, p. 580); and Winer, Gesenius, Van de Velde, and others seem to have found no difficulty in identifying the Riblah of Numbers with that of Jeremiah and the later historical books. But Palestine never actually extended thus far north, and the arguments of Keil (ad loc.) appear to us conclusive that another Riblah must there be meant south of Mt. Hermon, perhaps the site afterwards called Leshem and Dan, the present Tell el-Kady. SEE TRIBE.

2. Riblah of Hamath lay on the great road between Palestine and Babylonia, at which the kings of Babylonia were accustomed to remain while directing the operations of their armies in Palestine and Phoenicia. Here Nebuchadnezzar waited while the sieges of Jerusalem and of Tyre were conducted by his lieutenants; hither were brought to him the wretched king of Judaea and his sons, and after a time a selection front all ranks and conditions of the conquered city, who were put to death, doubtless by the horrible torture of impaling, which the Assyrians practiced, and the long lines of the victims to which are still to be seen on their monuments (Jer 39:5-6; Jer 52:9-10; Jer 52:26-27; 2Ki 25:6; 2Ki 25:20-21). In like manner Pharaoh-necho, after his victory over the Babylonians at Carchemish, returned to Riblah and summoned Jehoahaz from Jerusalem before him (2Ki 23:33). Riblah is probably mentioned by Ezekiel (Eze 6:14), though in the present Hebrew text and A.V. it appears as Diblah or Diblath (q.v.).

This Riblah has no doubt been discovered, still retaining its ancient name, Ribleh, on the right (east) bank of el-Asy (the Orontes), upon the great road which connects Baalbek and Hums, about thirty-five miles northeast of the former and twenty miles southwest of the latter place. It lies about twelve miles east by north of its great fountain, which still bears the name el-Ain. The advantages of its position for the encampment of vast hosts, such as those of Egypt and Babylon, are enumerated by Dr. Robinson, who visited it in 1852 (Bib. Res. 3, 545). He describes it as “lying on the banks of a mountain stream in the midst of a vast and fertile plain yielding the most abundant supplies of forage. From this point the roads were open by Aleppo and the Euphrates to Nineveh, or by Palmyra to Babylon... by the end of Lebanon and the coast to Palestine and Egypt, or through the Bukaa and the Jordan valley to the center of the Holy Land.” It appears to have been first alluded to by Buckingham in 1816 (Arab Tribes, p. 481). The most singular object in this neighborhood is a monument called Kamoa el Hermel, which stands on a high mound several miles farther up the Orontes than Riblah (that is, farther south), but distinctly visible from it. It stands on a pedestal of three steps, and in the form of two quadrilateral masses rising one above another, the lower ornamented with figures of dogs, stags, hunting-instruments, etc., and terminating in a kind of pyramid, it reaches the height of about sixty feet (as given by Robinson), but Van de Velde makes it about twenty more (2, 469). One of the corners, the southwest, is in a dilapidated state; in other respects it is entire, and forms a solid mass  of masonry built of large square stones. It is known to be of great antiquity; but its precise date and object are unknown; and Abulfeda is the first writer who is known to have mentioned it. Dr. Thomson, who was the first to draw attention to it, would connect it with the ancient Babylonian dynasty (Bib. Sacra, May, 1847).

## Ribov, Georg Heinrich[[@Headword:Ribov, Georg Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 8, 1703, at Lichau, Hanover, and studied theology at Halle. In 1722 he went to Bremen as teacher at the gymnasium, and in 1727 to Helmstaidt, where he commenced his academical career. In 1732 he accepted the pastorate at Quedlinburg, in 1736 was called to Gottingen, and made doctor of theology in 1737. In 1739 he was appointed professor at the university, but resigned his position in 1759 to accept a call to Hanover. Ribov died Aug. 22, 1774. Of his publications we mention, De Iis in quibus Christum Imitari nec Possumus nec Par est (Gotlingen, 1737): — Institutiones Theologiae Dognmaticae (1740): — De Apostolatu Judaico, Speciatim Paunino (1745): — De Termino Vaticiniorum Veteris Testamenti Ultimo (1748): — De Antiquitatibus: — Judaico: — Christianis (1752): — De Initio Munerais Apostolici Sancti Pauli (1756): — De Methodo qua Theologia Moralis est Tradenda (1759). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Riccaltoun, Robert[[@Headword:Riccaltoun, Robert]]

             an eminent divine of the Church of Scotland, minister of Hobkirk, was born near Jedburgh in 1691, and died 1769. He wrote, A Sober Inquiry into the Ground of the Present Differences in the Church of Scotland (1723, 12mo): — An Inquiry into the Spirit and Tendency of Letters on Theron, etc. (Edinb. 1762, 12mo). After his death, 1771, three volumes of his writings were published, edited by Rev. R. Walker: vol. 1, Essays on Human Nature, etc.; vol. 2, Treatise on the General Plan of Revelation; vol. 3, Notes, etc., on Galatians. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Riccardi, Niccolo[[@Headword:Riccardi, Niccolo]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Genoa in 1585. He studied in Spain, joined the Order of Dominicans, and in 1613 was chosen to occupy the chair of theology at Valladolid. He soon became noted as a preacher, and was called to court. Philip III, charmed with his eloquence, called him a prodigy; from this he was familiarly called Il Padre Mostro. In Rome his success was equally great; he was in favor with Urban VII, who made him professor in the college of Minerva in 1621, and in 1629 master of the palace. He died at Rome, May 30, 1639. As a preacher he was characterized by great passionateness, grandeur of imagery, and vigor of thought. His writings are, Ragionamenti sopra le Litanie di Nostra Signora (Rome, 1626, 2 vols. fol.).: — Historioe Concilii Tridentini Emaculatoe Synopsis (ibid. 1627, 16mo), and several minor treatises. He had also gathered materials for several important works, among them a Commentary on the whole Scriptures: — De Christiana Theologia, 3 vols.: Adversaria Sacra: — Antique Lectiones: — besides his Sermons. See Oldoino, Athenoeum Ligusticum; Erythrseus, Pinacotheca; Echard and Quetif, Bibl. Script. Ord. Proedicat. 2, 503; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letter. Ital. 8.

## Ricchini, Tommaso Agostino[[@Headword:Ricchini, Tommaso Agostino]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born at Cremona in 1695. At the age of fifteen he entered the Dominican order, devoted himself to poetry, and published at Milan several religious pieces. He afterwards taught theology in the principal houses of his order in Lombardy, and filled the office of prior at Cremona. Called to Rome in 1740, he became in 1749 secretary of the Congregation of the Index and examiner of the bishops. He enjoyed the favor of Benedict XIV, who often made use of his learning in literary work. In 1759 Ricchini became one of the masters of the pope's palace. He died at Rome in 1762. Among his numerous works are, In Funere Benedicti XIII (Rome, 1730, 4to): — De Vita Vinc. Gotti (ibid. 1742, 8vo): — Patris Mlonetoe adversus Catharos et Valdenses (ibid. 1743, fol.); the first edition of this work was accompanied with notes and a life of the author: — De Vita et Cultu B. Alberti Villaconiensis (ibid. 1784, 8vo): — De Vita ac Rebus Cardinalis Gregorii Barbidici (ibid. 1761, 4to), translated into Italian by Fr. Petroni. See Arisi, Cremona Litterata; Catalan, De Secretario S. Congr. Indicis Lib. II.

## Ricci (Lat. Ricius), Paul[[@Headword:Ricci (Lat. Ricius), Paul]]

             was a convert from Judaism in the 16th century. For a time he was professor at Padua, in Italy, when the emperor Maximilian I appointed him as his physician. Ricci was especially famous as a Cabalist, and translated a large portion of Joseph Gikatilla's cabalistic work entitled שערי אורה(The Gates of Light), which he dedicated to Maximilian, and which Reuchlin used very largely. Erasmus was his special friend, whom he also defended against Stephen the Presbyter, who had attacked the Cabala, as can be seen from a letter of Erasmus, dated March 10, 1516: “Paulus Riccius sic me proximo colloquio rapuit, ut mira quaedam me sitis habeat cum homine saepius et familiarius conserendi sermones.” To his former coreligionists he endeavored to prove the truth of Christianity philosophically. Living in a time when the Turks were the terror of the European nations, he used his influence to bring about a union between the Christians against their common foe by publishing his In Virulentam Immanissimamque Turcarum Rabiem, ad Principes, Magistratus, Populosque Germanioe (Augsburg, 1546). Of his numerous writings we  only mention, Statera Prudentium, a mystical treatise on Moses, the Law, Christ, and the Gospels (s. loc. 1532): — Opuscula Varia (printed by Burgfrank, Pavia, 1510, and often). See Fürst, Bibl. Judaica, 3, 155; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 1, 966; Jocher, Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Adams, Hist. of the Jews, 1, 346; Bayle, Dictionnaire, s.v. “Riccio;” Kalkar, Israel u. die Kirche, p. 87; Levita, Massoreth ha-Massoreth (ed. Ginsburg), p. 9; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9:193 sq.; Pick, Mission among the Jews, in the Quar. Rev. (Gettysburg, 1876; reprinted in the Jewish Intelligencer, Lond., Nov. and Dec., 1876), p. 368. (B.P.)

## Ricci, Antonio[[@Headword:Ricci, Antonio]]

             called Barbelunga, a painter of the Neapolitan school, was born at Messina in 1600. He went to Rome and studied under Domenichino; in that city he left several fine paintings. On his return to his native country he executed numerous works which now decorate its churches. Among them we mention, the Conversion of St. Paul: — an Ascension: — St. Charles Borromeo: — and a very beautiful picture of St. Cecilia in a church in Palermo. See Domenici, Vite de' Pittori Napolitani; Lanzi, Storia Pittorica; Ticozzi, Dizionario; Guida di Messina; Mortillaro, Guida di Palermo.

## Ricci, Bartolomeo (1)[[@Headword:Ricci, Bartolomeo (1)]]

             an Italian scholar, was born at Lugo, in Romagna, in 1490. He studied at Bologna, Padua, and Venice, and in the last-named city had charge of the education of Luigi Cornaro, afterwards cardinal. He subsequently taught at Ravenna. His reputation as instructor gained for him in 1539 the position of tutor to Alfonso and Luigi d' Este, sons of the duke of Ferrara. In 1561 he received from Alfonso letters of nobility with the title of lord of Vendina. Ricci wrote with elegance, but his style has been criticized as harsh and unequal. He died in 1569. His works have been collected into  three volumes, Opera (Padua, 1748). See G. delia Casa, Discorso sulla Vita di B. Ricci.

## Ricci, Bartolomeo (2)[[@Headword:Ricci, Bartolomeo (2)]]

             an Italian Jesuit, was born at Castelfidardo. He was master of the novices at Nola and at Rome, and afterwards provincial of his order in Sicily. lie died at Rome, Jan. 12, 1613. His works are Vita Jesu Christi ex Evangeliorum Contextu (Rome, 1607, 8vo), translated into Italian (ibid. 1609, 4to): — Triumphus Christi Crucifixi (Antwerp, 1608, 4to): — Monotessaron Evangelicum (Poitiers, 1621, 4to). See Tiraboschi, Storia della Letter. Ital. 7.

## Ricci, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Ricci, Lorenzo]]

             an Italian Jesuit, was born at Florence, Aug. 2, 1703. He was of a noble family, and at a very early age joined the Society of Jesus. He was employed in various ways, and finally became secretary-general under Luigi Centurione. At the death of his superior, Ricci was elected to fill his place, May 21, 1758. But there soon arose those difficulties which finally destroyed the order. Its members were banished from the principal courts of Europe, and Ricci received from France proposals of reform. To all such he replied haughtily that there was nothing to be reformed in the society, Sint ut sunt, out non sint. In January, 1769, several of the states of Europe solicited the abolishment of the order from Clement XIII. This pope died soon after, and his successor, Clement XIV, was also appealed to. He finally yielded, and on July 21, 1773, signed an edict which suppressed the entire order. Ricci, with his assistants, was transferred to the Castle of St. Angelo at Rome, where he died, Nov. 24, 1775. See Caraccioli, Vie du P. Ricci; Ch. Sainte-Foi, Vie du P. Ricci (2 vols. 12mo); Ami de la Religion.

## Ricci, Matteo[[@Headword:Ricci, Matteo]]

             one of the earliest and most successful missionaries of the Romish Church. He was born at Macerata, in Ancona, Oct. 6, 1552, and was early devoted to a clerical life. After a thorough instruction in languages and the sciences, he entered the Order of Jesuits in 1571. His comprehensive learning, together with his shrewdness, led to his being selected some years later to undertake the work of reestablishing the missions of his Church in China. The Minorite Monte Corvino had founded them so long ago as A.D. 1294; but the hostility of the resident Nestorian Christians, and the opposition of  the native religions, Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism, followed by the persecutions of the Ming dynasty, had destroyed all the fruits of his labors. The Capuchin Gaspar de Cruz had attempted to reintroduce Christianity into China in about A.D. 1522, but without success. Ricci arrived with two companions in 1583 and was permitted to settle at Tsao-King-Fo. Aided by the Jesuit Roger, he was even permitted to build a Christian church in the immediate vicinity of a Chinese temple. His method was to gain the confidence of the people by conforming to their manners and prejudices. He assimilated his first teachings, for example, to the religious and moral tenets of Confucianism; and he constructed a map of the world in which he grouped all other states about China as their center. The Chinese priests were eventually successful, however, in exciting suspicion against him, from which he was compelled to flee to the seaport Chow-chu. In 1595 he attempted a visit to Pekin, but, being considered a Japanese in disguise, he was unable to secure a presentation at court. Five years later he repeated the undertaking, and was fortunate enough to be selected by the Portuguese as the bearer of presents to the emperor; and he so improved the opportunity that he was thereafter permitted to reside with the other missionaries of his company in Pekin itself. Ricci now labored with increased energy in his mission. He acquired the respect of the imperial family and of prominent mandarins through his mathematical proficiency and through the arts of painting and music. Having given much attention to the vernacular, he was able to write a number of books in the Chinese language, and to adapt all his sayings and writings to the promotion of Christianity.

His influence extended, in course of time, beyond the precincts of the court and the capital, and was felt to the advantage of his cause in several provinces of the empire. The foundations for a durable work appeared to have been definitely laid when Ricci died, May 11, 1609. The mission immediately felt his loss in the withdrawal of the emperor's favor, and in being obliged to remove from the capital for a time. But the services rendered by the missionaries to the cause of mathematical science, and even to the State, were so valuable that they were soon permitted to resume their appropriate labors The Jesuits Schall, Verbiest, Pereira, and others are prominent in the subsequent history of Roman Catholic missions to China, and the successes realized were large but the entrance of other orders upon this work, e. g the Dominicans and Franciscans, introduced an element of discord among the missionaries themselves which impaired their usefulness and brought them into disfavor with the Chinese rulers. Incessant persecutions followed, extending from 1722 to 1845, which have  almost obliterated the traces of the work of Ricci and his colleagues. SEE CHINA in this Cyclopaedia. See Trigault, De Christ. Exped. apud Sinas ex Comm. Ricci (Augsburg, 1615, 4to); Wertheim, Ricci, in Pletz's Neue theol. Zeitschr. (Vienna, 1833), No. 3; Schall, Relatio de Initio et Progr. Missionis Soc. Jesu apud Chinenses (Ratisbon, 1672, and with Notes by Mannsegg, Vienna, 1834); Du Halde, Descript. de l'Emp. de la Chine (Paris, 1736; German, with Mosheim's introd., Rostock, 4 vols. 4to); Gutzlaff, History of China (Canton, 1833; German by Bauer, Quedlinb. 1836, 2 vols.; and with continuation by Neumann, Stuttgart, 1847); Wittmann, Herrlichkeit d. Kirche in ihren Missionen (Augsburg, 1841, 2 vols.); Gesch. d. kathol. Missionen bis auf unsere Zeit (Vienna, 1845); Hue, Chines. Reich (Leipsic, 1856, 2 vols.) Comp. Gieseler, Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch. III, 2, 658 sq.

## Ricci, Michael Angelo[[@Headword:Ricci, Michael Angelo]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastic, was born in Rome in 1619. He was created a cardinal in 1681, and died in 1683. He was skilled in mathematical sciences, and published at Rome (4to) Exercitatio Geometrica, which was reprinted in London, and annexed to Mercator's Logarithmotechnia. See Landi, Hist. Lit. d'Italie; Fabroni, Vitoe Ital. vol. 2.

## Ricci, Scipione[[@Headword:Ricci, Scipione]]

             bishop of Pistoja and Prato, in the duchy of Tuscany, was born at Florence Jan. 9, 1741, of parents belonging to an ancient and honorable family. He was early brought under Jansenistic influence, and developed the tendencies so received while pursuing his etheological studies with the Florentine Benedictines. In 1766 he became a priest, and soon afterwards a canon and auditor at the nunciature of Florence. In 1775 he visited Rome, on the occasion of the enthronement of pope Pius VI, and became acquainted with the intrigues of the papal court, which sought in vain to secure his adhesion. He returned to Florence, and became vicar general to the archbishop, in which capacity he introduced a Jansenist Catechism. In 1780 he was made t bishop. In connection with duke Leopold of Tuscany, he now attempted to carry through reforms similar to those effected by Joseph II in the empire of Austria. The inquiries instituted with reference to the state of nunneries, etc., revealed scandalous irregularities and crimes against morality carried to even unnatural lengths; but the removal of Leopold to ascend the throne of the German empire, soon after the Synod of Pistoja (q.v.), brought the reformatory career of Ricci to a close by depriving him of his protector. The opposition of the populace caused him to resign his bishopric, and the papal bull Auctorem Fidei annulled the decrees of the Synod of Pistoja (Aug. 28, 1795). He submitted to the papal decision, after a long struggle, in 1799, was subsequently imprisoned on political grounds, and died Jan. 27, 1810. See De Potter, Vie de Sc. de Ricci (Brussels, 1825, 3 vols.; German, Stuttg. 1826, 4 vols.).

## Ricci, Sebastiano[[@Headword:Ricci, Sebastiano]]

             a painter of the Venetian school, was born at Belluno in 1659. At the age of twelve he entered the studio of Cervelli, who took him to Milan. He  there studied under Lisandrino, and afterwards went to Bologna. Receiving the patronage of the duke of Parma, Ricci was enabled to go to Rome to study design. He remained there until 1694, and spent several subsequent years in traveling through Europe, leaving his pictures in many of the most important cities. He finally settled in Venice, where he remained during the rest of his life. He died in 1734. The paintings of Ricci are noted for the nobility of the figures, grace of attitude, correctness of design, and brilliancy of coloring. Nevertheless, he never seemed able to rid his works of a certain disagreeable mannerism. Among those in Florence are a St. Charles and St. Gregory Celebrating Mass; at the Museum of Dresden, an Ascension and Christ Giving to Peter the Keys of Paradise. See Orlandi, Abbecedario; Lanzi, Storia Pittorica; Ticozzi, Dizionario; Bertoluzzi, Guida di Parma.

## Ricciarelli, Daniele[[@Headword:Ricciarelli, Daniele]]

             (called Daniel of Volterra), a painter and sculptor of the Florentine school, was born at Volterra in Tuscany, in 1509. He studied design under Sodoma, and afterwards under Peruzzi at Siena. On going to Rome, he became a pupil of Pierino del Vaga, and assisted his master in adorning the Vatican and other buildings. He became a friend of Michael Angelo, who procured for him the patronage of pope Paul III, and continued his work in the Vatican after the death of his master Pierino. A great deal of the success of Ricciarelli was due to Angelo, who often furnished designs for his paintings and gave him valuable advice. The Descent from the Cross, considered one of the three finest paintings in Rome, owes much of its renown to the assistance which Ricciarelli received from his friend. Were this his only work, he would have ranked among the greatest of Italian masters, but many of his other pictures have a sad lack of expression. On the death of Paul III, Ricciarelli lost his position as superintendent of the works of the Vatican, and gave himself thenceforth to sculpture. He modeled the sculptures of Michael Angelo in the chapel of St. Lorenzo in Florence; and while engaged upon an equestrian statue of Henry II of France, he died suddenly, in 1566. In the Louvre is a bas-relief of Christ Placed in the Tomb, attributed to Ricciarelli. Among his minor paintings are Massacre of the Innocents and Martyrdom of St. Cecilia at Florence; at Dresden, a Holy Family (after Michael Angelo); and in the Louvre, David Killing Goliath. See Vasari, Vite; Lanzi, Storia Pittorica; Pistolesi, Descrizione di Roma.

## Riccio, Domenico[[@Headword:Riccio, Domenico]]

             a painter of the Venetian school, was born at Verona in 1494. After receiving the instructions of Giolfino, he went to Venice to study the works of Giorgione and Titian. He decorated the ducal palace at Mantua, and at Verona left many celebrated frescos. He died in 1567. Among his works are Conversion of St. Paul: — Marriage of St. Catharine: — Resurrection of Lazarus: — The Samaritan, and The Resurrection of Christ. See Ridolfi, Vite degli Illustri Pittori Veneti; Bennasuti, Guida di Verona.

## Riccio, Felice[[@Headword:Riccio, Felice]]

             an Italian painter, son of the preceding, was born at Verona in 1540. A pupil of his father, he continued his, studies at Florence under Jacopo Ligozzi. Here he acquired an entirely different style from that of his father. His Madonnas have much grace and delicacy, and he excelled in portrait painting. He painted many small pictures upon stone. His larger paintings are almost innumerable; among them are Adoration of the Magi: — Descent from the Cross: — St. Lucia and St. Catharine: — a colossal St. George, and a fresco on the facade of a house at Verona. See Ridolfi, Vite degli IIlustri Pittori Veneti.

## Riccioli, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Riccioli, Giovanni Battista]]

             an Italian astronomer and Jesuit, was born at Ferrara in 1598, and was professor of philosophy, theology, etc., at Bologna and Parma. By authority of his superiors, he devoted himself to astronomy, that he might confute the Copernican system, which he attempted to do in his Almagestum Novum (1651, 2 vols.). According to his theory, the sun, moon, Jupiter, and Saturn revolve around the earth; while Mercury, Venus, and Mars are satellites of the sun. He also published an able treatise on mathematical geography and hydrography in 1661, and Astronomia Reformata in 1665. He died in 1671. See Fabroni, Vitoe Italorum Doc. Excel.; Tiraboschi, Storia della Letteratura Italiana.

## Rice, Aaron[[@Headword:Rice, Aaron]]

             a Methodist preacher, was a native of Green County, Ky. Of his early history and his conversion, little is known. He became a member of the Louisville Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, and was  long esteemed as an able and reputable minister. He died Sept. 9, 1846. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1846.

## Rice, Benjamin Holt, D.D[[@Headword:Rice, Benjamin Holt, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Bedford County, Virginia, November 29, 1782. He was licensed by the Orange Presbytery, September 28, 1810; in 1814 was installed pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Petersburg, Virginia, where he remained for fifteen years; in 1832 was elected secretary of the Home Missionary Society; in 1833 was chosen, pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Princeton, N.J., where he remained, discharging his duties faithfully for fourteen years, and then became pastor of the church near Hampden-Sidney College, Virginia. He died January 24, 1856. Dr. Rice possessed superior powers as a preacher. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4:625.

## Rice, David[[@Headword:Rice, David]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Hanover County, Va., Dec. 20, 1733. He began his classical studies under the Rev. John Todd, and went to New Jersey College in 1759, becoming a member of the junior class. He graduated in 1761; was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Hanover, Nov., 1762; and was ordained and installed pastor of Hanover Church, Va., Dec., 1763. Giving up this charge, he afterwards preached for about ten years in Bedford County, Va., migrating to Kentucky in Oct., 1783, where he labored for fifteen years. In 1798 he removed to Green County, but did not take any pastoral charge. Mr. Rice assisted in the establishment of Hampden Sidney College, was one of the trustees of the Transylvania University, and president of the board from 1783 to 1787. The following is a list of his publications: Essay on Baptism (1789): — Lecture on Divine Decrees (1791): — Slavery Inconsistent with Justice, etc. (1793, 12mo): — An Epistle (1805): — Second Epistle (1808): — Letters and Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 246.

## Rice, Edward, D.D.[[@Headword:Rice, Edward, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was educated at Christ's Hospital, whence he was elected as an exhibitioner to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1813. He was one of the classical masters of Christ's Hospital in 1820; vicar of Horley, Surrey, in 1827; headmaster of Christ's Hospital in 1836; and died in 1853. He published several sermons: On Liturgies (Lond. 1820, 8vo): — On the Coronation of George IV (ibid. 1821, 8vo): — Two Sermons on the Romish Church, etc. (ibid. 1829, 8vo). See Lond. Gent. Mag. March, 1853, p. 316. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rice, Henry Leffler[[@Headword:Rice, Henry Leffler]]

             a Dutch Reformed minister, was the son of Henry and Elizabeth (Leffler) Rice, and was born in Washington County, Ky., June 25, 1795. His early education was conducted by the Rev. James Vance, of Kentucky, who took young Rice for some years into his own home. After spending three years in Transylvania University, Ky., he was graduated from that institution in the class of 1818. Having early experienced the renewing  grace of God, in his sixteenth year he united, by a public profession of his faith, with the Presbyterian Church at Corydon, Ind. Immediately after leaving the university, he entered the theological seminary at Princeton, N.J., whence he was regularly graduated in three years, after passing through the full course of study. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New Brunswick, Oct. 3, 1821, and was ordained as an evangelist by the same presbytery, Oct. 2, 1822. After his ordination he spent two years in mission work in new portions of the West, and then returned to New Jersey, where he accepted a call to become pastor of the Dutch Reformed Church at Spottswood, and was installed in September, 1825. Here he labored faithfully and successfully about eight years, until he was released by his classis, April 16, 1834, in order that he might accept a call to the German Reformed Church in Chambersburg, Pa., over which latter charge he was installed in May, 1834, and in which he continued until his death. While residing in Chambersburg, he became profoundly interested in the literary and theological institutions of the German Reformed Church located at Mercersburg, and in the fall of 1836 he was induced to undertake an agency on their behalf, his pulpit being supplied, meanwhile, by neighboring ministers. For a considerable time he was president of the Board of Trustees of Marshall College at Mercersburg. After his removal to Mercersburg he studied the German language, and so thoroughly mastered it as to preach occasionally in that tongue to the German people in his vicinity, to their great delight. While prosecuting the above mentioned agency with great energy and success, he was stricken down by fever, and died at Chambersburg, May, 3, 1837. Mr. Rice married, in 1821, Miss Gertrude Van Dyke; youngest daughter of Matthew Van Dyke, of Mapleton, four miles from Princeton, N.J. She was a woman of estimable character and fervent piety. She died June 9, 1837, about a month after her husband. Mr. Rice was a man of large culture and of extraordinary piety, energy, and influence. (W.P.S.)

## Rice, John H. (1)[[@Headword:Rice, John H. (1)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Sharon, N.Y., March 9, 1800. He received a good academical education, studied theology in Auburn Seminary, N.Y., was licensed and ordained in 1832, and subsequently became pastor of the following churches: Cambria, N.Y.; Beamsville and Grimsby, C.W.; Rutland, N.Y.; Barton, C.W.; Grand Haven, Mich.; Gowanda and Sheridan, N.Y.; Wattsburg and Wayne, Pa.; Clymer, N.Y.; Middlebrook and Green, Pa. He died in the latter place, June 21, 1858. Mr.  Rice was at one time an agent for the American Tract Society. He was a faithful laborer and devoted servant of Christ. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 122. (J.L.S.)

## Rice, John H. (2)[[@Headword:Rice, John H. (2)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Middle Tennessee, Dec. 26, 1826. He professed religion and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1839. He was admitted on trial into the Arkansas Conference Nov. 9,1849, ordained deacon Nov. 9, 1851, and elder Nov. 20, 1853. He continued in active service until 1857, when he located. He joined the Confederate army in 1863, was readmitted into the Arkansas Conference Oct. 21, 1863, and appointed chaplain of Colonel Shaver's regiment. He was killed in a skirmish with United States troops, March 25, 1864. For many years he had been a faithful minister, an able defender of the doctrines of his Church, and a bold dispenser of truth. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, M.E. Church, South, 1864, p. 529.

## Rice, John Holt, D.D[[@Headword:Rice, John Holt, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, brother of the foregoing, was born July 23,1818, at Petersburg, Virginia. He graduated from the College of New Jersey in 1838, pursued the study of law for three years in Princeton, was admitted to the bar, and practiced for a time at Richmond, Virginia. He graduated from Princeton Seminary in 1845, and the same year was licensed by the New Brunswick Presbytery. For several months he assisted his father, who was at that time pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Princeton. Then going south, he labored a year in New Orleans, Louisiana, as city missionary. In 1847 he began to preach at Tallahassee, Florida. He next became pastor of the village church at Charlotte Court-House, Virginia, and was released in 1855. For a time he served as agent of the Presbyterian Board of Publication in Kentucky and Tennessee. In 1856 he was installed pastor of Walnut Street Church in Louisville, Kentucky, where he remained til. 1861. During the civil war he preached in the South, at Lake Providence, Louisiana, and Brandon and Vicksburg, Mississippi. In 1867 he went to Mobile, in 1869 to Franklin, Tennesee, and afterwards to Mason, till 1876. After this he labored as an evangelist, preaching to the poor and destitute. He died September 7,1878. After the division of the Presbyterian Church, in 1861, he adhered to the Southern General Assembly. Dr. Rice had a knowledge wide and varied; his sermons were often of a very high order. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1879, page 49.

## Rice, John Holt, D.D.[[@Headword:Rice, John Holt, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near New London, Bedford County, Va., Nov. 28, 1777. He became tutor in Hampden Sidney College, Va., in October, 1796, and on Sept. 12, 1803, was licensed to preach. On Sept. 29, 1804, he was ordained and installed pastor of the church at Club Creek, still retaining his connection with the college until the latter end of the year, when he resigned his tutorship and removed to a small farm in Charlotte County. Here, his salary being insufficient, he also opened a school, and thus continued until 1812, when he became pastor of Mason's Hall, Richmond, Va. In May, 1816, he came to New York as a representative of the Bible Society of Virginia at the formation of the American Bible Society. He afterwards attended the meeting of the General Assembly at Philadelphia, where he was often sent again as a delegate from his presbytery. He was elected president of the College of New Jersey Sept. 26, 1822, as well as professor in the Union Theological Seminary in Prince Edward County, Va., on Nov. 16 of the same year: he only accepted the latter and resigned his pastoral charge. He entered upon his professorship Jan. 1, 1824. In May, 1830, he came to New York, where he delivered one of the series of the Murray Street Lectures. After this his health gradually declined until his death, Sept. 3, 1831. Dr. Rice started, in 1815, and published for a time the Christian Monitor, the first weekly  religious newspaper which appeared in Richmond. In January, 1818, he published the first number of the Virginia Evangelical and Literary Magazine, which he continued till 1829. His other writings are, a memoir of S. Davies and of Rev. J.B. Taylor; also a number of occasional sermons, addresses, and pamphlets, among which we will notice his Historical and Philosophical Considerations on Religion, addressed to James Madison, Esq. (the ex-president), which, after being first published as successive articles in the Southern Religious Telegraph in 1830, appeared in a small volume in 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit; 4, 325.

## Rice, John Jay[[@Headword:Rice, John Jay]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was the son of Gabriel and Phebe (Garrard) Rice, and brother of Rev. Nathan L. Rice, D.D. He was born in Garrard County, Ky., Sept. 7, 1804, and received his early education wholly in the country schools in the neighborhood of his father's residence. At the age of fourteen he entered Center College at Danville, Ky., but, after staying a short time, he returned home. Subsequently he again entered Center College and remained two years, but did not graduate. While at college he and his brother Nathan were both converted during a glorious revival which occurred in Danville. Soon after, having devoted himself to the work of the ministry, he began to study theology under Rev. James C. Barnes, a widely known pastor and preacher of Kentucky, at the same time laboring in Mr. Barnes's and neighboring churches. He was licensed by the Transylvania Presbytery, April 2, 1827, but soon became convinced that he was not so well furnished as to make full proof of his ministry, and went as a licentiate to Princeton Theological Seminary, where he studied two .years, 1829-31. While a student in the seminary he resided at Dutch Neck, about four miles south of Princeton. and statedly supplied the Church at that place, with frequent help from his brother Nathan. The preaching of the two brothers made a deep impression upon the people of Dutch Neck. Many were hopefully converted. The brothers were regarded with strong affection, and their names are held in tender and loving remembrance to this day among the people of the region. Having returned to Kentucky at the end of his second year in the seminary, Mr. Rice was ordained April 5, 1833, by the Presbytery of Ebenezer, and soon became widely popular as a preacher. In the years 1832-34 he preached as stated supply to the Church at Millersburg, Ky., and from 1834-35 at Maysville, Ky. But, alas! the hand of a fatal pulmonary disease was soon laid upon the zealous and eloquent preacher. After aiding his brother Nathan for two or three years in editing a  religious paper which the latter had started, he felt constrained to try a milder climate, and went to Florida. There, from Tallahassee as a center, he traveled much in Central Florida, and his soul was aroused at sight of the ignorance of the people and their destitution of Gospel privileges. Although sick, he must preach; and he did preach until he had utterly exhausted his remaining strength. He was at length seized with a high congestive fever, and died at Quincy, Fla., Sept. 19, 1840. He was a bright and shining light. His abilities were extraordinary. His pulpit gifts were highly attractive. His spirit was Christ-like, tender, loving, full of zeal. Mr. Rice married, May 5, 1829, Miss Emily Craig Welsh, of Lincoln, Ky., and at his death left only one child, a little daughter, who still survives (1878). Had he lived to a good old age, Mr. Rice would unquestionably have been one of the most prominent and illustrious ornaments of the American pulpit. (W.P.S.)

## Rice, Luther[[@Headword:Rice, Luther]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Northborough, Mass., March 25, 1783, graduated at Williams College in 1810, and immediately entered the Congregational Theological Seminary at Andover. He was ordained as a foreign missionary Feb. 6, 1812, and sailed a few days after for Calcutta; but his views on baptism having, in the meantime, undergone a change, he joined the Baptist Church on his arrival there, and came back to this country for the purpose of waking up the Baptist churches to an effort in behalf of foreign missions. He was the chief motor of the formation of the Baptist General Convention in 1814. He afterwards became agent of the Columbian College, for the establishment of which he had zealously labored, and with which he remained connected until his death, Sept. 25, 1836. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6:602.

## Rice, Nathan[[@Headword:Rice, Nathan]]

             a Methodist minister, was born June 10, 1792. in Coventry, R.I. His mother was a member of the Freewill-Baptist Church, and the first sermon he heard by a Methodist minister was from Rev. William Jewett. He united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in Lee, Mass., at the age of seventeen years. In 1819 he joined the New York Conference, and continued in active service until 1854, when, worn down with labor, he took a superannuated relation. Mr. Rice was a true patriot, an example of simplicity, unmurmuring, of a kind and sympathetic nature which delighted  in the welfare of others. His death, which occurred at Washingtonville, N.Y., Feb. 21, 1864, was very happy, a fit closing of such a life. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, 1864.

## Rice, Nathan Lewis, D.D.[[@Headword:Rice, Nathan Lewis, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Garrard County, Ky., Dec. 29, 1807; died June 11, 1877. To procure funds to enable him to obtain an education preparatory to the study of law, he taught a school at the early age of sixteen. At the age of eighteen he united with the Presbyterian Church. He entered Center College, Danville, Ky., in the fall of 1826, and during a part of his course was a teacher of Latin in the preparatory department. After remaining some years, without graduating he entered upon the study of theology, and at the close of the year was licensed to preach by the Transylvania Presbytery. Feeling the need of a more thorough preparation for the work of the ministry, he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, where, during his course, he became known for his large attainments and extraordinary ability. He accepted a call to the Presbyterian Church at Bardstown, Ky., and was ordained and installed in 1833. The more effectually to counteract the efforts at proselyting by the Roman Catholic college at that place, he established an academy for girls, and subsequently one for boys, and also founded a newspaper called the Western Protestant, which was afterwards merged in the Presbyterian Herald of Louisville. He continued in this pastoral relation for eight years, and became, in 1841, stated supply for the Church at Paris, Ky. While here he entered into a discussion with Alexander Campbell, the president of Bethany College, Va., on the subject of baptism.

The debate was held in Lexington, Ky. The moderators consisted of some of the most eminent lawyers of the state, among, whom was Henry Clay. This discussion created a wide and intense interest throughout the country, and brought out the full power of Dr. Rice as a disputant, and gained for him the reputation of being the greatest polemic of the age. The debate was written out by the disputants and published in a large octavo volume, which was extensively circulated. Soon after, Dr. Rice received a call to the Central Presbyterian Church, Cincinnati, O., and entered upon his duties as its pastor in 1844. He was installed June 12, 1845. He was in labors more abundant, and in connection with his work as pastor he wrote several volumes, taught classes of candidates for the ministry, held a debate with the now archbishop Purcell of Cincinnati, which was published in a volume, also a debate with the Rev. Mr. Pingree of the Universalist Church of that city. Calls came to him from  every quarter, so extensive had become his fame. In 1853, on the death of Dr. Potts, he accepted a call to the Second Presbyterian Church of St. Louis, Mo., and was installed Oct. 9 of the same year. He edited, besides his other labors, the St. Louis Presbyterian, and published several books. At the meeting of the General Assembly in Nashville, Tenn., in 1855, he was elected moderator. In 1858 he accepted a call to the North Presbyterian Church, Chicago, Ill. The Church was small and weak, but under his labors it grew strong and flourishing. While there he edited the Presbyterian Expositor. In May, 1859, he was elected by the General Assembly to the professorship of didactic and polemic theology in the Northwest Theological Seminary at Chicago, which duties he performed in addition to pastoral work. In 1861 he was called to the Fifth Avenue Church in the city of New York, to succeed Dr. J.W. Alexander, deceased. Here his labors proved too great for his strength, and he sought release in 1867, and retired to a farm near New Brunswick, N.J. After resting a year, he was called to the presidency of Westminster College, Mo., where he remained until 1874, when he was elected to the chair of didactic and polemic theology in the theological seminary at Danville, Ky. Here he performed his last earthly labors; and at the close of the session in 1877, having become greatly impaired in health, he sought retirement and rest at the residence of his brother-in-law in Bracken County, Ky., where within the brief space of one month, with a mind full of peace and holy joy, he died June 11. (W.P.S.)

## Rice, Phineas, D.D.[[@Headword:Rice, Phineas, D.D.]]

             an eminent Methodist preacher, was born in the State of Vermont in 1786. Having been converted when about sixteen years of age, he was soon called to publicly exercise his gifts. He was received on trial in the New York Conference in 1807, and was sent to labor as junior preacher on the Granville Circuit. The ministry of Dr. Rice extended over a period of fifty- four years, and each year during all that long period he was returned effective, and received regularly his appointment. He labored on circuits sixteen years, in stations eleven, and in the presiding elder's office twenty- eight years, excepting the last year, which was not completed at the time of his death. He was a member of every General Conference from 1820 to 1856, inclusive. He received the degree of D.D. from Wesleyan University. Dr. Rice was a marked man in every respect. His piety was deep, fervent, and abiding, and he was eminently a man of prayer. Scrupulously punctual, industrious, and self-sacrificing, he was a wise counsellor and a true friend.  He had a natural vein of pleasantry, and his conceptions were not unfrequently quaint, and quaintly expressed. Even when in the pulpit, at times a facetious remark, evidently unpremeditated, would cause his hearers to smile. These smiles were not seldom suddenly followed by tears as the preacher passed from one phase of his subject to another. His pathos and tenderness were strangely blended with his wit and humor; and if one could have wished that there had been less of the latter qualities, it was nevertheless evident that there was in them no bitterness, no harshness, no undue severity. As an expounder of ecclesiastical law and an administrator of the discipline Dr. Rice had few equals. During the last months of his life he suffered greatly but patiently, and calmly contemplated the approach of death, which came Dec. 4, 1861. See Minutes of the Conferences, Meth. Episc. Church, 1862, p. 70.

## Rice, Samuel D., D.D[[@Headword:Rice, Samuel D., D.D]]

             a general superintendent of the Methodist Church in Canada, was born in Maine in 1815. He studied for some time at Bowdoin College, and was converted in his seventeenth year. In 1837 he entered the itinerant ministry. With the exception of a year at the Sackville Wesleyan College, he spent six years in the city of St. John. From 1853 to 1857 he was treasurer and moral governor of Victoria College; from 1857 to 1860 stationed in the city of Hamilton; from 1863 to 1878 governor of the Wesleyan Ladies' College there; in 1873 and 1874 president of the conference; in 1880 appointed to Winnipeg, where he remained for three years as chairman of that district. In 1882 he was elected president of the Methodist Church of Canada; and at the first session of the General Conference of the United Methodist churches he was elected senior general superintendent. He died December 11, 1884. Dr. Rice was a man of tall and commanding  appearance. As a presiding officer he was dignified and firm as a preacher, earnest and forcible; as a pastor and administrator his principle was "not to mend our rules, but keep them." He was a man of strong faith and lofty courage. See (Canada) Christian Guardian, December 1884.

## Rice, William H.[[@Headword:Rice, William H.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Shelby County, Ky., July 15, 1827. His early education was thorough; his collegiate studies were pursued in Wabash College, Ind., and Hanover College, Ind. He spent one year in the theological seminary at New Albany, Ind., was licensed to preach in April, 1853, and ordained the same year by Vincennes Presbytery, and preached as stated supply for the Church at Rockport, Ind. In 1854 he removed to Texas, in the hope of restoring his health by a warmer climate. While there he preached for the churches at Palestine and Mound Prairie, in the bounds of the Eastern Texas Presbytery. In 1858 he resigned his charge, went to Alabama, and finally, in 1859, returned to Indiana, where he died, Sept. 27, 1859. Mr. Rice had a mind that was clear and penetrating, and his preaching powers were excellent. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 106. (J.L.S.)

## Rich, Claudius James[[@Headword:Rich, Claudius James]]

             an Oriental traveler, was born March 28, 1787. His researches as a pioneer explorer of Oriental countries were patient and protracted, and, though not able to sink his shafts as deep as Layard and other modern explorers, his labors are equally worthy of regard. Even as scientists have been supplanted by after discoveries, so the time may come when Wilkinson and Layard, and Schliemann and Cesnola, may be outdone by future explorers. The works of Rich are entitled, Memoires sur les Ruines de Babylon  (1812): Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan (1836). He died Oct. 5, 1821. (W.P.S.)

## Rich, Edmund, St[[@Headword:Rich, Edmund, St]]

             (French Saint-Edme), archbishop of Canterbury, was born in Abingdon, Berkshire, about 1190. Having studied at Oxford, he graduated in theology at the University of Paris, and lectured there for some time on Scripture. He taught philosophy at Oxford from 1219 to 1226, enjoying also a prebend in Salisbury. On April 2, 1234, he was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury, enforcing discipline, by authority given by the king, in spite of the opposition of clergy and others. Pope Gregory IX appointing Italians to vacancies, Edmund deemed this an abuse of the papal power, and, about 1239, retired to the Cistercian abbey of Pontigny, in France. Being in feeble health, he went to Soissy, in Champagne, where he died. He was canonized in 1246 by Innocent IV. Among his works are, Constitutions, in thirty-six canons, found in Labbd's edition of the Councils: — Speculum Ecclesioe, in vol. 3 of Bibliotheca Patrum. A manuscript Life of St. Edmund, by his brother Robert, is preserved in the Bodleian library; another by Bertrand, his secretary, was published in Martene's Thesaurus Anecdotorum. See Appletons' Cyclopaedia, s.v.

## Rich, John[[@Headword:Rich, John]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Davie County, N.C., Oct. 10, 1815. His conversion took place in 1837, he was licensed to preach in 1839, and was received into the North Carolina Conference in 1840. During the succeeding ten years of his laborious and useful life he filled many of the most important appointments in the conference with great acceptability. At the conference of 1850 he was superannuated, and on Oct. 25, 1851, he died. His distinguishing traits were clearness and penetration of thought, childlike simplicity, and unaffected piety. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1851, p. 345.

## Rich, Obadiah[[@Headword:Rich, Obadiah]]

             an American bibliopole, was born in 1783. He published several works bearing on bibliography, but that for which he was most distinguished was the Bibliotheca Americana Nova. He died Jan. 20, 1850. (W.P.S.)

## Richard[[@Headword:Richard]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was by birth a Norman. Very little is known of his early life. When the primary education of Richard was finished he was received into the monastery of Christ Church, Canterbury, and his manner being noticed by archbishop Theobald, he selected him to be one of his chaplains. Richard's first preferment was to the place of prior, in the monastery of St. Martin, Dover, in 1140. He was consecrated to the see of Canterbury, April 7, 1174, at Anagni, and "a more amiable man than archbishop Richard never sat in the chair of Augustine." In 1176 he was sent to Normandy, to arrange a marriage between the princess Joanna and William, king of Sicily. Ten years after he was seized with a violent chill when making a journey to Rochester, and died while there, February 16, 1184. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 2:508 sq.

## Richard (1)[[@Headword:Richard (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected to the see of St. Andrew's in 1163. He died in 1173. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 11.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of Moray in 1187. He died at Spynie in 1203. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 136.

## Richard (3)[[@Headword:Richard (3)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was probably bishop of Dunkeld in 1249. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 80.

## Richard (4)[[@Headword:Richard (4)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made bishop of the Isles in 1252. He died in 1274. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 300.

## Richard I[[@Headword:Richard I]]

             king of England, surnamed COEUR DE LION, was the third son of Henry II by his queen, Eleanor. He was born at Oxford in September, 1157. In the treaty of Montmirail, entered into Jan. 6, 1169, between Henry and Louis VII of France, it was stipulated that the duchy of Aquitaine should be made over to Richard, and that he should do homage for it to the king of France; also, that he should marry Adelais, youngest daughter of Louis. In 1173 Richard joined his mother and his brothers Henry and Geoffrey in their rebellion against the king. The rebels submitted in September, 1174, when two castles in Poitou were allotted to Richard. In 1183 a second family feud broke out in consequence of Richard refusing to do homage to his elder brother, Henry, for the duchy of Aquitaine. In this war his father sided with Richard against Henry and Geoffrey. It was ended by the death of prince Henry, when Richard, actuated probably by jealousy of his youngest brother, John, declared himself the liegeman of France for his possessions in that country. This step led to a war between the king of England and Philip of France, in which Richard fought against his father. The balance of success being decidedly with France, a treaty in accordance with this fact was about to be executed, when, by the death of Henry II, on July 6, 1189, Richard became king of England. He landed in his own country on Aug. 15, 1189, and was crowned in Westminster Abbey on Sept. 3 following. In the hope of gaining salvation, and with the certainty of following the occupation which he loved best, he now set out with an army to join the third Crusade, then about to leave Europe. He united his forces to those of France on the plains of Vezelay, and the two armies (numbering in all 100,000 men) marched together as far as Lyons, where they separated, and proceeded by different routes to Messina, where they again met. Here Richard betrothed his nephew Arthur to the infant daughter of Tancred, king of Sicily, with whom he formed a close alliance.

The Sicilian throne was at that time claimed by the emperor Henry VI; and the alliance with Tancred, from this cause, afterwards turned out a very unlucky one for Richard. Having settled a difference which now arose between him and Philip respecting his old engagement to Philip's sister Adelais, the English king, on April 7, 1191, sailed from Messina for  Cyprus, carrying along with him Berengaria, daughter of Sancho VI, king of Navarre. He had fallen in love with this princess, and he married her in the island of Cyprus, where he halted on his way to Palestine. But even love did not make him forget his favorite pastime of war: he attacked and dethroned Isaac of Cyprus, alleging that he had ill-used the crews of some English ships which had been thrown on his coasts. Having then presented the island to Guy of Lusignan, he set sail on June 4, 1191, and on the 10th of the same month he reached the camp of the Crusaders, then assembled before the fortress of Acre. The prodigies of personal valor which he performed in the Holy Land have made the name of Richard the Lion- hearted more famous in romance than it is in history. The man was the creation and impersonation of his age, and the reader who follows his career may perhaps be more interested than he would be by the lives of greater men, or by the history of a more important period. On Oct. 9, 1192, he set out on his return to England. After some wanderings and adventures, he became the captive of the emperor Henry VI, who shut him up in a castle in the Tyrol. John, meanwhile, ruled in England, and he and Philip of France had good reasons for wishing that Richard should never return to his kingdom. He disappointed them; not, however, until he had paid a heavy ransom, and even, it is said, agreed to hold his kingdom as a fief of the empire. On March 13, 1194, he found himself once more in England. His brother John, who had acted so treacherously towards him, he magnanimously forgave, but with Philip of France he could not deny himself the pleasure of a war. In the contest which followed he was generally victorious, but in the end it proved fatal to himself. He was killed by an arrow shot from the castle of Chaluz, which he was besieging, on March 26, 1199. If Richard had the vices of an unscrupulous man, he had at least the virtues of a brave soldier. See Stubbs, Chronicles and Memorials of Richard I, from a MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College (1864). SEE CRUSADES.

## Richard Of Armagh[[@Headword:Richard Of Armagh]]

             whose real name was Fitz-Ralph, and whose historical name is Armachanus — was born in Devonshire, England, or, according to some, at Dundalk, in Ireland. He was educated at Oxford — first at University and then at Baliol College. He graduated as doctor of divinity, and in 1333 was commissary-general of that university. His first Church promotion was to the chancellorship of the Church of Lincoln, July, 1334; he was next made archdeacon of Chester, in 1336; and dean of Lichfield, April, 1337. At Oxford he opposed the affectation and irregularities of the mendicant friars. In 1347 he was advanced to the archbishopric of Armagh, and still continued his opposition to the friars, who became so incensed at his exposure of them that they had him cited before Innocent VI at Avignon, where he defended his opinions with great firmness, but was decided against by the pope. He died at Avignon, Nov. 16, 1360, not without suspicion of poison. He was unquestionably a man of great talents and sound judgment. Perhaps his best panegyric is his being ranked, by some Catholic writers, among heretics. He is said by Bale to have translated the New Test., by Fox, the whole Bible, into Irish. His published works are, Defensio Curatorum adversus Fratres Mendicantes (Paris, 1496): — Sermones Quatuor ad Crucem (Lond. 1612).

## Richard Of Bury[[@Headword:Richard Of Bury]]

             an English prelate, was born at St. Edmundsbury, Suffolk, in 1281. His family name was Richard Angerville, or Angarville. He was educated at Oxford, and became tutor to prince Edward (afterwards Edward III). Having been sent on a mission to the pope, he formed a friendship with Petrarch, and was appointed bishop of Durham in 1333. He was made high chancellor of England in 1334; treasurer of England in 1336; co- ambassador to France twice in 1338. He died in 1345. Richard was a man of great erudition, for his day, and a liberal patron of learning, as well as a great collector of books, which he devised to a company of scholars at Oxford, and which were deposited in a hall once occupying the site of Durham (now Trinity) College. For an estimate of his character, see Jortin, Remarks on Eccles. Hist. 2, 394. His Philobiblon de Amore Librorum (Cologne, 1473, 4to) was translated into English (Lond. 1832, 8vo); the American edition was collated and corrected, with notes, by Samuel Hand (Albany, 1861, 12mo and 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Richard Of Cirencester[[@Headword:Richard Of Cirencester]]

             (so called from his birthplace, in Gloucestershire, England) — in Latin Ricardus Corinensis — was born in the first half of the 14th century. Nothing is known of his family or circumstances. In 1350 he entered the Benedictine monastery of St. Peter, Westminster (whence he is sometimes called the “Monk of Westminster”), and remained there the rest of his life. His leisure was devoted to the study of British and Anglo-Saxon history and antiquities. In the prosecution of these studies Richard is said to have visited numerous libraries and ecclesiastical establishments in England, and it is certain that in 1391 he obtained a license from his abbot to visit Rome. He died in 1401 or 1402. The work to which he owes his celebrity is his De Situ Britannioe, a treatise on the ancient state of Great Britain. This work was brought to light by Dr. Charles J. Bertram, professor of English at Copenhagen (1747), who sent a transcript of it, together with a copy of the map, to Dr. Stukeley, the celebrated antiquarian. From this transcript Dr.. Stukeley published an analysis of the work, with the itinerary (1757, 4to; London, 1809): — Historia ab Hengista ad Annum 1348: — Tractatus super Symbolum Majus et Minus: — and Liber de Offciis Ecclesiasticis.

## Richard Of Devizes[[@Headword:Richard Of Devizes]]

             was a monk of the priory of St. Swithun, at Winchester, in the 12th century, who wrote a history of the first years of the reign of Richard I — 1189-92: — Chronicon Ricardi Divisiensis de Rebus Gestis Ricardi Primi Regis Anglioe (Lond. 1838, 8vo): — also Richard of Cirencester's Description of Britain; translated and edited by J. Giles (Lond. 1841, 8vo): — Chronicles of the Crusades (1848, sm. 8vo). See Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. etc.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Richard Of Hexham[[@Headword:Richard Of Hexham]]

             was the first prior of his house before 1138. He compiled a short history of the last two years of the reign of Henry I, and of the more remarkable events of that of Stephen, and a history of the Church of Hexham. Tanner also attributes to him — probably on slender foundation — a history of the reign of Henry II. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Richard Of St. Victor[[@Headword:Richard Of St. Victor]]

             a celebrated mystic and writer of the 12th century, concerning whose life but little is known. He was of Scottish extraction, and at an early age entered the Augustinian convent of St. Victor at Paris, where he became the pupil of the learned and pious Hugo (q.v.). He was made sub-prior of the abbey in 1159 and prior in 1162, and in the latter capacity contended persistently against the bad administration and the unedifying life of the abbot Ervisius, until he effected the removal of the latter from his office. Nothing further has been handed down with reference to the circumstances of his life, save that he was a friend of St. Bernard, and died in 1173. A number of writings from his hand have been preserved, divided, as respects character, into exegetical, ethical, dogmatical, and mystical, or contemplative, works.

As the exegesis is little more than mystical allegory, the works in which it is contained possess simply historical value; but those which deal with other subjects have much higher merit, though the mystical element is everywhere apparent. Of his ethical works, mention is made of his tracts, De Statu Interioris Hominis: — De Eruditione Interioris Hominis: — De Esterminatione Mali et Promotione Boni: — De Differentia Peccati Mortalis et Venialis. Of his dogmatic writings the following are prominent, De Verbo Incarnato, where, in imitation of Augustine, sin is praised as felix culpa, because it necessitated the incarnation of Christ: — two books, De Emmanuele, against the Jews: — and, very particularly, six books, De Trinitate, with which compare De Tribus Appropriatis Personis in Trinitate. In these works the author appears as one of the most skilful dialecticians and experienced psychologists of his time. Like his master Hugo, he aims to unite knowledge and faith, scholasticism and mysticism. He acknowledges the right of philosophical inquiry, but insists that for the Christian thinker faith is the necessary prerequisite of knowledge. This principle governs him in the work on the Trinity, which is perhaps the most remarkable product of his mind. He first shows that reason proves the existence of but one supreme substance, which is God. An examination of the divine attributes follows, particularly of power and knowledge, and it is argued that in their perfection they can belong only to the one Absolute Being. The idea of love is then introduced, in order to effect the transition to the subject of the Trinity.

As love, like all the attributes of the Deity, must be perfect, it implies necessarily a plurality of Persons. Abstract love (amor) cannot become concrete (caritas) without an object upon which it may fasten. The  Supreme Love can only be expended on a Supreme Object; and as it is eternal, its object must be so likewise. But as it is a proof of weakness not to allow society in love, these two Persons, who love each other, desire a third Person whom they may love with equal fervor. As there can be no inequality in the divine nature, these Persons differ simply in their origin — one being self-originated, and the others deriving their origin from him, though in an eternal sense. In his mystical writings Richard appears as the first to undertake a scientific theory of contemplation, on which account he bore the name of Magnus Contemplator. He begins with a sober psychological analysis, by which he shows that reason (ratio) and inclination or will (affectio) are the fundamental powers, and that they are aided, the former by the imagination, the latter by the senses. Reason needs to perceive the forms of visible things before it can ascend to the contemplation of the invisible, and the will needs sensual objects in order to the exercise of its powers. The human spirit is the reflection of the divine, and the recognition of self and the purification of the heart are necessary to an apprehension of God, though even then supernatural help and revelation are needed. The highest aim of contemplation can only be realized “per mentis excessum,” caused by the direct operation of grace, or brought about by practice, and consisting in a widening (dilatatio) of the spirit to greater keenness and comprehension, in an elevation (sublevatio) by which it is exalted above itself, but retains its consciousness of external things, or in an alienation or transport (alienatio) in which such consciousness is lost, and a trance-like state ensues, in which present and future are seen in visions. This entire process of contemplation rests on the idea of love to God, and has for its object the recognition of God. There is no hint of an absorption into the Divine Being. The influence of this theory is seen in the tendency of the more distinguished of the scholastics to rate the objects of contemplation above those of dialectics from this time, and in the more or less complete reproduction of the theory itself in the writings of Bonaventura and in the mysticism of Gerson. With Richard of St. Victor the glory of that school came to an end. The first edition of his works appeared in Paris in 1528; reprinted at Lyons in 1534; at Cologne in 1621. The best edition is that of Rouen (1650, fol.). Concerning the MSS. of unprinted works, see the Hist. Lit. de la France, 13, 486. See Schmid, Mysticismus d. Mittelalters (Jena, 1824), p. 308 sq.; Engelhard, R. von St. Victor u. Joh. Ruysbrock (Erlangen, 1838); Liebner, R. a Sto. V. de Contempl. Doctrina (Gott. 1837 and 1839, 4to), pt. 1, 2; Helfferich, Christl. Mystik (Gotha, 1842), 2, 373 sq.; Noack, Christl. Mystik  (Königsb. 1853), 1, 91 sq.; Baur, Christl. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit, 2, 521 sq.

## Richard, Charles Louis[[@Headword:Richard, Charles Louis]]

             a French ecclesiastic, was born at Blainville sur l'Eau, Lorraine, in April, 1711. At the age of sixteen he entered the Dominican convent at Blainville, and took the vows of that order at Nancy. He taught theology at Paris, was made doctor, and in various ways showed himself the champion of his sect. In 1778 he was obliged to retire to Flanders in consequence of the part he had taken in a controversy concerning the marriage of a converted Jew. When the Revolution occurred, he went into Belgium, and at the time of  the second French invasion, in 1794, was living at Mons. On account of his great age he was unable to flee, and, though he remained some time in concealment, was at last discovered, brought before a military commission, and sentenced to be shot. The sentence was executed on Aug. 16,1794. His crime was that of publishing, before the entrance of the French, a treatise entitled Parallele des Juifs qui ont Crucifie Jesus-Christ avec les Francais qui ont Execute leur Roi (Mons, 1794, 8vo); and not, as Barbier pretends, one entitled Des Droits de la Maison d'Autriche sur la Belgique (ibid. 1794, 8vo). The works of father Richard are numerous; among them are, Dissertation sur la Possession des Corps et l'Infestation des Maisons par les Demons (1746, 8vo): — Bibliotheque Sacroe, etc. (Paris, 1760, 5 vols. fol.); in this work he was assisted by several other Dominicans; the supplement bears his name and that of Giraud; a new edition, with additions and corrections, appeared early in the present century (ibid. 1821-27, 29 vols. 8vo): — Examen du Libelle intitule Histoire de l'Etablissement des Moines Mendiants (Avignon, 1767, 12mo): — Analyse des Conciles Generaux et Particuliers (Paris, 1772-77, 5 vols. 4to): — La Nature en Contraste avec la Religion et la Raison (ibid. 1773, 8vo): Annales de la Charite et de la Bienfaisance Chretienne (ibid. 1785, 2 vols. 12mo): — Voltaire de Retour des Ombres, etc. (Brussels and Paris, 1776, 12mo): — Sermons (Paris, 1789, 4 vols. 12mo). He also wrote many treatises and brochures, all relative to the civil oath required of the priests and the Revolution. See Guillon, Les Martyrs de la Foi; Carron, Les Confesseurs de la Foi, vol. 4; Ami de la Religion, 1822, vol. 30; Notice in vol. 1 of the new edition of the Bibliotheque Sacroe.

## Richard, Jean-Pierre[[@Headword:Richard, Jean-Pierre]]

             a French preacher, was born at Belfort, Feb. 7, 1743. In 1760 he was admitted to the Order of Jesuits, and on its dissolution he went to Lorraine, where he superintended the education of the nephew of the prince-bishop. About 1786 he returned to France, and preached in Paris, but did not take the oath. In 1805 he became canon of Notre Dame. He died at Paris Sept. 29, 1820. His Sermons were published in 1822 (Paris, 4 vols. 12mo). See L'Ami de la Religion, 34, 65, 77.

## Richardot, Francois[[@Headword:Richardot, Francois]]

             a French prelate, was born in 1507 at Morey-Ville-Eglise, Franche-Comte. While very young he joined the Order of Augustines at Champlitte, and  was sent in 1529 to Tournay to teach theology. He afterwards taught in Paris. During his visit to Italy, which occurred a little later, he obtained from the pope a release from the vows of his order, with permission to wear the secular dress. He was made canon of Besancon, and in this capacity rendered such efficient service to his bishop that he was made suffragan, with the title of bishop of Nicopolis. On Nov. 11, 1561, he was installed bishop of Arras, but had scarcely taken possession of the see when he obtained from Philip II the creation of the University of Douai. He founded this institution in 1562, and taught there till his death. He was a member of the Council of Trent in 1563, assisted at the provincial Council of Cambrai in 1565. and held several synods. At the taking of Malines by the duke of Alba he was made prisoner, but regained his liberty a month after. He died at Arras July 26, 1574. Of his writings we have, Ordonnances Synodales (Antwerp, 1588, 4to): — Trait de Controverse, Sermons, translated into Latin by Francois (Schott, 1608, 8vo): — L'Institution des Pasteurs (Arras, 1564. 8vo): — Oraisons Funebres, of Isabella of France, wife of Philip II. His works are all remarkable for great erudition. See Stapleton, Oraison Funebre de Richardot, in his Oeuvres (1620, 4 vols. fol.;); Valere Andre, Bibl. Belgica; Gazet, Hist. Eccles. des Pays-Bas; Gallia Christiana, vol. 3; Dom Berthod, Vie MSS. de Fr. Richardot, in the Memoires de la Société Royale d'Arras, p. 170.

## Richardot, Jean[[@Headword:Richardot, Jean]]

             a French prelate, was born at Arras in the 16th century. His father sent him to the best schools in Spain, and his precocity attracting the attention of Philip II, he was admitted to the privy council of that monarch. While in Flanders, somewhat later, he was made ambassador to Clement VIII, and received in 1602 the bishopric of Arras. He was afterwards prior of Morteau, and in 1610 was made archbishop of Cambrai, which office he held till his death, Feb. 28, 1614. See Le Carpentier, Hist. de Cambrai et du Cambresis.

## Richards, Austin, D.D[[@Headword:Richards, Austin, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Plainfield, Massachusetts, February 9, 1800. He graduated from Amherst College in 1824, and from Andover, Theological Seminary in 1827, was pastor at Trancestown, N.H., and at Nashua thereafter until 1870, and died at Boston, Massachusetts, May 9, 1883. See Cong. Year-book, 1884, page 33.

## Richards, Elias Jones, D.D.[[@Headword:Richards, Elias Jones, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was the son of Hugh and Jane Ellis Jones Richards, and was born in the valley of the Dee, England, Jan. 14,1813. While he was yet a child his parents came to the United States, and settled in the State of New York. He was prepared for college at Bloomfield Academy, in the town of Bloomfield, N.J., and was graduated at the college of New Jersey  at Princeton in 1834. In early life he gave evidence of conversion, and at about seventeen years of age united with the Brick Church in the city of New York. After leaving college he spent one year in teaching as tutor in a private family at Fredericksburg, Va. In 1835 he entered Princeton Theological Seminary, and passed through a full course of three years. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New York in 1838, and ordained by the same presbytery, sine titulo, in New York city in the same year. For one year (1839-40) Mr. Richards preached as stated supply to the Presbyterian Church at Ann Arbor, Mich. From 1840 to 1842 he was pastor of the Second Presbyterian Church at Paterson, N.J., and from 1842 to 1846 he was pastor of the Western Presbyterian Church in the city of Philadelphia. On Oct. 14, 1846, he was installed as pastor of the First Presbyterian Church of Reading, Pa. Here he really began the best and greatest work of his life — a work which was prosecuted with fidelity, zeal, and perseverance to the end of his life. Dr. Richards was a man of great gentleness and amiability of character, yet was endowed with unusual tenacity of purpose. As a scholar, he was far above the average of his profession. As a preacher, he was pleasing, attractive, persuasive, logical, and thoroughly evangelical. As a pastor, he was faithful, kind, and dignified. In all the relations of life he was lovely and beloved, and had a strong hold upon the affections of those who knew him well. Dr. Richards was twice married: the first time to Miss Emily Theresa Ward, of Newark, N.J.; the second time to Elizabeth F. Smith, of Reading, Pa. After more than twenty-five years of active and earnest pastoral labors in Reading, he was attacked by that frightful malady known as Bright's disease of the kidneys, and, after much suffering, departed to be with Christ, March 25, 1872. His last utterance was, “My faith is in Christ.” (W.P.S.)

## Richards, George, D.D.[[@Headword:Richards, George, D.D.]]

             an English divine, was born at Halesworth, Suffolk, in 1769. He was educated at Christ's Hospital, matriculated at Trinity College, Oxford, in 1785, and obtained a scholarship. He was made fellow of Oriel College in 1790, vicar of Bampton in 1796, and rector of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields in 1820. He died in 1837. His principal work is The Divine Origin of Prophecy Illustrated and Defended, in a course of sermons preached in 1800 (Oxford, 1800, 8vo). He also published several Sermons and Poems. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Richards, James (1), D.D.[[@Headword:Richards, James (1), D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Canaan, Conn., Oct. 29, 1767. His early education was limited. Having finally succeeded in entering Yale College in 1789, his health soon compelled him to leave it; yet, having afterwards gone through the academical and theological course with untiring energy, the corporation of Yale College conferred upon him the degree of B.A. in 1794. In 1793 he was licensed to preach, and, having been called as pastor by the Church in Morristown, N.J., he was ordained and installed in May, 1797. In 1801 he was made M.A. by Princeton College, and in 1805, when but thirty-seven years of age, he was chosen moderator of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church. His ministrations at Morristown were particularly successful, but having in 1809 received a call to the congregation of Newark, he accepted it, and removed there. Here his influence gradually increased. In 1815 he preached the annual sermon before the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. The theological seminary at Auburn having been established by the Synod of Geneva in 1819, he was appointed its professor of theology in 1820. This he at first declined, but, having been reelected in 1823, he finally accepted, and entered upon his duties Oct. 29,1823. His rare qualities fitted him for this service, and he filled the situation with great credit to himself and benefit to others until his death, Aug. 2,1843. Dr. Richards published a number of occasional Sermons, Addresses, and Lectures. After his death there were published from his MSS. a volume of Lectures on Mental Philosophy and Theology, with a sketch of his life by the Rev. Samuel H. Gridley (1846, 8vo), and some twenty Discourses (1849, 12mo): — Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 99. See also the Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1850; Plumley, Presbyterian Church, p. 371.

## Richards, James (2)[[@Headword:Richards, James (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Abington, Mass., Feb. 23, 1784. He graduated at Williams College in 1809, entered the ministry in 1812, and, having offered himself to the American Board, sailed, with eight others, Oct. 23, 1815, for Ceylon. He was stationed at Batticotta, but, his health failing, he went to Cape Town in 1818, and returned the next winter, after which he was able to labor a year from April, 1820, and died Aug. 3, 1822. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 596.

## Richards, John J.[[@Headword:Richards, John J.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born July 16, 1816. He united with the Church in his thirteenth year, and for several years filled the office of class leader, Sunday school teacher, and exhorter. In 1837 he was licensed to preach, and admitted on trial in the Georgia Conference in 1839, in which connection he remained until 1844, when he was transferred to the Florida Conference. There he labored until 1860, when, because of failing health, he was superannuated, and held that relation until his death — Sept. 4, 1863 — in Madison County, Fla. Mr. Richards was a sound and practical preacher, devoting his time and talents to the service of the Church. See Minutes of Ann. Conf. M.E. Ch. South, 1863, p. 467.

## Richards, John W., D.D.[[@Headword:Richards, John W., D.D.]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Reading, Pa., April 18, 1803, and made a public profession of religion in his sixteenth year. His classical studies were pursued chiefly under the instruction of Rev. Dr. J. Grier. In 1821 he commenced the study of theology under the direction of his pastor, Dr. Muhlenburgh, remaining with him until 1824. when the Synod of Pennsylvania licensed him to preach. He resigned his first charge (New Holland, Lancaster County, Pa.) in 1834, and removed to Trappe, Montgomery County. In 1836 he accepted a call to Germantown, Pa., where he remained till 1845, when he became pastor of St. John's Church, Easton, Pa. While here he held the professorship of German language and literature in Lafayette College. In 1851 he took charge of Trinity Church, Reading, Pa., and died Jan. 24, 1854. He was made doctor of divinity by Jefferson College in 1852. He published two Sermons, and left in MS. a translation of Hallische Nachrichten, and a History of the American Lutheran Church. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 165.

## Richards, John, D.D[[@Headword:Richards, John, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Farmington, Connecticut, May 14, 1797. He graduated at Yale College in 1821; at Andover Theological Seminary in 1824; was for a year agent for the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions; pastor at Woodstock, Vermont, from 1827 to 1831; associate editor of the Vermont Chronicle from 1831 to 1837, and pastor of the Church at Dartmouth College from 1841 until his death, at Hanover, N.H., March 29, 1859. "Dr. Richards was a comprehensive scholar, faithful to Christ, and heartily devoted to the best interests of mankind. No man ever questioned his learning, integrity, and piety." See Cong. Quarterly, 1859, page 316.

## Richards, Jonas De Forest, LL.D.[[@Headword:Richards, Jonas De Forest, LL.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Hartford, Vt., Dec. 28, 1809. After attending a grammar school, he entered Dartmouth College, where he graduated in 1836, and became tutor in Marietta College, O., where he remained but a short time, and then entered Lane Theological Seminary, at Cincinnati, O. From thence he went to New York and entered Union Theological Seminary, where he remained one year, and then matriculated at Andover Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1840, staying  long enough at each of these institutions to become acquainted with their policy and modes of instruction. On May 28, 1841, he was ordained and installed pastor of a Church in Charlestown, N.H. After remaining ten years, his pastoral relation was dissolved, and he accepted a call from Chester, Vt., where he remained four years as a stated supply. His next pastorate was Weathersfield, Vt., where he continued five years, at the end of which time he removed to Monroe, Mich., where he remained without charge for three years and returned to Weathersfield. After remaining one year in this place, he went South, and was elected a member of the Alabama Senate, which post he occupied four years, in the meantime being elected to a professorship in the University of Alabama. He died during his professorship, Dec. 2, 1872. (W.P.S.)

## Richards, Lewis[[@Headword:Richards, Lewis]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in 1752, in the parish of Llanbadarn Fawr, Cardiganshire, South Wales. At the age of nineteen years he made a public profession of religion, and joined a society of Independents and studied for a short time in Lady Huntingdon's College. He then came to America, intending to pursue his studies at the Orphan House in Georgia. He was ordained in Charleston in 1777, and after traveling about a year in various parts of South Carolina and Georgia he removed to Northampton County, Va. In 1784 he became the pastor of the First Baptist Church in Baltimore. He continued alone in this pastorate till 1815, when Rev. E.J. Reis was elected copastor. Mr. Richards resigned his charge in 1818, but continued a member of the Church until his death, Feb. 1, 1832. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulp. 6:201.

## Richards, Robert R.[[@Headword:Richards, Robert R.]]

             a Methodist preacher, joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in Thomaston (now city of Rockland), Me., in 1838. Of his birth and early life we have no information. In 1841 he was admitted into the Maine Conference as a probationer, was ordained deacon in 1843, and elder in 1848. For twenty-three years he sustained an effective relation in the conference, but in 1864 failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation, which relation he sustained until Aug. 9, 1866, the date of his death. He was a man of sound understanding and great perseverance; as a friend, true and faithful; as a preacher, clear, logical, and instructive. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, 1867, p. 138.

## Richards, Thomas T.S.[[@Headword:Richards, Thomas T.S.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Baltimore, Md., Sept. 13, 1834. He professed conversion when in his thirteenth year, and in due time entered the ranks of the local ministry. In 1864 he was received on trial in the East Baltimore Conference, and continued in active service until the fall of 1868, when failing health compelled him to seek relief in rest. In the spring of 1869 he was transferred to the Baltimore Conference and given a supernumerary relation. lie died Dec. 26, 1869. Mr. Richards was a preacher of creditable abilities, and, as a Christian, was ardent and devout. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1870, p. 19.

## Richards, William (1), LL.D.[[@Headword:Richards, William (1), LL.D.]]

             a Baptist minister of distinction, was born in 1749, in South Wales, His early advantages for obtaining an education were very limited. At the age of twenty-four he entered the academy at Bristol, England, where he remained two years. He became pastor of the Church in Lynn, England, July 7, 1776, and continued his residence in that place the remainder of his life, about half the time as pastor of the Church. He died in 1818. In English and Welsh history and in the Welsh language and literature Dr. Richards was well versed. He wrote, History of Lynn: — A Review of Noble's “Memoirs of the Protectoral House of Cromwell:” — and a Dictionary of Welsh and English. At his death he bequeathed his library — consisting of not far from 1300 volumes — to Brown University. “The library thus bequeathed is in many respects valuable; it contains a considerable number of Welsh books, a large collection of works illustrating the history and antiquities of England and Wales, besides two or three hundred bound volumes of pamphlets, some of them very ancient, rare, and curious. The collection is particularly valuable for its treatises on civil and religious liberty” (Guild, Manning and Brown University, p. 145- 147). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (J.C.S.)

## Richards, William (2)[[@Headword:Richards, William (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, was born in Plainfield, Mass., Aug. 22, 1792. He graduated at Williams College in 1819, and in Feb., 1822, offered himself to the American Board as a missionary to the Sandwich Islands. He was accepted, ordained Sept. 12, and sailed on Nov. 19, with two others, and four natives of the islands who had been instructed in this country. Mr. Richards was stationed at Lahaina, on Mani Island, and labored with great  success until 1837, when he came to the United States, but returned in 1838, and occupied the posts of king's counsellor. interpreter, and chaplain. In 1842 — after the organization of an independent government on the islands — he was sent as ambassador to England, where he remained three years. After his return he lived in Honolulu with the king, and died there, Dec. 7, 1847. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 688.

## Richards, William I.[[@Headword:Richards, William I.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Fulton County, N.Y., July 30, 1815. He was converted when nineteen years of age, and for several years served as a local preacher, but entered the Black River Conference in 1850. He continued in active service (with the exception of one year) until his death — in Clarkson, Monroe County, N.Y. — May 22, 1875. He was a man of piety and great usefulness. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1875, p. 137.

## Richards, William K.[[@Headword:Richards, William K.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Tennessee. Aug. 20, 1816, and in the same year his parents removed to Indiana. In 1837 he professed conversion; he was licensed to preach on Aug. 13, 1844; was employed by the presiding elder in 1851, and the next fall was admitted into the Indiana Conference. He labored until a few weeks previous to April 6, 1861, the date of his death. He was a good man and a strong preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1861, p. 197.

## Richards, William Lyman[[@Headword:Richards, William Lyman]]

             a native Indian missionary, was born in Lahina, Southern India, Dec. 2, 1823. He was sent to America to be educated with a view to the ministry. He accordingly entered Jefferson College, Va., where he graduated in 1841. Soon after he left college he became teacher of a classical school in Woodington, Va., where he remained one year, and then entered the Union Theological Seminary, where he graduated in 1846. He received license to preach at the same time, and was ordained to the Gospel ministry in Oct., 1847, and sent as a missionary to Fuh Chau, China, at which place he remained until 1851, when, on account of declining health, he was released and advised to return to the United States for its recovery, but died at sea near St. Helena, in the South Atlantic, June 5 of the same year. (W.P.S.)

## Richardson, Chauncey[[@Headword:Richardson, Chauncey]]

             a Methodist minister, was born in Vermont in 1802. When nineteen years of age he professed conversion, and in 1823 was licensed to preach. In 1826 he was received on trial by the New England Conference, and in 1832, because of impaired health, was obliged to locate. His first residence in the South was at Tuscumbia, Ala., where he labored to build up an educational institution. He was elected president of Rutersville College, Texas, in 1839, and became a member of the first Annual Conference in Texas, 1840. He was also a member of the convention held in Louisville, 1845, to organize the Methodist Episcopal Church, South; and of its General Conference in 1850. He served the Church as presiding elder, as editor of the Church paper, the Texas Wesleyan Banner, and as conference secretary for several years. He died April 11, 1852. Mr. Richardson was a good, gifted, trusty man. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 721; Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1852, p. 423.

## Richardson, Elias Huntington, D.D[[@Headword:Richardson, Elias Huntington, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Lebanon, N.H., August 11, 1827. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1850, and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1853; was ordained at Goffstown, May 18, 1854, and remained there two years, then was pastor at Dover until 1863; next of the Richmond Street Church, Providence, R.I., until 1867; of the First Church, Westfield, Massachusetts, until 1872; of the Center Church, Hartford, Conn., until 1879, and finally of the Center Church, New Britain, until his death, June 27, 1883. See The Congregationalist, July 5, 1883. (J.C.S.)

## Richardson, J. Clark[[@Headword:Richardson, J. Clark]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in East Windsor, Conn., in 1822. He spent some time in Yale College, but was compelled to discontinue because of sickness. Subsequently he passed a year, in the double character of pupil and tutor, in the University of Knoxville, Tenn. In 1847 he acted as colporteur in Kentucky and Tennessee; in 1849 he was licensed by the Presbytery of Tennessee, and was associated with James G. Fee as a missionary until 1860, when he accepted an invitation to Oramel, Allegheny Co., N.Y., where he was ordained by Genesee Valley Presbytery, and where he continued his acceptable labors until his removal to Ossian, N.Y., in 1865. He died Sept. 30, 1865. Mr. Richardson was a devoted, self-denying minister of the Gospel; in spirit, humble and retiring; in the maintenance of truth and the discharge of duty, extremely conscientious. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 222. (J.L.S.)

## Richardson, James J.[[@Headword:Richardson, James J.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Tennessee in 1808. He experienced religion in 1822, and in 1827 emigrated to Illinois. He was admitted on trial in the Illinois Conference in 1837, and served the Church in active work until 1856, when, because of failing health, he took a superannuated relation. In 1859 he became effective, but in 1862 he was again superannuated. In 1865 he was appointed to Spring Garden Circuit, which he served three years. He then traveled Benton Circuit one year, at the close of which the active labor of his life ceased. His death occurred Sept. 21, 1872, in Marion County, Ill. Mr. Richardson was a plain, practical, and earnest preacher, and a prudent disciplinarian. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1872, p. 136.

## Richardson, James Monroe[[@Headword:Richardson, James Monroe]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Carroll County, Miss., in 1829. He went to Mississippi College, where he graduated in 1849, and entered the Union Theological Seminary and passed through the full course, graduating in 1852. He was ordained in 1853, and became a stated supply of the Church at Marion, Miss., where he remained five years, and began the profession of teacher in Enterprise, Miss. In 1860 he supplied the Church at Flower's Place, Miss. After this he entered the Confederate army as an officer, and was killed in battle in Georgia in 1864. (W.P.S.)

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

             fourth bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in Canada after the separate organization of 1828, was born at Kingston, Upper Canada, Jan. 29, 1791. He was trained as a sailor on the lakes; in the war of 1812-15 he served as a lieutenant in the provincial marine, and subsequently as principal pilot of the royal fleet. In the capture of the fort of Oswego he lost his left arm. At the close of the war he settled at Presque Isle, and became magistrate and collector of customs. He was converted in 1817, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church the following year, serving the Church as steward and local preacher. In 1825 he was admitted on trial into the Conference, and was ordained deacon at Hamilton Conference, 1827, but was not ordained elder till 1830. In 1831 Mr. Richardson was appointed presiding elder of the Niagara district, and in 1832 editor of The Christian Guardian. He opposed the union with the British Wesleyans in 1833, but finally acceded to it and accepted appointments under it. But afterwards, being dissatisfied, he removed to the United States, and was preacher in charge at Auburn. In 1837 he returned to Toronto and joined those who continued to adhere to Episcopal Methodism. In 1840 he became agent for the Upper Canada Bible Society, and held the office for eleven years. In 1852 he was appointed presiding elder, and in 1858, at St. David's, he was elected and consecrated bishop, which office he held until his death, in March, 1875. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Richardson, John[[@Headword:Richardson, John]]

             bishop of Ardagh, was a native of Chester, England, but took his degree of D.D. at the University of Dublin. Of his early life we know nothing, save that he was appointed preacher to the state in 1601. He was consecrated bishop of Ardagh in 1633, and held the archdeanery of Derry, the rectory of Ardstra, and the vicarage of Granard for a year after. In 1641, being in dread of the rebellion which broke out in October, he removed to England, and died in London, Aug. 11, 1654. He was a man of profound learning, well versed in the Scriptures, and skilled in sacred chronology. His works are, Choice Observations and Explanations upon the Old Testament (1655, fol.): — Sermon of the Doctrine of Justification (Dublin, 1625, 4to). He also wrote the “Assembly's Annotations” on Ezekiel. See Harris, Ware; Lloyd, Memoirs, p. 607.

## Richardson, John P.[[@Headword:Richardson, John P.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Virginia. 1829, and was admitted into the Memphis Conference in 1848 or 1849. After five or six years his health failed: he located, studied medicine, and graduated as a physician. He was readmitted into the Mississippi Conference in 1860, and after a year's successful labor volunteered as a soldier in the Confederate army, receiving the appointment of chaplain. At the fall of Fort Donaldson, he was taken prisoner and carried to Camp Chase, Ohio, where he died, March 4, 1862. Mr. Richardson was a superior preacher, a close and indefatigable minister, and active and zealous as a Christian. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1862, p. 384.

## Richardson, Lyman[[@Headword:Richardson, Lyman]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Attleborough, Mass., in 1790. In 1806 his parents removed to Harford, Pa.; he had at this time a fair education, with some knowledge of Latin, and in the winter of 1807-8 he taught his first school, which employment he continued in subsequent years. He was converted in 1809, and immediately turned his attention to the ministry. A friend secured for him the position of assistant in the academy at Wilkes- Barre, Pa., of which he subsequently became principal; he remained there three years, devoting all his spare time to his classical studies, and then returned to Harford, Pa., and opened a select school for youths pursuing the higher branches of study. He remained at Harford three years, during  which he studied theology under Rev. Ebenezer Kingsbury, and in 1820 was licensed by Susquehanna Presbytery, and soon after entered upon his ministry at Louisville, now Franklin, Pa. Subsequently he was ordained as an evangelist, and as such he preached at Wyalusing, Pike, and Orwell, Pa.; at Windsor, N.Y., three years; at Mount Pleasant and Bethany, Pa.; and at Wysox, Pa. In 1840 he returned to Harford, Pa., to take charge of the academy, then a very popular institution. This work suited him exactly, and he entered into it with great zeal and success, until 1865, when disease and old age induced him to give it up. He died Dec. 1, 1867. As a preacher, Mr. Richardson was characterized by the power of glowing representations of truth and earnest love for souls; as a teacher, by kindness of manner and spirit, and by his wise counsel. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 225. (J.L.S.)

## Richardson, Manoah[[@Headword:Richardson, Manoah]]

             a Methodist preacher, was born in Lincoln County, Tenn., June 21, 1814; went to Missouri in early life, and settled in Chariton County. He joined the Church in 1831; was licensed to preach Jan. 16, 1841; entered the itinerancy Oct. 16, 1841; and was ordained deacon Oct. 1, 1843; elder Oct. 7, 1845. He did effective work for six years, when he superannuated, owing to failing health, and located at the end of a year. In 1868 he was readmitted into the Missouri Conference, and labored until about four weeks previous to his death, which occurred in Bloomington, Macon Co., Mo., April 18, 1871. He was a good man and a faithful preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conf. M.E. Church, South, 1871, p. 606.

## Richardson, Marvin, D.D.[[@Headword:Richardson, Marvin, D.D.]]

             a prominent Methodist minister, was born in Stephentown, Rensselaer Co., N.Y., June 10, 1789, but went, with his parents, in early youth to Brooklyn. He professed conversion in May, 1806, and united with the Sands Street Methodist Episcopal Church in that city. On Oct. 1, 1808, he was appointed to fill a vacancy on Croton Circuit, and was admitted into the New York Conference in 1809, of which he continued to be a member for sixty-seven years. He received his regular appointment as an effective minister forty-two consecutive years. He was a member of eight successive General Conferences 1820-52. Mr. Richardson in his early ministry endured the hardship, deprivation, and toil of pioneer life. The record of his life is one of early and deep religious experience, of consistent piety, of  ardent love to God and the Church, of a successful ministry, and at the close a record of patient waiting and holy triumph. His last words were, “I have no fear.” He died at Poughkeepsie, N.Y., June 14, 1876. See Minutes of Annual Conferences M.E. Church, 1877, p. 41.

## Richardson, Merrill, D.D[[@Headword:Richardson, Merrill, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Holden, Massachusetts, October 4, 1811. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1835, then taught for two years in the Academy of Middlebury, and graduated at Yale Divinity School in 1839. He was ordained pastor at Terryville, Connecticut, October 27, 1841, remaining there nearly five years. From 1847 to 1849 he was acting pastor at Durham, when he was reinstalled at Terryville. From this charge he was dismissed, January 18, 1858. The same month he was installed. pastor of the Salem Street Church, Worcester, Massachusetts, and here he remained until September 1870. The following November he assumed charge of the New England Church, New York city, from which he was dismissed in May, 1872. From June 12, 1873, he was in charge of the Church at Milford, Mass., until his death, December 12, 1876. During 1847 and 1848 he was secretary of the Connecticut School Board. See Cong. Quarterly, 1877, page 423.

## Richardson, Nathan Smith, D.D[[@Headword:Richardson, Nathan Smith, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Middlebury, Vermont, January 8, 1810. He graduated from Yale College in 1834, studied at the General Theological Seminary, N.Y., became minister at Watertown, Conn., in 1838, at Ansonia in 1844, editor of the American Church Review in 1848, rector at Bridgeport in 1868, editor of The Guardian in 1879, and died August 7, 1883. He published Reasons Why I am a Christian, and other works.

## Richardson, Robert Hugh[[@Headword:Richardson, Robert Hugh]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Liberty, Va., March 13, 1834. After receiving a preparatory education, he entered the Union Theological Seminary in 1860, and, taking the full course, graduated in 1863. He was appointed — after he had been duly licensed by the New York Presbytery — a city missionary of New York, and remained in that office till he died, Oct. 6, 1863. Though his ministerial life was brief, it was not without its usefulness or good fruits. (W.P.S.)

## Richardson, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Richardson, William, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1698, at Wilshamstead, near Bedford, and educated at Westminster and Emmanuel colleges, Cambridge. He was appointed curate of St. Olave's, Southwark; and lecturer in 1727. He was collated to the prebend of Welton-Rivall, Lincoln, in 1724; was made master of Emmanuel College in 1736, and its vice-chancellor in 1738, and again in 1769; in 1746 he was appointed chaplain to the king. He died in 1775. He published four sermons on The Usefulness and Necessity of Revelation (Lond. 1730, 8vo): — a fifth on Relative Holiness (1733).

## Richelieu, Alphonse-Louis du Plessis de[[@Headword:Richelieu, Alphonse-Louis du Plessis de]]

             called the cardinal of Lyons, elder brother of the great French marshal, was born at Paris in 1582. At the age of twenty-two he became bishop of Lucon, but about 1605 he resigned the see in favor of his brother Armand. In 1606 he entered the convent of Grande-Chartreuse, and for twenty years led a life of great austerity. He was prior of Bonpas when his brother obliged him to leave the cloister to occupy the archbishopric of Aix. In 1628 he was transferred to Lyons, and was made cardinal by Urban VIII, Aug. 21, 1629. Honors were heaped upon him, and he became, successively, grand almoner of France in 1632; dean of St. Martin's of Tours in the same year; abbot of St. Victor's, at Marseilles, and of St. Stephen's, at Caen, in 1640; of the Chaise-Dieu in 1642; and, on the death of his brother, was elected master of the Sorbonne. Meanwhile he was engaged in the work of his diocese, and, during the ravages of an epidemic  in Lyons, was untiring in his efforts to aid the suffering. Louis XIII had several times engaged him in ecclesiastical affairs, but after the death of this monarch Richelieu seldom left Lyons, and gave little attention to the court intrigues of the day. He died March 23, 1653. In the Imperial Library are to be found letters written by Richelieu to Louis XIII and the most illustrious persons of his court. See Abbé de Pure, Vie de Richelieu, Cardinal de Lyon; Du Tems, Le Clerge de France, t. 4; Aubery, Dict. des Cardinaux.

## Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis de[[@Headword:Richelieu, Armand Jean du Plessis de]]

             a noted French ecclesiastic and statesman, was born at Paris, Sept. 5, 1585, and was educated for the military profession at the College de Navarre. His eldest brother resigning the bishopric of Lucon, Richelieu decided to take holy orders in order to succeed to that office. In 1607 he was consecrated bishop of Lucon, and for some time devoted himself zealously to the duties of his office. At the States-General, 1614, being appointed one of the representatives of the clergy, he secured the favor of the queen mother — Marie de Medicis — by an address delivered in the presence of the young king, Louis XIII. He was appointed almoner to the queen mother, and in Nov. 1616, entered the council as secretary of state. In 1617 Mary was banished to Blois, and he followed her thither, but was ordered to retire to Avignon. When the queen mother was recalled to the court she reinstated Richelieu in favor, and from that time he grew in power.

Having strengthened his position by the marriage of his niece with the nephew of the duke De Luynes, he received the cardinal's hat in 1622, reentered the state council, and soon after rose to the premiership. The administration of Richelieu was memorable for several great measures, of which the first and most lasting was that by which the remains of feudalism were swept away and the absolute authority of the sovereign was established. In the pursuit of this object his most powerful adversary was Gaston, the duke of Orleans, brother of the king. But Richelieu triumphed over him, and even the queen mother was obliged to bow before his unbending spirit and to withdraw into exile at Cologne. Another enterprise was the overthrow of the Huguenots as a political party and a rival of the throne of France.

He conducted in person (1628) the siege of Rochelle, but is said to have secured for the Huguenot party a certain measure of toleration, and to have used his success against them with moderation. In 1631 Richelieu was raised to the dukedom and peerage. In the external relations of France the great object of Richelieu's measures was the abasement of Austria. With  this view he did not hesitate to foment the internal disaffections of Germany, even allying himself with the German Protestants, and assisted Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, the great champion of Protestantism. He also took part with the disaffected Spanish provinces in the Netherlands, and favored the Catalonians and Portuguese when they shook off the Spanish yoke. At last Austria was humbled, Portugal was separated from Spain (1640), French influence predominated in Catalonia, England was in full revolution, and France quiet and prosperous. His administration was again threatened by intrigues at court or treason in the camps. Richelieu, however, vindicated his power, and in 1642 came into Paris in triumph, carried on a litter, escorted by an army, and surrounded by the utmost pomp. Two months afterwards — Dec. 4, 1642 — he died, and was buried at the Sorbonne, where his mausoleum (the celebrated Girardon's masterpiece) may be seen. Busy with affairs of state, with war abroad, and dissension, plots, and treason at home. Richelieu nevertheless promoted arts and sciences, founded the Jardin du Roi (now Jardin des Plantes), also the French Academy and the royal printing office, built the Palais Royal, and rebuilt the Sorbonne. He also found time to write several works and two plays — Mirame, a comedy, and La Grande Pastorale. He is regarded as the author of Memoires du Cardinal de Richelieu (first published complete by Petitot [Paris, 1823]): — Le Testament Politique (1764, 2 vols.): — and of Le Journal de M. le Cardinal de Richelieu (Amst. 1649, 2 vols.). His theological works are, La Defense des Principaux Points de la Foi Catholique, etc. (1617): — Instruction du Chretien (1619). See Aubery, Memoires du Cardinal de Richelieu (1660); Jay, Histoire du Ministere de Richelieu; Capefigue, Richelieu et Mazarin (1836); Martin, Histoire de France; Michelet, Histoire de France; Violart, Histoire du Ministere de Richelieu (1649); Caillet, L'Administration en France sous Richelieu (1861, 2 vols.); Robson, Life of Cardinal Richelieu (1854); Sully, Memoires; Retz, Memoires.

## Richer, Edmund[[@Headword:Richer, Edmund]]

             a noted defender of the liberties of the Gallican Church against papal absolutism, was born, of poor parents, in a village in Champagne, Sept. 30, 1560. He became doctor in theology in 1590, and for a time devoted his energies to pulpit labors; but in 1594 he was made president of the College of Cardinal Lemoine, and soon afterwards censor of the University of Paris, in whose faculty he filled a theological chair. He undertook an edition of Gerson's works in 1605, the publication of which was defeated  by the papal nuncio Barberini (subsequently pope Urban VIII), and which called forth the violent condemnation of Gersol's works by Bellarmine. Richer's defense (Apologia pro J. Gersonio [1606]) was not published until after his death (Leyden, 1674, 4to); but Gerson's writings appeared in 1607. Appointed syndic of the theological faculty in the following year, he opposed the public defense of the theses on the infallibility of the pope; and, in response to the request of Nicholas de Verdun, the first president, he wrote the book De Ecclesiastica et Politica Potestate, in which he developed the idea — always held by the University of Paris — of the superiority of councils over the pope, and of the independence of secular governments in temporal things. This book brought on him the rage of the ultramontane party. He was dismissed from the university, his teachings were condemned by several provincial synods and the papal court, and he was prohibited from replying to the charges promulgated against him. He was even apprehended, but again liberated on the demand of the university. A protracted contest with his enemies ensued, in which he was finally conquered by cardinal Richelieu. He signed a retraction at the point of the dagger of assassins hired to take his life. His death took place Nov. 28, 1631. See Baillet, La Vie d'Edm. Richer (Amst. 1715, 12mo).

## Riches[[@Headword:Riches]]

             (the rendering in the A.V. of several Heb. and Gr. words, especially עשֶׁר, πλοῦτος). The wealth of a pastoral people, such as the Hebrews in the patriarchal age, consisted chiefly in flocks and herds. Hence we find it assigned as a cause of the separation of Esau and Jacob that ”their riches were more than they might dwell together; and the land wherein they were strangers could not bear them because of their cattle” (Gen 36:8). It was not until the reign of Solomon that the Jews possessed any abundance of the precious metals; and as the nation never became commercial, its rich men must in all ages have been the great land holders. Throughout the East the holders of land have ever been remarkable for exacting very disproportionate shares of the profit from the actual cultivators of the soil, and this is the reason why we find “the rich” so often and so severely denounced in Scripture. Riches is frequently used in a metaphorical sense for intellectual endowments, and for the gifts and graces of God's Holy Spirit, which constitute the treasure to be “laid up in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal.”

## Richey, Daniel[[@Headword:Richey, Daniel]]

             a Methodist minister, was born in New Jersey in 1797, and moved when quite young to the neighborhood of Cayuga Lake, N.Y. His connection with the traveling ministry began in the Pittsburgh Conference, 1829, and continued up to the time of the Erie Annual Conference, July, 1845. when he was placed in a superannuated relation, which continued until his death, March 25, 1855. In point of zeal, integrity, and fidelity to duty and principles, he had few equals. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1855.

## Richmond, Edward, D.D[[@Headword:Richmond, Edward, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Middleborough, Massachusetts, in 1767. He graduated from Brown University in 1789; studied theology under Reverend Dr. Gurney, of North Middleborolugh; was ordained pastor of the Church in Sloughton, December 5, 1792; dismissed, January 15, 1817; installed at Dorchester, June 25 following; dismissed in 1833; then resided for several years in Braintree, and died in Boston, April 10, 1842. Dr. Richmond was a candid man, a close and acute reasoner, and was much respected as a minister and a neighbor. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2:417.

## Richmond, Francis M.[[@Headword:Richmond, Francis M.]]

             a Methodist preacher, was born in Herkimer County, N.Y., in 1803, and emigrated to Indiana in 1817. Although reared under Baptist influence, he united with the Methodist Episcopal Church at the age of twenty-five years. In 1836 he was admitted on trial into the traveling connection, and, with the exception of a temporary location under pressure of domestic circumstances, he labored faithfully to the close of life. His last appointment was to Greenfield Circuit, North Indiana Conference, but, after laboring a few months, was smitten down in the prime of life, in 1853. He was a sound theologian, and a powerful, practical, and experimental preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1853, p. 283.

## Richmond, Legh[[@Headword:Richmond, Legh]]

             an English clergyman, was born in Liverpool, Jan. 29, 1772. He graduated at Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1794, and was ordained in 1797. He became curate of Brading and Yaverland, in the Isle of Wight, in 1798, and, in 1805, chaplain to the Lock Hospital, London. In the same year he was presented to the rectory of Turvey, Bedfordshire, which he held until his death, May 8, 1827. Mr. Richmond was the author of several tracts — The Dairyman's Daughter, The Negro Servant, The Young Cottager — published separately at first, but afterwards (1814) collected into two volumes 12mo, under the title of Annals of the Poor. Of The Dairyman's Daughter four millions of copies, in nineteen languages, had been circulated before 1849. He also edited The Fathers of the English Church (Lond. 1807, 12, 8 vols. 8vo), and published Domestic Portraiture: — Memoirs of his three children (9th ed. Lond. 1861, 8vo): — a Missionary Sermon (1809, 8vo), and a Memoir of Miss H. Sinclair.

## Richmond, Paul C.[[@Headword:Richmond, Paul C.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Barnard, Vt., where he passed his early manhood. He received license to preach in March, 1825, and soon after was received on trial into the New England Conference. After filling several appointments in Vermont, he was in 1829 transferred to Maine Conference, where he did effective work until 1855, when failing health compelled him to take a superannuated relation. He resided in Frysburgh, and continued to labor as his strength allowed. He died there, May 29, 1875. He was well versed in Scripture, apt in illustration, an able and successful minister. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p. 87.

## Richter, Aemilius Ludwig[[@Headword:Richter, Aemilius Ludwig]]

             a distinguished teacher of jurisprudence in Germany, who rendered especially meritorious services in the department of ecclesiastical law. Richter was born at Stolpen, near Dresden, on Feb. 15, 1808, and entered Leipsic University in 1826. After graduating, he became an advocate, and at once began to write in the field of ecclesiastical jurisprudence; and he added to these functions those of a teacher in the university, at first as a tutor, and subsequently, in 1835, as extraordinary professor. His labors were already attracting notice by that time, and obtained for him the doctorate of laws from the University of Göttingen, to which the University of Greifswald, twenty years later, added that of divinity. In 1838, Richter was made professor of ecclesiastical and civil law in the University of Marburg. Eight years of quiet but productive labors were spent in that station, and he was then transferred to the High-school at Berlin, where he entered on a career which made him felt throughout Germany within the limits of his chosen field.

His studies were given to the world in numerous writings, and the conclusions reached by him were brought to bear in the administration of the Department of Religion, under whose ministry he held various important posts; and his thorough learning, and fair yet conscientious spirit, gave him a commanding position with reference to Church laws and methods of administration, not only in Prussia, but in many other German lands. Few laws were passed relating to the churches, and few changes in their administration introduced, during the period of his connection with the government, in respect to which he did not exert a more or less determining influence. He died, after a long and severe illness, May 8, 1864.  The attitude of Richter towards the ecclesiastical issues of his time was largely determined by the principle, fundamental in his view, that the jus circa sacra belongs inseparably to the State as a moral power. He believed it wise that the State should allow freedom of action to the Church within its own appropriate field; but insisted that for the regulation of mixed questions, for the restraining of ecclesiastical intrusions into the secular realm, for the repression of notoriously aggressive and thoroughly organized religious parties, e.g. the Order of the Jesuits; for the protection of the rights of one ecclesiastical organization as against the encroachments of others, etc., the right of sovereignty must be retained by the State. He was accordingly opposed to the course of the Raumer ministry, which simply ignored the necessity for restraining the unconstitutional demands of the Roman Catholic Church, in consequence of which the Jesuits flooded the western provinces of Prussia, and formed settlements without corporate titles as required by law, and even without coming under any kind of legal supervision.

He was also opposed to the concordats concluded between several states and the pope, as being radically wrong. With regard to the evangelical churches of Germany, Richter condemned the territorial no less than the episcopal system, and favored that in which the sovereign prince is endowed with authority, while the Church itself is thoroughly organized into congregations (not parishes), presbyteries, and synods. The merit of Richter as a writer on ecclesiastical law consists in his having based his works on a wide collection of previously unused material as well as that to which reference was ordinarily made, and on a profound investigation of all the sources at command, and also in the absolute fairness of his spirit. These qualities appear as clearly in his works on Roman Catholic law as elsewhere. His earliest publication, the Corpus Juris Canonici (1833-39), is the best edition of that book extant. Other early books are, Beiträge zur Kenntniss d. kanon. Rechts (Leips. 1834): — De Inedit. Decretal. Coll. Lipsiensi (Lips. 1836). In connection with Schulte he also published a large edition of the Canones et Decret. Conc. Tridentini (ibid. 1853). An epochal book in its department was his Lehrbuch des kathol. und evangel. Kirchenrechts, etc. (Leips. 1842; 6th posthumous ed. 1865); and similar importance attaches to the collection entitled Die evangel. Kirchenordnungen des 16ten Jahrhunderts, etc. (Weimar, 1846, 2 vols.).

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

             a German hymnologist, was born at Sorau, in Silesia, Oct. 5, 1676. He studied medicine and theology at Halle, and after the completion of his studies was appointed by Francke superintendent of the academy. After the death of his brother, he was also appointed medical attendant of the Orphan house there. In conjunction with his brother, Dr. Christian Sigismund Richter, he discovered the celebrated Halle medicine, prepared from gold, and called essentia dulcis, and which gave a great name to the Orphan house at Halle. The profits of this medicine he devoted to the benefit of the institution. From his twentieth year he composed hymns, and thirty-three excellent and deeply spiritual Christian hymns are attributed to him. Knapp, in his Liederschatz, gives fourteen of his hymns, some of which have also been translated into English, as, Mein Salomo! dein freundliches Regieren, by Dr. Bomberger, in Schaff's Kirchenfreunde, 2, 337 (“Jesus my king! thy mild and kind control”); Huter wird die Nacht der Sunden, in Sacred Lyrics, p. 32 (“O watchman, will the night of sin”); Hier legt mein Sinn vor dir sich nieder, in the Moravian Hymn-book, No. 437 (“My soul before thee prostrate lies”); Gott, den ich als Liebe kenne, by Cox, in Hymns from the German, p. 190 (“O God, whose attributes shine forth in turn”). Richter was also the author of a remarkable medical treatise on the Crucifixion of Christ. He died October 5, 1711. See Koch, Geschichte des Kirchenliedes, 4, 296, 355 sq.; 8, 246 sq., 297, 434, 515; Miller, Singers and Songs of the Church, p. 141 sq.; Jocher, Gelehrten- Lexikon, s.v.; Richter's Leben und Wirken als Arzt, Theolog. und Dichter (published by the Haupt-Verein fur christl. Erbauungsschriften in den preussischen Staaten, Berlin, 1865). (B.P.)

## Richter, Henry[[@Headword:Richter, Henry]]

             an English painter, of German extraction, was born in 1772. He resided mostly in London, where he died in 1857. His most important historical work is Christ restoring Sight to the Blind, now in a church at Greenwich, England.

## Richter, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Richter, Johann Georg]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1727 at Leipsic, where. he also pursued his theological studies. In 1750 he commenced his academical career, was in 1751 professor, and in 1756 doctor of theology. He died June 14, 1780, leaving, De Arte Critica Scripturae Interprete (Leipsic, 1750): — De Vitiis Criticis Luciani et Lexicorumi Graecorum (1752): — Singulares Quodam Martini Lutheri de Matrimonio Sententiae (eod.): — De Paulo in Vitam Revocati Nuncio ad Acts 12:32, 33 (1756): — De Munere Sacro Johanni Baptistce Divinritus Delegato (1757): — De Theologo Dei Homine ad 2Ti 3:17 (1765): — Tabulae Theologiae Dogmaticae ad Usus Lectionum (1771). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Richter, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Richter, Johann Heinrich]]

             inspector in the missionary institute at Barmen, Germany, under whose administration the missions of the Rhenish Missionary Society were established, was born at Belleben Dec. 11, 1799, and entered on the duties of the station in which he spent his life May 28, 1827. The Barmen  Missionary Society did not as yet send out missionaries, nor even own a house, but a number of young men were trained under its direction for work among the heathen. Richter subsequently, aided by his brother William, became their instructor, and after about eighteen months was able to report the readiness of four of his pupils to begin their expected labors. The poverty of the Barmen association now induced them to invite other local societies to aid in forwarding the candidates to their foreign fields, and as a result the Rhenish Missionary Society was organized. Its first mission was among the slaves of the Boers in South Africa, which, in course of time, extended over five stations. Another was begun on the island of Borneo in 1834, but failed to achieve successful results while Richter lived; and a third, among the Indians of North America, was likewise unsuccessful; but the latter gave rise to a flourishing mission among the evangelical Germans of America. Richter's ardent soul was continually employed in devising new means for the extension of Christianity. He was incessantly busy with his pen, issuing reports, spreading information through the periodical press, editing the Monatsberichte d. rhein. Missions-Gesellschaft, etc., and with public appeals in sermons and addresses in every section of the land. The institution of a society to preach the Gospel to the Jews was his work, and also the establishing of a German mission in China, which came to pass but a short time previous to his death. Richter was twice married, and became the father of a large family. A brief sickness ended his life April 5, 1847. As an author, Richter gave to the world a number of works; e.g. Erklarte Hausbibel, a commentary on the entire Bible (6 vols.), decidedly orthodox according to the Lutheran standard, and everywhere confidently accepting the literal meaning: Evangel. u. romische Kirchenlehre (1844), a polemical work: — a Life of Gutzlaf, the Chinese missionary, and others. In personal intercourse he was vivacious, stimulating, witty, and yet dignified. A man of scientific culture, he was an accomplished botanist, mineralogist, etc.; but his writings are characterized by freshness of statement rather than by depth of thought.

## Richter, Karl[[@Headword:Richter, Karl]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1804 at Warendorf. In 1826 he was director of the gymnasium at Rietberg, in 1828 professor at Paderborn, in 1837 director at Culm, in 1844 canon and professor at Pelplin, in 1849 at Posen, in 1867 at Treves, and died August 24, 1869, doctor of theology. (B.P.)

## Richthofen, Charles, Baron Von[[@Headword:Richthofen, Charles, Baron Von]]

             canon of Breslau, was born of evangelical parents Jan. 31, 1832, in Hartwigswaldau, Silesia. In 1838 his father quietly joined the Roman Catholic Church, while his mother remained firm in her belief, and the sons, by law, had to follow the father. From 1845 to 1852 he attended the [Matthias Gymnasium at Breslau, and decided to prepare himself for the  office of woods and forests. He entered the academy at Neustadt- Eberswalde, and finished his course there, but was not satisfied with the step he had taken. He decided to study theology, attended the theological course at the Breslau University, and in 1860 received holy orders. In 1869 he was stationed at Hohenfriedberg, but would not accept the decisions of the Vatican Council. The government had appointed him canon of Breslau, but bishop Forster, of that city, pressed by the chapter, wished to have the canon sign a paper, according to which he accepted the Vatican decrees. Richthofen refused to sell his conscience to Rome, and the bishop excommunicated him in 1873. He then joined the Old Catholic party, and acted as priest till 1875. But finding no satisfaction or peace of conscience and mind even in this party, he joined the Lutheran Church at Leipsic, being received by Dr. Ahlfeld as member Dec. 11, 1875. He died March 7, 1876, in the house of his brother at Berlin. Dr. Besser delivered the funeral oration. See Schneider, Theol. Jahrbuch, 1877, p. 227 sq.; Carl Freiherr von Richthofen, fruher Domherr in Breslau, ein Lebensbild aus den kirchlichen Kampen der Gegenwart (Leipsic, 1877); Schürer, Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1877, p. 616 sq. (B.P.)

## Ricius, Paul[[@Headword:Ricius, Paul]]

             SEE RICCI.

## Rickards, Samuel[[@Headword:Rickards, Samuel]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1795; entered Oriel College, Oxford, in 1814; obtained the Newdigate prize for English verse in 1815, and graduated in second-class honors in 1817. He was fellow of Oriel College in 1819 to 1823, and vicar of Stow, Langtoft, Suffolk, from 1832 until his death, in 1865. He was the author of the Christian Householder, or Book of Family Prayers (1849, 12mo): — Short Sermons for Family Reading (1849, 8vo): — several other Prayer-books: — also Religious Tracts, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rickman, Thomas[[@Headword:Rickman, Thomas]]

             a distinguished English architect, was born at Maidenhead in 1776. Although unsettled in early life, he seems always to have had a love for architecture, and to have studied it carefully. In 1808 he began to give his full attention to it, and wrote the Classification of Gothic Styles, which has rendered him famous. He afterwards resided in Birmingham, and acquired  great celebrity by his Gothic churches and other structures. He died in March, 1841. He is well known as an author by his Gothic Architecture, an Attempt to Discriminate the Styles of Architecture in England, etc. (Lond. 1817, 8vo). There is a later and better edition by Parker (Oxford, 1862, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Riculphus (Fr. Riculfe)[[@Headword:Riculphus (Fr. Riculfe)]]

             bishop of Soissons, died about 902. He entered upon this see between 883 and 892, and assisted in the council of Verberie in 892 and of Rheims in 893. In 900, in the latter city, he consecrated archbishop Hervd, and excommunicated the murderers of archbishop Foulques. He made himself celebrated by the constitution which he established in his church in 889. This had for its object the correction of the ignorance of the clergy, and has been reprinted several times since 1615. It may be found in the supplement to the Conciles des Gaules of Pierre de la Lande, and in vol. 9 of the Conciles of Labbe. See Gallia Christiana; Hist. Litter. de la France; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

Rid.

SEE ISAIAH DI TRANI.

## Riddell, Mortimer S., D.D[[@Headword:Riddell, Mortimer S., D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at East Hamilton, N.Y., May 8, 1827. After pursuing secular business for several years, he studied at the Hamilton Institution, graduating in 1858, and was soon after ordained pastor in New Brunswick, N.J., where he took high rank as a preacher, and his eight years' ministry was eminently successful. His labors, during a revival of  remarkable power, broke down his health, and he was obliged to suspend his ministerial work. All his efforts to regain his wasted strength proved futile, and he died at Ottawa, Kansas, February 1, 1870. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 988. (J.C.S.)

## Riddha[[@Headword:Riddha]]

             in Arabic mythology, is coincidence with he divine will; one of the five principal virtues which swim about on the sea of passions and tribulations.

## Riddle[[@Headword:Riddle]]

             (חַידָה, chidah'; lit. complication, Judges 14; Eze 17:2; Sept. αἴνιγμα, πρόβλημα; Vulg. problema, propositio; A.V. elsewhere “dark saying,” dark speech,” “dark sentence,” “hard question;” once [Hab 2:6] “proverb”). The Hebrew word is derived from a root cognate to an Arabic one meaning “to bend off,” “to twist,” and is used for artifice (Dan 8:23), a proverb (Pro 1:6), a song (Psa 49:4; Psa 78:2), an oracle (Num 12:8), a parable (Eze 17:2), and in general any wise or intricate sentence (Psa 94:4; Hab 2:6, etc.), as well as a riddle in our sense of the word (Jdg 14:12-19). In these senses we may compare the phrases στροφὴ λόγων, στροφαὶ παραβολῶν (Wisdom 8, 8; Ecclesiastes 39:2), and περιπλοκὴ λόγων (Eurip. Phacn. 497), and the Latin scirpus, which appears to have been  similarly used (Aul. Gell. Noct. Att. 12, 6).

Augustine defines an enigma to be any “obscura allegoria” (De Trin. 15, 9), and points out, as an instance, the passage about the daughter of the horseleech in Pro 30:15, which has been elaborately explained by Bellermann in a monograph on the subject (AEnigmata Hebraica [Erf. 1798]). Many passages, although not definitely propounded as riddles, may be regarded as such — e.g. Pro 26:10, a verse in the rendering of which every version differs from all others. The riddles which the queen of Sheba came to ask of Solomon (1Ki 10:1; 2Ch 9:1) were rather “hard questions” referring to profound inquiries. Solomon is said, however, to have been very fond of the riddle proper, for Josephus (Ant. 8, 5, 3) quotes two profane historians (Menander of Ephesus, and Dius) to authenticate a story that Solomon proposed numerous riddles to Hiram, for the non- solution of which Hiram was obliged to pay a large fine, until he summoned to his assistance a Tyrian named Abdemon, who not only solved the riddles, but propounded others which Solomon was himself unable to answer, and consequently in his turn incurred the penalty. The word αἴνιγμα occurs only once in the New Test. (1Co 13:12, “darkly,” ἐν αἰνίγματι; comp. Num 12:8; Wettstein, N.T. 2, 158); but, in the wider meaning of the word, many instances of it occur in our Lord's discourses. Thus Erasmus applies the term to Mat 12:43-45. In the Apocrypha we find (Wisd. 47, 15) παραβολαῖς αἰνιγμάτων. The object of such implicated meanings is obvious, and is well explained by Augustine: “Manifestis pascimur, obscuris exercenmur” (De Doct. Christ. 2, 6). The word αἴνιγμα, taken in the extensive meaning of its root, αινος, certainly applies to an immense portion of the sacred writings — viz. as a narrative or tale, having an application to present circumstances; Odyss. (14, 508), a fable, bearing moral instruction; Hesiod, Oper. (p. 202), which nearly approaches to the nature of a parable, SEE PARABLE ; a pointed sentence, saying, or proverb (Theocritus, 14, 13). SEE PROPHECY; SEE PROVERB.

According to Lennep, the word αἴνιγμα, taken substantively, means “anything obscure.”

We know that all ancient nations, especially Orientals, have been fond of riddles (Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3, 68). We find traces of the custom among the Arabs (Koran, 25, 35), and, indeed, several Arabic books of riddles exist — as Ketab el-Algaz in 1469, and a book of riddles solved, called Akd el-Themin. But these are rather emblems and devices than what we call riddles, although they are very ingenious. The Persians call them  Algaz and Maamma (D'Herbelot, s.v. “Algaz”). They were also known to the ancient Egyptians (Jablonski, Pantheon AEgypt. p. 48). They were especially used in banquets both by Greeks and Romans (Müller, Dor. 2, 392; Athen. 10, 457; Pollux, 6, 107; Gell. 18, 2), and the kind of witticisms adopted may be seen in the literary dinners described by Plato, Xenophon, Athenseus, Plutarch, and Macrobius (see Zorn, De Enigmatibus Nuptialibus [Lips. 1724]). Some have groundlessly supposed that the proverbs of Solomon, Lemuel, and Agur were propounded at feasts, like the parables spoken by our Lord on similar occasions (Luk 14:7, etc.).

Riddles were generally proposed in verse, like the celebrated riddle of Samson, which, however, was properly (as Voss points out, Instt. Oratt. 4, 11) no riddle at all, because the Philistines did not possess the only clue on which the solution could depend. For this reason Samson had carefully concealed the fact, even from his parents (Jdg 14:14, etc.). Other ancient riddles in verse are that of the Sphinx, and that which is said to have caused the death of Homer by his mortification at being unable to solve it (Plutarch, Vit. Hom.).

The pleasure of the propounder is derived from perplexing his hearers, and theirs from overcoming the difficulty, which is usually renewed by their proposing another enigma. This kind of amusement seems to have been resorted to, especially at entertainments, in all ages among different nations, and has even been treated as an art and reduced to rules. The chief writers on this curious subject are Nic. Reusner (AEnigmatograph.) and F. Menestrier. The principal rules laid down for the construction of an enigma are the following: that it must be obscure, and the more obscure the better, provided that the description of the thing, however covered and abstract, and in whatever remote or uncommon terms, be really correct; and it is essential that the thing thus described be well known. Sometimes, and especially in a witty enigma, the amusement consists in describing a thing by a set of truisms, which tell their own meaning, but which confound the hearer through his expectation of some deep and difficult meaning.

Franc. Junius distinguishes between the greater enigma, where the allegory or obscure intimation is continuous throughout the passage (as in Eze 17:2, and in such poems as the Syrinx attributed to Theocritus), and the lesser enigma or ὑπαίνιγμα, where the difficulty is concentrated in the peculiar use of some one word. As specimens of the enigmatical style of the former kind in the Old Test., Winer points out Pro 30:12-19; Isa 21:12. The speech of Lamech to his wives Adah and Zillah (Gen 4:23-24) is possibly an enigmatic mode of communicating some painful intelligence. In the New Test. we may adduce our Lord's discourse with Nicodemus (Joh 3:3), and with the Jews (6:51, etc.), where the enigmatical style is adopted for the purpose of engaging attention in an unrivalled manner (Stuck, Antiq. Conviv. 3, 17). It maybe useful to refer to one or two instances of the latter kind, since they are very frequently to be found in the Bible, and especially in the prophets. Such is the play on the word שְׁכֶם(“a portion,” and “Shechem,” the town of Ephraim), in Gen 48:22; on מָצוֹר(matzor, “a fortified city”) and מַצְרִיַם(Mizraim, Egypt), in Mic 7:12; on שָׁקֵד(Shaked, “an almond tree”) and שָׁקִד(shakad, “to hasten”), in Jer 1:11; on דּוּמָה(Dumah, meaning “Edom” and “the land of death”), in Isa 21:11; on שֵׁשִׁךְ, Sheshach (meaning “Babylon,” and perhaps “arrogance”), in Jer 25:26; Jer 51:41. The description of the Messiah under the name of the “Branch” (נֶזֶר, nezer), when considered in regard to the occasion and context, may be taken as a specimen of the lesser enigma (see Lowth upon the passage). SEE NAZARITE.

It only remains to notice the single instance of a riddle occurring in the New Test. — viz. the number of the beast. This belongs to a class of riddles very common among Egyptian mystics, the Gnostics, some of the fathers, and the Jewish Cabalists. The latter called it Gematria (i.e. γεωμετρία), of which instances may be found in Carpzov (App. Crit. p. 542), Reland (Ant. Hebr. 1, 25), and some of the commentators on Rev 13:16-18. Thus נָחָשׁ(nachash), “serpent,” is made by the Jews one of the names of the Messiah, because its numerical value is equivalent to מָשַׁיחִ; and the names Shushan and Esther are connected together because the numerical value of the letters composing them is 661. Thus the Marcosians regarded the number 24 as sacred from its being the sum of numerical values in the names of two quaternions of their eons, and the Gnostics used the name Abraxas as an amulet because its letters amount numerically to 365. Such idle fancies are not infrequent in some of the fathers. Instances occur in the mystic explanation by Clem. Alexandrinus of the number 318 in Gen 14:14, and by Tertullian of the number 300 (represented by the letter T or a cross) in Jdg 7:6, and similar instances are supplied by the Testimonia of the Pseudo- Cyprian. The most exact analogies, however, to the enigma on the name of  the beast are to be found in the so-called Sibylline verses. We quote one which is exactly similar to it, the answer being found in the name Ι᾿ησοῦς =888, thus: Ι =10+ η = 8+ σ =200+ ο =70+ υ =400+ ς =200=888. It is as follows, and is extremely curious:

ἣξει σαρκοφόρος θνητοῖς ὁμοιούμενος ἐν γῇ τέσσερα φωνήεντα φέρει, τὰ δ᾿ ἄφωνα δύ᾿ αὐτῷ δίσσων ἀστραγάλων (·), ἀριθμὸν δ᾿ ὅλον ἐξονομήνω ὄκτω γὰρ μονάδας, ὅσσας δεκάδας ἐπὶ τούτοις, ἤδ᾿ ἑκατοντάδας ὄκτω ἀπιστοτέροις ἀνθρώποις οὔνομα δηλώσει.

With examples like this before us, it would be absurd to doubt that John (not greatly removed in time from the Christian forgers of the Sibylline verses) intended some name as an answer to the number 666. The true answer must be settled by the Apocalyptic commentators. Most of the fathers supposed, even as far back as Irenaeus, the name Λάτεινος to be indicated. A list of the other very numerous solutions, proposed in different ages, may be found in Elliott's Horoe Apocalypticoe (3, 222-234), from which we have quoted several of these instances. SEE NUMBER OF THE BEAST.

## Riddle, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Riddle, John, D.D.]]

             a minister of the Associate Reformed Church, was born in Monaghan County, Ireland, in 1758. He graduated at the University of Glasgow April 10, 1782, and entered upon the study of theology, under the supervision of John Brown, of Haddington. He was licensed to preach June 14, 1788, and was installed pastor of the congregation in Donaghloney, County Down, Nov. 18. In this connection he remained till the spring of 1794, when he came to the United States. In August of the same year he was installed at Robinson Run as pastor of the united congregations of Robinson Run and Union, in the vicinity of Pittsburgh. After a few years the congregations so increased that, at his request, he was released from Union, and settled for the whole of his time at Robinson Run. Here he continued to labor the remainder of his life, and died, after a month's illness, Sept. 4, 1829. Dr. Riddle took an active part in the management of the affairs of the Associate Reformed Church, which was in its infancy when he became a member of it. He was among those who opposed the proceedings of the General Assembly Reformed Synod, and who finally, in 1820, resolved to constitute themselves into an independent synod, to be known as the “Associate Reformed Synod of the West.” He was a close student, argumentative in his preaching, and an excellent pastor. None of the  productions of his pen were ever printed, though he left behind a large MS. on the subject of Religious Covenanting, which, had he lived a little longer, it is thought he would have published. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 57.

## Riddle, Joseph Esmond[[@Headword:Riddle, Joseph Esmond]]

             an English clergyman, of St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, curate of Harrow, and subsequently incumbent of St. Philip's, Leckhampton, was born about 1801, and died Aug. 27, 1859. He was the author of many works, both theological and educational, among which are, Luther and his Times (Lond. 1837, 12mo): — Ecclesiastical Chronology, or Annals of the Christian Church (ibid. 1840, 8vo): — Manual of Christian Antiquities (ibid. 1839, 8vo; 2d ed. 1843): — Natural History of Infidelity (eight Bampton Lectures; 1852, 8vo): — besides Sermons, Manuals, etc.: — also a Complete English -Latin and Latin-English Dictionary (ibid. 1836, 8vo), of which several editions have been published. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Riddoch, James[[@Headword:Riddoch, James]]

             a minister of the Episcopal Church, Scotland, during the last century, was born at Grange, Bamffshire. He was first minister of a chapel at Glasgow, and afterwards became one of the ministers of St. Paul's Chapel, Aberdeen, in 1757, in which charge he continued twenty years. His sermons are distinguished for pathos, persuasion, eloquence, and piety. He published Sermons on Several Subjects, etc. (Lond. 1799, 3 vols. 8vo; a fifth edition was published in 1831, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Rideout, Uriel[[@Headword:Rideout, Uriel]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bowdoin, Me., July 26, 1816. He joined the Maine Conference in 1846, and labored until 1849, when he located for the purpose of attending the Concord Biblical Institute. He resumed his place in conference in 1850, and continued in active service until the session of 1868, when he received a supernumerary relation. After an illness of ten days, he died at Cape Elizabeth Ferry Aug. 30, 1868. His labors were characterized by zeal and discretion, by ability and ministerial fidelity. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 141.

## Rider[[@Headword:Rider]]

             (רוֹכֵב, rokeb). It is uncertain at what time, or in what place, horses were first used for riding, but there is every reason to believe that it was not until a period long after their having been employed for draught. Instead of cavalry, the Egyptians and Babylonians, and the Greeks of the Homeric age, used war chariots, the drivers of which are in the earlier books of the Old Test. called “riders,” as in Miriam's song of triumph for the overthrow of the Egyptian host (Exodus 15). The book of Job, however, clearly intimates a “rider,” in our acceptation of the word, in the description of the chase of the ostrich: “She scorneth the horse and his rider” (Job 39:18). White asses were used as steeds by the nobles in the land under the Judges, and instead of these we find that mules were used in the age of the Kings, horses being almost exclusively reserved for chariots. The Persians appear to have been the first Oriental nation that discovered the superiority of a flexible body of cavalry over a cumbrous and unwieldy corps of chariots. Many of their early victories may fairly be ascribed to their skill in horsemanship. On the other hand, the Jewish armies were always deficient in cavalry, and their alliances with foreign states were generally designed to obtain a supply of auxiliary horse. It is not one of the least proofs of Solomon's political wisdom that he exerted himself to supply this national deficiency. SEE HORSE.

## Rider, John[[@Headword:Rider, John]]

             an Irish prelate, was born at Carrington, in Cheshire, about 1562, and entered Jesus College, Oxford, in 1576, where he took his degree of A.M., and continued in the university for some years, teaching grammar chiefly. He was preferred to the living of Waterstock, Oxfordshire, in 1580, but resigned it in 1581. In 1583 he was admitted to that of South Wokingdoin, which he resigned in 1590. He was also rector of St. Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey, and of Winwick, in Lancashire. He was afterwards archdeacon of Meath, in Ireland, dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin, and in 1612 bishop of Killaloe. He died in 1632, and was buried in his cathedral. He was much respected for his piety and learning. His principal work is, A Dictionary, English-Latin and Latin-English (Oxf. 1589, 4to). It was the first Latin dictionary in which the English part was placed before the Latin part. In addition are given, A Letter Concerning the News out of Ireland (Lond. 1601, 4to): — Caveat to Irish Catholics (Dublin, 1602, 4to): —  Claim of Antiquity in Behalf of the Protestant Religion (Lond. 1608, 4to). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ridge[[@Headword:Ridge]]

             the upper angle of a roof. It has usually, though by no means always, a piece of timber running along it, called the ridge piece, upon which the upper ends of the rafters rest; the tiles with which it is covered are called ridge-tiles. These are sometimes made ornamental, good instances of which are found at Great Malvern and Lincoln. — Parker, Glossary of Architecture, s.v. SEE RIB.

## Ridgley, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Ridgley, Thomas, D.D.]]

             an eminent English Independent minister, was born in London about 1667, and educated at an academy in Wiltshire. Entering the ministry, he was in 1695 chosen assistant to Mr. Thomas Gouge, near the Three Cranes, London, and about four years afterwards became his successor. In 1712 he, with Mr. John Eames, began to conduct an Independent academy in London as divinity tutor. He died March 27, 1734. His principal work is, A Body of Divinity, an exposition of the Assembly's Larger Catechism (1731-33, 2 vols. fol.; new edition, with notes, by John M. Wilson, Edinb. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo; Lond. 1845, 2 vols. 8vo; N.Y. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). He also published Sermons, etc. (Lond. 1701-25). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Riding Committees[[@Headword:Riding Committees]]

             were committees of the General Assembly sent to supersede a presbytery which had refused to ordain a presentee over a reclaiming parish. The first instance occurred in 1717, when a presbytery refused to ordain a Mr. John Hay in the parish of Peebles, and the General Assembly passed an act “appointing certain brethren to correspond with the Presbytery of Peebles, and to act and vote in their meetings at their next ensuing diet, and thereafter, until the settlement of Mr. John Hay in the parish of Peebles be completed, and to concur with them in his ordination.” By this device both the opposition of the people and the conscientious reluctance of the presbytery were surmounted. The last instance of a settlement effected by  means of a riding committee was that of Mr. Watson in the Presbytery of Linlithgow, May 30, 1751.

## Ridley, Gloucester, D.D.[[@Headword:Ridley, Gloucester, D.D.]]

             a learned English divine, was born at sea, on board the Gloucester, an East Indiaman, 1702. He received his education at Winchester and New College, receiving the degree of B.C.L. April 29, 1729. For a great part of his life he had no other preferment than the small college living of Weston, in Norfolk, and the donative of Poplar, in Middlesex, where he resided. To these his college added, some years after, the donative of Romford, in Essex. In 1761 he was presented by archbishop Secker to a golden prebend at Salisbury. He published, Eight Sermons on the Holy Ghost (1740-41; Lond. 1742, 8vo; new ed. Oxf. 1802, 8vo): — De Syriacarum Novi Foederis Versionum Indole atque Usu Dissertatio, etc. (Lond. 1761, 4to): — Life of Nicholas Ridley (1763, 4to): — besides Letters, etc. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict.; Hook, Eccles. Biog.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Ridley, Joseph James, D.D[[@Headword:Ridley, Joseph James, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in North Carolina in 1810. He was confirmed in 1835; made deacon in 1843., and presbyter in 1844; became rector in Oxford, N.C., in 1853, and the following year in Clarksville, Tennessee. While in this parish he received the degree of M.D., after having pursued a course of study in medicine. In 1860 he removed to Knoxville, as president of East Tennessee University; the following year returned to Clarksville, as rector of Trinity Church; in 1866 was rector of St. Paul's Church, Louisburg, N.C.; in 1867 of St. Thomas's Church, Somerville, Tennessee; about 1870 of Zion's Church, Brownsville, where he died, March 10, 1878.

## Ridley, Nicholas[[@Headword:Ridley, Nicholas]]

             an eminent English prelate and martyr, was descended from an ancient family in Northumberland, and was born in the year 1500, in Tynedale, at a place called Wilmontswick. He was educated in a grammar school at Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and entered Pembroke Hall, Cambridge, about 1518. Here he was taught Greek by Richard Crook, who about that time began to teach it in Cambridge. His religious sentiments were those of the Romish Church, in which he had been brought up. In 1522 he took the degree of A.B., in 1524 was chosen fellow of his college, and in 1525 received the degree of A.M. Directing his attention to the study of divinity, his uncle, Dr. Robert Ridley, who had thus far paid for his education, sent him for further improvement to the Sorbonne at Paris, and thence to Louvain. In 1530 he was chosen junior treasurer of his college, and at this time paid great attention to the study of the Scriptures. For this purpose he used to walk in the orchard at Pembroke Hall, and there committed to memory almost all the epistles in Greek. The walk is still called Ridley's Walk. In 1533 he was chosen senior proctor of the university, and while in that office the question of the pope's supremacy came before the university to be examined on the authority of Scripture.

The decision was that “the  bishop of Rome had no more authority and jurisdiction derived from God, in this kingdom of England, than any other foreign bishop,” and was signed by the vice-chancellor, and by Nicholas Ridley and Richard Wilkes, proctors. In 1534 he took the degree of B.D., and was chosen chaplain of the university and public reader. In 1537, Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury, appointed him one of his chaplains, and as a further mark of his esteem collated him, April, 1538, to the vicarage of Herne, in Kent. In 1539, when the act of the Six Articles was passed, Mr. Ridley bore his testimony against it in the pulpit, although he was in no danger from its penalties; still believing in transubstantiation, unmarried, and leaning to the practice of auricular confession, although not insisting upon it as necessary to salvation. In 1540 he went to Cambridge and took the degree of D.D., and about the same time was elected master of Pembroke Hall, having been also, through Cranmer's influence, appointed chaplain to the king, and appointed a prebend in the cathedral of Canterbury. At Canterbury he preached with so much zeal against the abuses of popery that the other prebendaries and preachers of the old learning brought articles against him at the archbishop's visit in 1541, but the attempt failed. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, next caused articles to be exhibited against him before the justices of the peace in Kent, and afterwards before the king and council, charging him with preaching against auricular confession and with directing the Te Deum to be sung in English. The accusation was referred to Cranmer, and immediately crushed by him. The greater part of 1545 was spent by Dr. Ridley in retirement, and he employed himself in carefully examining the truth and evidence of the doctrine of transubstantiation, of which he had been an unsuspecting believer. He consulted the Apology of the Zwinglians and the writings of Bertram (q.v.), and concluded that the doctrine had no foundation, and found that Cranmer and Latimer both joined him in the same opinion. At the close of the year Cranmer gave him the eighth stall in St. Peter's, Westminster. When Edward VI ascended the throne, in 1547, Dr. Ridley, being appointed to preach before the king on Ash-Wednesday, took that opportunity to discourse concerning the abuses of images in churches, and ceremonies, particularly the use of holy-water for driving away devils. About this time the fellows of Pembroke Hall presented Dr. Ridley to the living of Soham, in the diocese of Norwich; but the presentation being disputed by the bishop, he was admitted to the living by command of the king.

On Sept. 25 he was consecrated bishop of Rochester, and in 1548 was employed with Cranmer and others in reforming and compiling the Book of Common Prayer. On the suspension  of bishop Bonner, bishop Ridley was transferred to London, and was installed April, 1550. In 1551 the sweating sickness prevailed in London, and although it was fatal to hundreds, yet bishop Ridley remained faithfully at his post. In June, 1550, the bishop directed that the Romish altars should be taken down, and tables substituted, in order to take away the belief of the people that an altar was necessary to the celebration of the sacrament. He was soon after engaged with Cranmer in drawing up the Forty-two Articles. In 1552 he visited his old college at Cambridge, and on his return called at Hansdon, to pay his respects to the princess Mary. The arrogance, insolence, and bitterness of her nature she displayed on this occasion in the insults she offered Ridley. In 1553 the bishop preached before Edward VI, and so aroused the benevolence of the king that the latter sent to him to inquire how he might best put into practice the duties he had so strongly enforced. The result was the founding and endowment of Christ's, Bartholomew's, Bridewell, and St. Thomas's hospitals. Upon the death of Edward VI, Ridley strove to put lady Jane Grey upon the throne; but failing, he went to Mary, as was expected of the bishop of London, and did her homage. By her command he was sent back from Framingham on a lame horse and committed to the Tower, July 26, 1553, to be proceeded against for heresy. It has been thought that bishop Ridley might have recovered the queen's favor by countenancing her proceedings in religion. But he was too honest to act against his convictions, and, after eight months' imprisonment in the Tower, was taken to Oxford, where he was, Oct. 1, 1555, condemned to death for heresy. The evening before his execution he supped with some of his friends, showing great cheerfulness; and refused the offer of one of them to sic up with him, saying, “I mean to go to bed, and, by God's will, to sleep as quietly as ever I did in my life.” On October 16, arrayed in his episcopal habit, he walked to the place of execution between the mayor and one of the aldermen of Oxford. Seeing Latimer approach, he ran to meet him, and, embracing him, exclaimed, “Be of good heart, brother, for God will either assuage the fury of the flames, or else give us strength to endure them.” Going to the stake, they both kissed it and prayed earnestly. Refused permission to speak unless he recanted, he said, ”Well, so long as the breath is in my body, I will never deny my Lord Christ and his known truth. God's will be done in me.” Fire was then applied, and after suffering intensely for a long time Ridley expired. Bishop Ridley, in his private life, was a pattern of piety, humility, temperance, and regularity. The following works are ascribed to him by Anthony Wood: Treatise concerning Images: — Brief Declaration of the  Lord's Supper (1555 and 1586, 8vo): — A Friendly Farewell, written during his imprisonment at Oxford (1559, 8vo): — Account of the Disputation held at Oxford (1688, 4to): — A Treatise of the Blessed Sacrament. Additions are made by other authorities. Many of his letters are in Fox's Acts and Monuments, and in Dr. Gloster's Life of Bishop Ridley.

## Ridolphus (Ital. Ridolfi), Claudio[[@Headword:Ridolphus (Ital. Ridolfi), Claudio]]

             a painter of the Venetian school, was born at Verona in 1574. He was descended from a noble family, and in his youth made great progress in his art. He worked in Verona, Urbino, and other cities of Italy. He died in 1644. The works of Ridolphus show a purity of design and simplicity of composition which are seldom found in the works of the Venetian school. Among his best are. Presentation of the Virgin at the Temple: — The Assumption: — a Virgin, and several Saints. See Bumassuti, Guida di Verona.

## Riederer, Johann Bartholomaus[[@Headword:Riederer, Johann Bartholomaus]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Nuremberg, March 3,1720. He studied at Altdorf and Halle, was in 1744 afternoon preacher at Nuremberg, in 1745 preacher at Altdorf, in 1752 professor, in 1753 doctor of theology, in 1769 archdeacon, and died February 5, 1771. He wrote, De Genuino Sensu Jer 31:3 (Altdorf, 1753): — De Pauli Praedicantis inter Gentes Evangelium Successibus (1759), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:167, 317, 546, 630, 750; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rieger, Georg Conrad[[@Headword:Rieger, Georg Conrad]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 7, 1687, at Cannstadt. In 1715 he was vicar at Stuttgard, in 1718 deacon at Urach, in 1721 professor at the gymnasium in Stuttgard, in 1733 pastor of St. Leonhard, in 1742 dean, and died April 16, 1743. Rieger was an excellent preacher, and his sermons and ascetical writings have been repeatedly reprinted. See Schmidt, Geschichte der Predigt (Gotha, 1872), pages 196-198; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rieger, Karl Heinrich[[@Headword:Rieger, Karl Heinrich]]

             son of Georg Conrad, was born at Stuttgard, June 16, 1726. In 1753 he was vicar at Stuttgard, in 1754 second deacon at Ludwigsburg, in 1757 court chaplain, and in 1779 court preacher at Stuttgarc, and died January 15, 1791. After his death were published, Ueber die evangelischen Texte an den Sonn-, Fest- und Feiertagen (Stuttgard, 1794): — Ueber das Neue Tespnment (1828, 4 volumes): — Ueber die Psalmen und die zwolf kleinen Propheten (1835, 2 volumes): — Ueber das Leben Jesu (1838). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Riegger, Joseph Anton Stephan von[[@Headword:Riegger, Joseph Anton Stephan von]]

             an eminent teacher of jurisprudence, who was also author, imperial councilor, censor of books, etc., and whose principal field of labor was the University of Freiburg, was born at Innspruck, Feb. 13, 1742. He wrote his first work — a review of the works of Plautus and Terence when scarcely fifteen years of age, became master in philosophy in 1761, and in 1764 entered on his first position as a teacher in the Theresianum. During his preliminary studies he had published a Bibliotheca Juris Canonici (1761): — an edition of August. Archiep. Taracon. De Emend. Gratiani Dialogi, and a new edition of the canonist Cironius, and had also written verses in German and Latin. In 1765 he was called to a professorship at Freiburg, and for the first time delivered lectures on jurisprudence in the German tongue. His promotions were now so rapid that scarcely a year passed without bringing to him new honors of this kind, and his reputation secured for him the charge of repeated government commissions of importance and delicacy; but the payment of debts incurred by his father and by an insolvent brother so impaired his fortune that a removal from Freiburg became desirable. He became professor of civil law at Prague and government councilor of Bohemia, and died Aug. 5, 1795. He had been actively connected with the reform movements of his age, and had given books to the world which excited much attention in their time, e.g. one on the right of a prince to tax persons of clerical rank. A work on the decretals  of popes, etc., in which unpublished MSS. were largely introduced, would have been his crowning labor, but an installment issued under the title Bernardi Breviarium Extravagantium (1778) failed to secure the sympathy of the public and caused him to renounce the undertaking. His numerous writings in the departments of belles lettres, jurisprudence, and canon law are given in Mensel, Lexikon d. v. Jahre 1750-1800 verstorb. deutsch. Schriftsteller (Leips. 1811), vol. 11; and in Weidlich, Biogr. Nachrichten, etc. (Halle, 1751), part 2. See Grünwald, Biographie d. beid. Ritter von Riegger (Prague, 1798); Schlichtegroll, Necrolog. auf d. Jahr 1795, 1st half.

## Riegger, Paul Joseph von[[@Headword:Riegger, Paul Joseph von]]

             father of J.A.S. Riegger (q.v.), and professor of canon law in the University of Vienna from 1753 to 1775, was born at Freiburg, June 29, 1705, and received his education in his native town. At the age of sixteen years he obtained the degree of master in philosophy, and at the age of twenty-eight he became doctor of both civil and ecclesiastical law. Soon afterwards he was called to the chair of jurisprudence and German history at Innspruck, where he subsequently attained to the highest honors, being twice elected rector and eight times dean of the university, frequently acting as its chosen agent in transactions with the imperial court, and also serving as counsel to the courts of Lower Austria. The empress Maria Theresa placed him over the Imperial Theresa School and the Academy of Savoyard Knights as teacher of public and canonical law in 1749, and in 1753 he became professor of ecclesiastical law in the University of Vienna, though retaining the positions he already held. His Institutiones Jurisprudentioe Ecclesiasticoe (4 vols.) were generally introduced into the schools of Austria. His next preferment was to the posts of imperial councilor and censor of books, and in 1764 to the knighthood and to the Bohemian branch of the government. Many laws relating to the establishing and execution of spiritual functions owe their origin to him, as does the abolition of trials for magical practices and witchcraft. He is the father of the ecclesiastical system of Austria as subsequently taught in all its schools. The liberal influence exerted by him crowded the ultramontane theories out of use, and caused him to be regarded at Rome as an important promoter of reforms in the Church. It is said that he was threatened with excommunication in consequence, and that his works were placed in the Index. He died Dec. 8, 1775. A list of his works is given in Mensel and Weidlich. See Biographie d. beid. Ritter von Riegger (Prague, 1798).

## Riegler, Georg[[@Headword:Riegler, Georg]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born April 21, 1778. In 1806 he received holy orders, and was for some time priest of different congregations, called in 1821 as professor to Bamberg, and died in 1847. He is the author of, Kritische Geschichte der Vulgata (Sulzbach, 1820): — Hebraische Sprachschule (together with A. Martinet, Bamberg, 1835): — Dass Bulch Ruth aus dens Hebraischen mit Erlauterungen (Wurzburg, 1812): — Der xviii. Psalm erlautert (1823): — Die Klagelieder Jeremias erlautert (1820): — Christliche Moral (1823, 3 volumes): — Der Eid (2d ed. 1826): — Biblische Hermeneutik (1835): — Die Eucharistie nach Schrift und Tradition (1845): — Das heilige Abendmahl mit Controversesn (1845). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:62, 117, 203, 210, 220, 317, 489, 870; 2:350, 387. (B.P.)

## Rienzo, Cola Di[[@Headword:Rienzo, Cola Di]]

             (Nicolo di Lorenzo), Rome's “last tribune,” was born of humble parentage, in the year 1313, at Rome. He was endowed with an ambitious and daring spirit, and, as the event proved, with an overweening vanity, and he possessed the gift of a fiery eloquence. His first public appearance was in 1343, in the character of notary to an embassy of Roman citizens sent to greet pope Clement VI and persuade him to return to Rome, where the families of Colonna and Ursini were then contending against each other — the power of the nobles generally having grown to excessive proportions — and the oppression of the people and their sinking into immorality were keeping equal pace. Rienzo became acquainted with Petrarch — subsequently his enthusiastic supporter — while at Avignon, and he there received the appointment of papal notary. After his return to Rome he devoted himself to the work of inflaming the passions of the people through the means of popular and patriotic addresses, and with such success that he was proclaimed tribune of Rome and clothed with dictatorial powers in May, 1347. The pope at first confirmed Rienzi's elevation in the hope of securing the people and humbling the nobility, and the tribune's good fortune, power, and just administration recommended him even to princes, e.g. the emperor Lewis and the king of Hungary, who sought his friendship; but the height he had attained made him dizzy. He knighted himself; declared Rome the sovereign of the world; commanded the pope and cardinals to return to Rome; cited the emperor and the king of Bohemia before him in order to restore peace between them; ordered the electors to furnish evidence of their right to elect the emperors, etc. Warnings and outbreaks of discontented factions failed to restrain him, and pope Clement interfered with what was rapidly becoming a reign of terror by issuing (Dec. 3, 1347) a bull against the tribune. The people immediately forsook Rienzi, and he was compelled to flee in disguise from Rome in January 1348.

He subsequently returned secretly to Rome, but soon went to Prague, where he was apprehended by the emperor Charles IV, who delivered him to the pope at Avignon in 1351. Innocent IV soon afterwards became pope, and Rienzi succeeded in disproving the charges raised against him of heresy and tyranny, and even in securing the pope's favor and confidence. In the meantime the conflict of factions had broken out again with fresh fury at Rome, and a papal notary named Baroncelli (or Baracelli) had assumed the role of tribune. It was seen at Avignon that Rienzi might defeat the projects of that agitator, and he was accordingly  attached to the suite of the cardinal Aegidius Albornoz, to whom was intrusted the pacification of Italy. The vacillating populace received him with enthusiasm; but no sooner was he in the possession of power than he began once more to abuse it. He disregarded the hatred of the house of Colonna, imposed unwise taxes, and left his bodyguard unpaid; and when it became apparent that his firmness had departed and that his administration was undecided and fluctuating, a popular outbreak was brought about by some means, Rienzi's house was burned, and Rienzi himself was slain by the people who just before had almost worshipped him. The date of his death is Oct. 4, 1354 (others, Oct. 7 or 8). The estimates of Rienzi's life and services differ greatly, some (as Schlosser, Weltgesch.) representing him as a fantastical charlatan, and others finding in him noble traits, especially an enthusiasm for republican institutions and for justice. Still others deny to him all greatness of character, but find an explanation of his career in the extraordinary conditions of his time and the circumstances of his life. Nationalism, based on the renewed familiarity with the conditions of antiquity, was certainly the leading element in the rapid drama of his life. See Baluzii Vitoe Pap. Avenion.; Bzovius, Annal. Eccl. ad Ann. 1353, No. 2; Villani, Col. di Rienzo; Schlosser, Weltgesch. vol. 4, pt. 1; Hist. polit. Blätter, vol. 20; Papencordt, Col. di Rienzo u. seine Zeit (Hamb. and Gotha, 1841); and others; also Bulwer's novel, Rienzi, the Last of the Tribunes.

## Ries, Franz Ulrich[[@Headword:Ries, Franz Ulrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born January 3, 1695, at Breidenbach, Hesse, and studied at Marburg and Heidelberg. In 1721 he was professor of philosophy at Marburg, in 1725 doctor, and in 1728. professor of theology. Ries died November 6, 1755, and left De Jesu Nazareno in Vaticiniis Veteris Testamenti Pradicto (Marburg, 1722): — De Deo Spiritu (1724): — De Morbo Pauli Apostoli ad 2Co 12:7 (eod.): — De Atheis Eorumque Stultitia (1725): — De Sacerdotis Summi in Sanctum Sanctorum Ingressu (1726): — De Divinitate Sacrae Scripturae (1748): — De Salute Protoplastorum (1750): — De Asylis sive Urbibus Refugii (1753). See Doring, Die gelehlrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rieti, Moses Ben-Isaac Di[[@Headword:Rieti, Moses Ben-Isaac Di]]

             of Perugia, a noted Jewish writer, was born in 1388 and died after 1451. He was a physician and philosopher of some renown. and wrote very elegant verses in Hebrew and Italian. He is the author of ס מקדש מעט, a Great Paradiso in Terza Rima, with literary and historical notes. It consists of two parts, viz. the חלק האולם and החיכל חלק, which again are separated into divisions. The first part contains in the first division a prayer to God, and speaks of the plan, name, division, and grouping of the work; in the second the author treats of theology, revelation, the thirteen articles of faith, the phases of philosophy among Greeks and Hebrews, of the Cabala and its study; in the third he treats of the other sciences, the liberal arts, etc.; in the fourth he speaks of the introduction of Porphyry, the ten categories, the commentary of Ibn-Roshd, and the philosophical labors of Levi ben-Gershon, or Ralbag; in the fifth he continues to speak of philosophy. The second part, which is composed of eight divisions, speaks  in the first of Paradise, with its patriarchs, prophets, Sanhedrim, the wise and pious; the second, which is also entitled למשה תפלה, is a grand confessional, penitential, and admonitory prayer; in the third, which is called עיר אלהים, The City of God, the bright abode of Ezra, Daniel, Zerubbabel, Zechariah, etc., is described; in the fourth, called הנפש אניות, the author of the Mishna and his work in the domain of the blessed are described; the fifth speaks of the chapters of the six orders of the Mishna and their contents; the sixth treats of the writings of the Tanaim, Amoraim, Saboraim, Geonim, etc., down to the author's own time; the seventh descants upon the teachers of the Talmud, the theology of the Midrashim, etc.; and, finally, the eighth narrates the exiles of the Jews and their sufferings. In the Paradiso, Di Rieti excludes Immanuel of Rome (q.v.) from the regions of the blessed, and he is also said to have repented of his own poetry as a waste of time. “This would show that he possessed more judgment than those who have published this unattractive work as the production of the ‘Hebrew Dante'” (Steinschneider). This Divina Commedia was first edited after three MSS., by Jacob Goldenthal, with an Italian and Hebrew introduction (Vienna, 1851). Di Rieti wrote some other works, which, however, are yet in MS. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 158 sq.; Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb. 3, 945 a; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1875), 8, 143-145; Delitzsch, Gesch. d. jüdischen Poesie, p. 54, 145; Moses Rieti, in the Jewish Messenger (N.Y.), May 18, 1876. (B.P.)

## Rietschel, Ernst Friedrich August[[@Headword:Rietschel, Ernst Friedrich August]]

             an eminent German sculptor, was born in Pulsnitz, Saxony, Dec. 15, 1804. He studied under Rauch at Berlin, and in Italy. Settling in Dresden, he became professor in the Academy of Arts. Among his works are, Mary Kneeling over the Dead Body of Christ: — a bust of Luther: — the Four Hours of the Day: — colossal statues of Goethe and Schiller (at Weimar), and the Christ-angel. He died at Dresden in 1861.

## Rietter, Anton[[@Headword:Rietter, Anton]]

             a German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Stadt-am-Hof in 1808. He studied at Regensburg and Munich; was appointed professor of moral philosophy at Amberg in 1835, at Regensburg in 1842, and at Munich in 1852. He died at Stadt-am-Hof, Nov. 6, 1866. He wrote, Das Leben, das Werk und die Würde Jesu Christi (Regensburg, 1846): — Der Weg der Liebe (ibid. 1856): — Der heil. Liebe naturliches Licht, etc. (Munich,  1857): — Die Moral des heil. Thomas von Aquin (ibid. 1858): — Breviarium der christlichen Ethik (Regensburg, 1866). (B.P.)

## Riffel, Caspar[[@Headword:Riffel, Caspar]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian, some time professor of theology at Giessen, who died in 1856, a doctor of theology, is the author of, Christliche Kirchengeschichte der neuesten Zeit (Mayence, 1847, 3 volumes): — Die Auf hebung des Jesuiten-Ordens (3d ed. 1855): — Darstellung der Verhaltnisse zwischen Kirche und Staat (1841). (B.P.).

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

             Rifi is a dialect of Shilha, Morocco. A translation of the gospel of Matthew into this dialect was made by Mr. William Mackintosh, agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society at Morocco, which was printed by the same society in 1855, in Arabic type. (B.P.)

## Rig-Veda[[@Headword:Rig-Veda]]

             the first and principal of the four Vedas. SEE VEDA.

## Rigand, Stephen Jordan, D.D.[[@Headword:Rigand, Stephen Jordan, D.D.]]

             the eldest son of John Francis Rigand, was educated at, and afterwards fellow and tutor of, Exeter College, Oxford. He became second master of Westminster School, and headmaster of Ipswich School, Suffolk; mathematical examiner in 1845, and one of the select preachers of Oxford University in 1856. He was appointed bishop of Antigua in 1857, and died there, of yellow fever, May 16, 1859. He published Sermons on the Lord's Prayer (Ipswich, 1852, 8vo), and edited vol. 1, and published vols. 1 and 2, of the Correspondence of Scientific Men. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rigaud, Stephen Jordan, D.D[[@Headword:Rigaud, Stephen Jordan, D.D]]

             a colonial bishop of the Church of England, matriculated at Exeter College, Oxford; took the degree of B.A. in 1841; was ordained deacon in 1840 and presbyter in 1842; became fellow, tutor, and examiner of Exeter College in 184546; head master of Queen Elizabeth School, Ipswich, in 1850; and was consecrated bishop of Antigua in 1857, his jurisdiction comprising seven hundred and fifty-one square miles. He died of yellow fever at Antigua, West Indies, May 16, 1859. Bishop Rigaud was the author and editor of, Letters of Scientific Aen: — Newton and Contemporaries: — Defence of Halley against the Charge of Religious Infidelity: — Sermons on The Lord's Prayer, etc. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. 1859, page 538.

## Rigby, Alfred A.[[@Headword:Rigby, Alfred A.]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, of whose early history nothing is known. He fought in the Union army during the Rebellion, and it was while in military service that he connected himself with the Church. He was licensed to preach soon after his return from the war, and in 1870 was received on trial in the Des Moines Conference and appointed to Wheeling Circuit. But overwork and over study brought on disease, and he died at New Vernon, July 9, 1872. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1872, p. 103.

## Rigdon, Sidney[[@Headword:Rigdon, Sidney]]

             a prominent Mormon leader, was born in St. Clair, Beaver County, Pennsylvania, February 19, 1793, and received a fair English education. I1 learned the printer's trade, and was working in an office in Pittsburgh when, about 1812, a manuscript was offered for publication by an eccentric preacher named Solomon Spaulding, which was entitled, The Manuscript Found, or, The Book of Mormon. Rigdon was so much interested in the work that he made a copy before it was returned to Spaulding, who died a short time after. About 1817 Rigdon became a Campbellite preacher, with an evident leaning towards Adventism. In 1829 he became acquainted with Joseph Smith, and arranged with him to have the Book of Mormon published, as the basis for a new sect. From this time he was closely  identified with the Mormon movement, going with the new body, and suffering persecution with them. He was a candidate for the leadership on the death of Smith, and on the election of Brigham Young refused to acknowledge his authority. Accordingly he was excommunicated, and returned to Pittsburgh. He afterwards lived in obscurity, and died at Friendship, N.Y., July 14, 1876. SEE MORMONS.

## Riggen, John Wesley[[@Headword:Riggen, John Wesley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Maryland Aug. 26, 1794. His parents migrated to Mason County, Ky., and, being poor and in a new country, were unable to give him a proper education. In 1816 he was converted, and joined the Methodist Episcopal Church. He commenced as a local preacher in 1823, and in 1827 was ordained deacon. He joined the traveling connection in 1834, and was ordained elder in 1835. He was a member of the Kentucky Conference until his death, Sept. 30, 1845. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, M.E. Church, South, 1846, p. 56.

## Riggs, Adam S.[[@Headword:Riggs, Adam S.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Williamson County, Tenn., near Rigg's Cross Roads, June 6, 1816, and professed conversion June 19, 1836. He united with the Church on the  25th of the same month; was licensed to preach Sept. 21, 1839; was received on trial in the Tennessee Conference in 1839, and served as an itinerant preacher thirty-one years. After an illness of a little over three weeks, he died Oct. 29, 1870. Mr. Riggs was an able and judicious officer of the Church; a wise counsellor; modest, firm, and faithful. He was honored by his brethren, and was chosen several times as a delegate to the General Conference. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, M.E. Church, South, 1870, p. 586.

## Riggs, Cyrus C., D.D[[@Headword:Riggs, Cyrus C., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Fairfield, Pennsylvania, April 10, 1810. He graduated from Jefferson College in 1836, studied at the Western Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1839, ordained in 1840, pastor in Illinois until 1845, then in Maryland and Pennsylvania, and teacher in Beaver, Pennsylvania, in 1869. He died August 29, 1883. See Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v.

## Riggs, Joseph L.[[@Headword:Riggs, Joseph L.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at New Providence, N.J., March 19, 1809. He graduated at Amherst College, Mass.; studied theology in Andover Seminary, Mass., and in Princeton Theological Seminary, N.J., and was licensed and ordained Aug. 27, 1845. His fields of labor were, Wells, Bradford Co., Pa.; Millerstown, Pa.; Cumberland, Ill.; and as city missionary in Elmira, N.Y., where he died, Aug. 20, 1865. Mr. Riggs was a faithful preacher, and he loved the work to which he had devoted himself. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 223.

## Riggs, Stephen R., D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Riggs, Stephen R., D.D., LL.D]]

             a venerable Presbyterian missionary to the North American Indians, was born at Steubenville, Ohio, March 23, 1812. He graduated from Jefferson College, and pursued his theological studies at Allegheny Seminary. He was ordained and commissioned as a missionary to the Dakota Indians in 1836. He commenced his labors at Laquiparle, where he made encouraging progress in teaching and converting the red men. He reduced the Dakota language to a written form, published text-books for spelling and reading, and translated the Bible. He also published a Dakota Dictionary. Upwards of fifty books, consisting of original writings and translations in connection with a history of Dakota, constitute the literary work of his life. In 1880 Dr. Riggs, Hon. W.E. Dodge, and justice Strong of the United States Supreme Court, were appointed a committee by the Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States to present to Congress the need of securing to Indians the rights of white men. Dr. Riggs was the author of the memorial which was read to the Senate committee by justice Strong. More than forty years of his life were spent among the Indians, and he lived to sec six of the churches of Dakota transferred to the Board of Foreign Missions. He died at Beloit, Wisconsin, August 24, 1883. See Presbyterian Home Missionary, September 1883; Nevin, Presb. Encyclop. s.v. (W.P.S.)

## Righiel Lambo[[@Headword:Righiel Lambo]]

             in Mongol mythology, is the sacred mountain, in the main identical with the Hindu Meru, and varying from it only in minor particulars which grow out of the fancy of the worshippers of the Lama.

## Right[[@Headword:Right]]

             as an adjective, describes the quality of an action as in conformity with moral law; as a substantive, the claim of a person upon others consequent upon the equal subjection of all to moral law. A right action (rectum) is an action agreeable to our duty, but a man's right (jus) has a very different meaning. What I have a right to do, it is the duty of all men not to hinder me from doing, and what I have a right to demand of any man, it is his duty to perform. A man's right is that which is vested in him by society, and because its laws may not always be conformable to the supreme rule of human action, viz. the Divine Law, the two words may often be properly opposed. We may say that a poor man has no right to relief, but it is right that he should have it. A rich man has a right to destroy the harvest of his fields, but to do so would not be right. See Fleming and Krauth, Dict. of Phil. Science, s.v.

## Right, Divine[[@Headword:Right, Divine]]

             SEE JURE DIVINO.

## Righteousness[[@Headword:Righteousness]]

             (צֶדֶק, δικία, the quality of being right morally). The righteousness of God is the essential perfection of his nature, and is frequently used to designate his holiness, justice, and faithfulness (Gen 18:25; Deu 6:25; Psa 31:1; Psa 119:137; Psa 119:142; Isa 45:23; Isa 46:13; Isa 51:5-8; Isa 56:1). The righteousness of Christ denotes not only his absolute perfection (Isa 51:11; 1Jn 2:1; Act 3:14), but is taken for his perfect obedience unto death as the sacrifice for the sin of the world (Dan 9:24; Rom 3:25-26; Rom 5:18-19; Jer 23:6; Joh 1:29). The righteousness of the law is that obedience which the law requires (Rom 3:10; Rom 3:20; Rom 8:4). The righteousness of faith is the justification which is received by faith (Rom 3:21-28; Rom 4:3-25; Rom 5:1-11; Rom 10:6-11; 2Co 5:21; Gal 2:21). Righteousness is sometimes used for uprightness and just dealing between man and man (Isa 60:17), also for holiness of life and conversation (Dan 4:27; Luk 1:6; Rom 14:17; Eph 5:9). The saints have a threefold righteousness:

(1.) The righteousness of their persons, as in Christ, his merit being imputed to them, and they accepted on the account thereof (2Co 5:21; Eph 5:27; Isa 45:24);

(2.) The righteousness of their principles, being derived from, and formed according to, the rule of right (Psa 119:11);

(3.) The righteousness of their lives, produced by the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit, without which no man shall see the Lord (Heb 13:24; 1Co 6:11). See Dickinson, Letters, let. 12; Witherspoon, Essay on Imputed Righteousness; Hervey, Theron and Aspasio; Owen, On Justification; Watts, Works, 3, 532, 8vo ed.; Jenks, On Submission to the Righteousness of God. SEE JUSTIFICATION; SEE SANCTIFICATION.

## Righter, Chester N.[[@Headword:Righter, Chester N.]]

             an agent of the American Bible Society in the Levant, was a native of New Jersey. He graduated at Yale College in 1846; studied at New Haven and  Andover, and afterwards spent a year or two in foreign travel for the benefit of his health. He sailed for the Levant in 1854, and died at Diarbekir, Turkey, in December 1856, aged about thirty. Extracts from his letters and journals will be found in The Bible in the Levant, by Samuel I. Prime. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rigorists[[@Headword:Rigorists]]

             a name given to the Jansenists by their adversaries. They made repentance to consist in the voluntary sufferings which the transgressor inflicts upon himself, in proportion to the nature of his crimes and the degree of his guilt. They went so far as to call those who had shortened life by excessive abstinence and labor the sacred victims of repentance, and said that they were consumed by the fire of divine love; that their conduct was highly meritorious in the sight of God; and that by their sufferings they not only appeased the wrath of God, but drew down abundant blessings upon their friends and upon the Church. SEE JANSEN.

## Rigr[[@Headword:Rigr]]

             in Norse mythology, was a name of the god Heimdal, under which he became the ancestor of the four ranks of men servants, peasants, nobles, and princes. Two of his descendants likewise bear this name.

## Riley, Henry Augustus[[@Headword:Riley, Henry Augustus]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in the city of New York Nov. 21, 1801. In 1815 he was sent to the Jesuit College at Georgetown, D.C., but left in 1817, and, under a private tutor in Philadelphia, he was prepared for the University of Pennsylvania, from which institution he graduated in July, 1820. After this he entered the law office of Horace Binney, Esq., and continued in the study of the law until the fall, when a severe attack of illness moved him to the study of medicine. To this end he entered a private class of Prof. Nathaniel Chapman, M.D., and attended medical lectures in the University of Pennsylvania, and graduated from its medical department in April, 1825. Returning to his home in New York, he entered upon the practice of medicine, and continued for about three years. In June 1828, he united with the Rutgers Street Presbyterian Church, then under  the pastoral care of the Rev. Thomas M'Auley, D.D., and soon after determined to devote his life to the work of preaching the Gospel. With this end in view, he entered Princeton Theological Seminary Feb. 5, 1829, and, after taking the full course, graduated in 1832. He was licensed by the Presbytery of New York in October of the same year, and ordained by the said presbytery in 1835. After his licensure he went to Philadelphia, and laid the foundation of the Third Church of that city in January 1833, and labored there until April following. From that time until August he supplied the Presbyterian Church at Mattewan, N.Y., and in April 1835, took charge of the Eighth Avenue Church — now West Twenty-third Street Church — in New York city, at which time, as above stated, he was ordained. He labored in this field until January 1839, when he went to Montrose, Pa., and was installed, and there he had a long, most useful, and successful pastorate of nearly a quarter of a century, from which he was released only on account of the loss of his voice, which occurred in 1863. After his resignation, he resumed for a limited time the practice of medicine, and continued to reside in Montrose, where he died, March 17, 1878. (W.P.S.)

## Riley, Isaac[[@Headword:Riley, Isaac]]

             a minister of the Presbyterian Church, son of H.A. Riley, was born in the city of New York Feb. 2, 1835. After receiving a preparatory education he entered Yale College, and was graduated, having written the class poem. He next entered the Union Theological Seminary, and, after graduation, was admitted to the ministry. His first pastorate was at Middletown, Del., where he labored three years. He then accepted a call to Pottsville, Pa., and from there went to Newark, where he spent some time as associate pastor with his father-in-law, the Rev. Joel Parker. His next pastoral duties were in New York, where for seven years he occupied the pulpit of the Thirty- fourth Street Church, filling the position with signal ability and success. In 1875 he was called to the pastorate of the Westminster Church, Buffalo, preaching his first sermon Oct. 20. His work was remarkably fruitful, and during his pastorate the Church enjoyed an uninterrupted prosperity. He was a man of very decided ability, and in him were united qualities very rarely combined in the same individual. His reasoning faculty was strong, and so also was his imagination. He was exact and mathematical, and at the same time poetical and rhetorical. All the varied powers of a disciplined intellect, and also of a strong emotional nature, were imbued with divine love, so that the whole man was consecrated to the work of the ministry.  He wrote carefully and spoke fluently, and the best work was what he gave to his people and the public. He was one of the most useful men in Buffalo. In his last illness he suffered much, but bore it uncomplainingly, and sank into the peaceful slumber of death. He died at Buffalo Oct. 23, 1878. (W.P.S.)

## Rimah[[@Headword:Rimah]]

             SEE WORM.

## Rimmon[[@Headword:Rimmon]]

             (Heb. Rimmon', רַמּוֹן, a pomegranate, as often), the name of an idol, of a man, and also of several places; all probably having some allusion to the pomegranate, especially the localities, which were doubtless so named from the abundance of that fruit in the vicinity, although in modern times, owing to the neglect which has for ages prevailed under Turkish rule, that tree is comparatively scarce. SEE RIMMON METHOAR; SEE RIMMON PAREZ.

1. (Sept. ῾Ρεμμάν.) A deity worshipped by the Syrians of Damascus, where there was a temple or house of Rimmon (2Ki 5:18). Traces of the name of this god appear also in the proper names Hadadrimmon and Tabrimmon, but its signification is doubtful. Serarius, quoted by Selden (De Dis Syris, 2, 10), refers it to the Heb. rimmon, a pomegranate, a fruit sacred to Venus, who is thus the deity worshipped under this title (comp. Pomona, from pomum). Ursinus (Arboretum Bibl. cap. 32, 7) explains Rimmon as the pomegranate, the emblem of the fertilizing principle of nature, the personified natura naturans, a symbol of frequent occurrence in the old religions (Bahr, Symbolik, 2, 122). If this be the true origin of the name, it presents us with a relic of the ancient tree worship of the East, which we know prevailed in Palestine. But Selden rejects this derivation, and proposes instead that Rimmon is from the root רוּם, ram, “to be high,” and signifies “most high;” like the Phoenician Elium, and the Hebrew

עֶלְיוֹן. Hesychius gives ῾Ραμάς, ὁ ὕ ψιστος θεός. Clericus, Vitringa, Rosenmüller, and Gesenius were of the same opinion. Movers (Phon. 1, 196, etc.) regards Rimmon as the abbreviated form of Hadadrimmon (as  Peor for Baal-Peor), Hadad being the sun god of the Syrians. Combining this with the pomegranate, which was his symbol, Hadadrimmon would then be the sun god of the late summer, who ripens the pomegranate and other fruits, and, after infusing into them his productive power, dies, and is mourned with “the mourning of Hadadrimmon in the valley of Megiddon” (Zec 12:11).

2. (Sept. ῾Ρεμμών.) A Benjamite of Beeroth, and the father of Rechab and Baanah, the murderers of Ishbosheth (2Sa 4:2; 2Sa 4:5; 2Sa 4:9). B.C. ante 1053.

3. (Sept. ῾Ρεμμών v.r. Ε᾿ρεμώθ, etc.) A town in the southern portion of Judah (Jos 15:32), allotted to Simeon (Jos 19:7; 1Ch 4:32 : in the former of these two passages it is inaccurately given in the A.V. as “Remmon”). In each of the above lists the name succeeds that of Ain, also one of the cities of Judah and Simeon. In the catalogue of the places reoccupied by the Jews after the return from Babylon (Neh 11:29) the two are joined, and inaccurately appear in the A.V. as “En-Rimmon” (q.v.). It is grouped with Ziklag and Beersheba, and must consequently have been situated near the southern border of the tribe. Rimmon would appear to have stood towards the western extremity of Simeon, and thus south of the plain of Philistia; for Joshua, in enumerating “the uttermost cities of the tribe of the children of Judah,” begins at the coast of Edom on the east, and Rimmon is the last of twenty-nine, and therefore must have been near the western extremity. The only other notice of it in the Bible is in the prophecies of Zechariah “All the land shall be turned as a plain, from Geba to Rimmon, south of Jerusalem” (Zec 14:10). The land referred to is the kingdom of Judah; Geba lay on the northern and Rimmon on the southern border. Though both Eusebius and Jerome mention Rimmon, their notices are so confused, and even contradictory, that they evidently knew nothing of it. They appear to have confounded three towns of the same name. In one place Jerome calls it a town “of Simeon or Judah;” and yet he locates it “fifteen miles north of Jerusalem.” In the very next notice he writes, “Remmon, in tribu Simeonis, vel Zabulon” (Onomast. s.v. “Remmon”). Under the name Eremmon (Ε᾿ρεμβών, Onomast. s.v.) both Eusebius and Jerome appear to give a more accurate account of the site of this city. They state that it is a “very large village” (vicus proegrandis), sixteen miles south of Eleutheropolis. This was no doubt pretty nearly its true position (see Reland, Paloest. p. 973). About thirteen miles south of Eleutheropolis (now Beit Jibrin) is a  ruined village called Khurbet Um er-Rumanim (“Mother of Pomegranates”), which in all probability marks the site, as it bears the name, of Rimmon of Simeon. On the top of the hill there are the foundations of an important square building of large well-dressed stones, and lower down there are the bases of three columns in situ (Quar. Statement of “Pal. Explor. Fund,” Jan, 1878, p. 13). A short distance (about a mile) south of it are two tells, both of which are covered with ruins; and between them, in the valley, is “a copious fountain, filling a large ancient reservoir, which for miles around is the chief watering place of the Bedouin of this region” (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 344). As fountains are extremely rare in this southern district, it seems probable that this one may have given the name of Ain to the ancient town on the adjoining tell; and the proximity of Ain and Rimmon led to their being always grouped together.

4. (Heb. Rimmono', רַמּוֹנוֹ, his pomegranate; Sept. ἡ ῾Ρεμμών.) A city of Zebulun belonging to the Merarite Levites (1Ch 6:77). There is great discrepancy between the list in which it occurs and the parallel catalogue of Joshua 21. The former contains two names in place of the four of the latter, and neither of them the same. But it is not impossible that DIMNAH (Jos 21:35) may have been originally Rimmon, as the D and R in Hebrew are notoriously easy to confound. At any rate there is no reason for supposing that Rimmono is not identical with Rimmon of Zebulun (19:13), in the A.V. Remmon-methoar (q.v.). The redundant letter was probably transferred, in copying, from the succeeding word — at an early date, since all the MSS. appear to exhibit it, as does also the Targum of Joseph.

5. THE ROCK RIMMON (Heb. Sela ha-Rimmon, הָרַמּוֹן[also without the article] סֶלִע; Sept. ἡ πέτρα τοῦ ῾Ρεμμών; Josephus, πέτρα ῾Ροά; Vulg. petra cujus vocabulum est Remmon; petra Remmon), a cliff (such seems rather the force of the Hebrew word sela) or inaccessible natural fastness, in which the six hundred Benjamites who escaped the slaughter of Gibeah took refuge, and maintained themselves for four months until released by the act of the general body of the tribes (Jdg 20:45; Jdg 20:47; Jdg 21:13). It is described as in the “wilderness” (midbar), that is, the wild, uncultivated (though not unproductive) country which lies on the east of the central highlands of Benjamin, on which Gibeah was situated — between them and the Jordan valley. This is doubtless the Rimmon which Eusebius and  Jerome mention, locating it fifteen miles north of Jerusalem (Onomast. s.v. “Remmon”). About ten miles north of Jerusalem, and nearly four east of Bethel, is a very conspicuous white limestone tell, rising like a cone above the neighboring hill tops, and overlooking the whole wilderness down to the Jordan valley. Upon it stands a large modern village called Rummon. This is unquestionably the “Rock Rimmon” on which the Benjamites took refuge. It is admirably adapted for the purpose. A deep and wild ravine cuts off the approach from the south, and others skirt its western and northern sides, rendering it a natural fortress of great strength. The sides of the tell are steep, bare, and rocky, and could be defended by a few resolute men against a host. The top is rounded, affording ample space for the refugees, while along the sides are some large caverns (Robinson, Bib. Res. 3, 290; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 344; Porter, Handbook, p. 217; Schwarz, Palest. p. 129).

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

             On the identification of this rock with that of Rummon, see the Quar. Statement of the “Palest. Explor. Fund," October 1881, page 247. The village Rumaneh is not described in the Memoirs accompanying the Ordnance Survey.

## Rimmon (3)[[@Headword:Rimmon (3)]]

             SEE POMEGRANATE.

## Rimmon Methoar[[@Headword:Rimmon Methoar]]

             (Heb. Rimmon' ham-Methoar', רַמּוֹן הִמְּתֹאָר, i.e. Rimmon the extensive; Sept. ῾Ρεμμωναὰ Μαθαραοζᾶ v.r. ῾Ρεμμωνὰμ μαθαρίμ; Vulg. Remmon, Amthar; A.V. “Remmon-methoar”), a place which formed one of the landmarks of the eastern boundary of the territory of Zebulun (Jos 19:13 only). It occurs between Eth-Katsin and Neah. Methoar does not really form a part of the name, but is the Pual of תָּאִר, to stretch, and should be translated accordingly (as in the margin of the A.V.) — ”Rimmon which reaches to Neah.” The object of the sacred writer is to describe as minutely as possible the exact course of the borderline. This is the judgment of Gesenius, Thesaur. col. 1292 a; Rodiger, ibid. 1491 a; Fürst, Handwb. 2, 512 a; and Bunsen, as well as of the ancient Jewish commentator Rashi, who quotes as his authority the Targum of Jonathan, the text of which has, however, been subsequently altered, since in its present state it agrees with the A.V. in not translating the word. The latter course is taken by the Sept. and Vulg. as above, and by the Peshito, Junius and Tremellius, and Luther. Symmachus rendered המתאר, a descriptive epithet attached to Rimmon, “Rimmon the Renowned” (Rosenmüller, ad loc.). This Rimmon does not appear to have been known to Eusebius and Jerome, but it is mentioned by the early traveler Parchi, who says that it is called Rumaneh, and stands an hour south of Sepphoris (Zunz, Benjamin, 2, 433). If for south we read north, this is in close agreement with the statements of Robinson (Bib. Res. 3, 110) and Van de Velde (Memoir, p.  344), who place Rummaneh on the south border of the plain of Buttauf, three miles north northeast of Seffuirieh (comp. Pococke, Trav. 2, 62; Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 123; De Saulcy, Dead Sea, 1, 69).

Rimmon is not improbably identical with the Levitical city which in Jos 21:35 appears in the form of Dimnah, and again, in the parallel lists of Chronicles (1Ch 6:77) as Rimmono (A.V. “Rimmon”).

## Rimmon Parez[[@Headword:Rimmon Parez]]

             (Heb. Rimmon' Pe'rets, פֶּרֶוֹ רַמּוֹן[in pause, Pa'rets, פָּרֶוֹ], pomegranate of the breach, so called probably from some local configuration; Sept. ῾Ρεμμὼν Φαρές), the second-named station of the Israelites in the desert after leaving Hazeroth, and located between Rithmah and Libnah (Num 33:20). It was somewhere in the northern interior of the Desert et-Tih, west of Kadesh-Barnea. SEE EXODE.

## Rin[[@Headword:Rin]]

             in Norse mythology, was the name of one of the rivers of hell.

## Rinaldi, Odoric[[@Headword:Rinaldi, Odoric]]

             a learned Italian ecclesiastical historian of the 17th century, was a native of Treviso, and was educated at Parma by the Jesuits. He became an Oratorian at Rome in 1618. After the death of cardinal Baronius (who was also a member of the Congregation of the Oratory), Rinaldi wrote a continuation of his Ecclesiastical Annals from 1198 (where the former left off) to 1564, when the Council of Trent was dissolved. Rinaldi's addition to the work consists of ten large folio volumes, published at different periods from 1646 to 1677. Rinaldi was also the author of a sufficiently copious abridgment in Italian of the whole Annals, compiled by Baronius and himself.

## Rinck, Friedrich Theodor[[@Headword:Rinck, Friedrich Theodor]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was, born April 8, 1770, at Stave, Pomerania. He commenced his academical career in 1792 at Kinigsberg, was in 1800 professor of theology, in 1801 first preacher at Dantzic, and  died April 27, 1821, doctor of theology. He is the author of, De Linguarum Orientalium cum Graeca Mira Convenientia (Konigsberg, 1788): — Arabisches, syrisches, und chaldaisches Lesebuch (eod.): — Commentarii in Hoseae Vaticinia Specimen (1789): — Neue Sammlung der Reisen natch den Orient (1807). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:151, 528; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rinck, Heinrich Wilhelm[[@Headword:Rinck, Heinrich Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran minister of Germany, was born in 1822 at Bischofingen, Baden. For some time inspector of the "Evangelical Society" at Elberfeld, he was in 1855 elected pastor of the Lutheran congregation, and died in January, 1881. He is the author of, Die christliche Glaubenslehre, schriftgemass dargestellt (Basle, 1854): — Vom Zustande nach dem Tode (2d ed. 1866): — Die Zeichen der letzen Zeit und die Wiederkunft Christi (1857): — Bileam und Elisa (1868): — Homilien uber den Jacobusbrief (1870): — Den ersten Johannesbrief (1872): — Die drei ersten Kapitel der Offenbarung Johannis (1875). (B.P.)

## Rinck, Wilhelm Friedrich[[@Headword:Rinck, Wilhelm Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Dietlingen, near Pforzheim, February 9, 1793. In 1813 he was pastor of the German evangelical congregation at Venice, in 1821 at Bischoffingen, in 1827 at Eyringen, in 1835 at Grenzach, Baden, and died in 1856. He is the author of, Lehrbegraif von den heiligen Abendmahl (Heidelberg, 1818): — Das Sendschreiben der Korinther an den Apostel Paulus aus dem Armenischen (1823): — Lucubratio Critica in Acta Apostolorum, Epistolas Catholicas et Paulinas, etc. (1833): — Die angefochtenen Erzahlungen in dem Leben Jesu beleuchtet (1842): — Apokalyptische Forschungen (Zurich, 1853). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:103, 276, 454; 2:39, 224. (B.P.)

## Rinda[[@Headword:Rinda]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of Odin's wives, the mother of Wali, who became so strong in a single night that he was able to slay Hoeder, the murderer of Balder.

## Ring[[@Headword:Ring]]

             (usually טִבִּעִת, tabba'ath; δάκτυλος, occasionally גָּליל, galil, a circlet for the fingers, Est 1:6; Son 5:14, גָּב, gab, a rim of a wheel, Eze 1:18). The ring was regarded as an indispensable article of a Hebrew's attire, inasmuch as it contained his signet, and even owed its name to this circumstance, the term tabbaath being derived from a root signifying “to impress a seal.” It was hence the symbol of authority, and as such was presented by Pharaoh to Joseph (Gen 41:42), by Ahasuerus to Haman (Est 3:10), by Antiochus to Philip (1Ma 6:15), and by the father to the prodigal son in the parable (Luk 15:22). It was treasured accordingly, and became a proverbial expression for a most valued object (Jer 22:24; Hag 2:23; Ecclesiastes 49:11). Such rings were worn not only by men, but by women (Isa 3:21; Mishna, Sabb. 6, § 3), and are enumerated among the articles presented by men and women for the service of the tabernacle (Exo 35:22). The signet ring was worn on the right hand (Jeremiah loc. cit.). We may conclude, from Exo 28:11, that the rings contained a stone engraven with a device, or with the owner's name. SEE ORNAMENT.

The ancient Egyptians wore many rings, sometimes two and three on the same finger. The left was considered the hand peculiarly privileged to bear those ornaments; and it is remarkable that its third finger was decorated with a greater number than any other, and was considered by them, as by us, par excellence the ring finger, though there is no evidence of its having been so honored at the marriage ceremony. They even wore a ring on the thumb. Some rings were very simple; others were made with a scarabaeus, or an engraved stone; and they were occasionally in the form of a shell, a knot, a snake, or some fancy device. They were mostly of gold, and this metal seems to have always been preferred to silver for rings. Silver rings, however, are occasionally met with. Bronze was seldom used for rings, though frequently for signets. Some have been discovered of brass and iron (the latter of a Roman time); but ivory and blue porcelain were the materials of which those worn by the lower classes were usually made. The scarabaeus was the favorite form for rings; in some the stone, flat on both faces, turned on pins, like many of our seals at the present day, and the ring  itself was bound round at each end, where it was inserted into the stone, with gold wire. This was common not only to rings, but to signets, and was intended for ornament as well as security. Numerous specimens of Egyptian rings have been discovered, most of them made of gold, very massive, and containing either a scarabaeus or an engraved stone (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 337). The ancient Assyrians seem to have been equally fond of similar ornaments. The same profusion was exhibited also by the Greeks and Romans, particularly by men (Smith, Dict. of Antiq. s.v. “Rings”). It appears also to have prevailed among the Jews of the apostolic age; for in Jam 2:2, a rich man is described as χρυσοδακτύλιος, meaning not simply “with a gold ring,” as in the A.V., but “golden-ringed” (like the χρυσόχειρ, “golden-handed,” of Lucian, Timon, 20), implying equally well the presence of several gold rings. SEE JEWEL.

The principal information we have about ancient rings is derived from Pliny. He says that Alexander the Great sealed all important documents in Europe with his own ring, and in Asia with that of Darius. He states that the Romans derived the custom of wearing rings from the Sabines, and they from the Greeks; hence there occurs no mention of Roman rings earlier than the reign of Numa Pompilius. The rings then worn were generally of iron, and sometimes engraved. In process of time silver rings were adopted by free citizens, and those of iron were abandoned to slaves. Gold rings could, in the earlier ages of the republic, only be worn by senators; and even in their case the use of the gold ring was to be confined to public occasions. Marius, in his third consulate, is said to have worn one habitually; but if this account be correct, it must have been a ring of some special kind, for more than a century earlier the equestrian order had the privilege of wearing gold rings, since Hannibal, after the battle of Cannae, sent as a trophy to Carthage three bushels of gold rings, taken from the fingers of the Roman knights slain in the battle. It is clear that the equestrian ring was not allowed to be indiscriminately worn, for Horace informs us that he did so himself by the express permission of Augustus (Horace, Sat. 2, 7, 54). It may be that the passage in James's epistle refers to the equestrian ring as a token of Roman rank. The ring was generally worn on the fourth finger of the left hand, and Aulus Gellius gives as a reason for this that there is a vein from that finger running directly to the heart. To wear rings on the right hand was regarded as a mark of effeminacy, but they were not unfrequently worn in considerable numbers  on the left. This was a practice among men of fashion at Rome (Martial, Epig. 11, 60), as it had been at Athens so far back as the age of Aristophanes (Aristoph. Nubes). Lampridius informs us that Heliogabalus, whose fingers were always covered with rings, never wore the same twice; and a part of the foppery of the age consisted in having rings of different weights for summer and winter. Wedding rings, often of large size, were in use among the Jews, and from them Christians have borrowed the practice; and the ring has from a very early period formed a part of the episcopal costume, as indicating that the bishop was wedded to his Church. So long ago as the Council of Toledo (A.D. 633), a deposed bishop was restored by returning to him his episcopal ring. SEE SIGNET.

## Ring (In Attire)[[@Headword:Ring (In Attire)]]

             The practice of wearing rings has been widely prevalent in different countries and at different periods. They have been used to decorate the arms, legs, feet, toes, fingers, nose, and ears. The most general and most distinguished use of rings is on the finger. In ancient times the ring was a symbol of authority, and power was delegated by means of it. Finger rings are alluded to in the books of Genesis and Exodus; Herodotus mentions that the Babylonians wore them; and from Asia they were probably introduced into Greece, doubtless subsequent to Homer's time, as he makes no mention of them. Rings worn in early times were not purely ornamental, but had their use as signet rings. The devices in the earlier rings were probably cut in the gold; but at a later period the Greeks came to have rings set with precious stones Among the Romans the signs engraved on rings were very various, including portraits of friends or ancestors and subjects connected with mythology or religion. Rings entered into the groundwork of many Oriental superstitions, as in the legend of Solomon's ring, which, among its other marvels, sealed up the refractory Jinn in jars and cast them into the Red Sea. The Greeks mention various rings endowed with magic power, as that of Gyges, which rendered him invisible when its stone was turned inwards; and the ring of Polycrates, which was flung into the sea to propitiate Nemesis and found by its owner inside a fish. Wedding and other rings have been thought to possess curative powers. Sometimes they owed their virtue to the stones with which they were set; thus diamond was believed to be an antidote against poison, etc. The Gnostics engraved ring gems with mystic symbols, names, monograms, and legends. In early times the names of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph on rings were deemed to be preservatives against the plague.  The early Christians adopted the use of rings, being at first simple circles of ivory, bronze, iron, or some other cheap material. Many of them were adorned with symbols connected with their faith, such as the cross, the monogram of Christ, the dove, anchor, ship, palm branch, etc.; others had simple religious phrases, among the most common of which was Vivas in Deo or Spes in Deo. Rings to be used as seal rings alone were fitted with a plate of metal, often of the form of the bottom of a sandal or of the human foot, this, according to ancient tradition, being the symbol of possession. Among the rings found in the catacombs are some with a key, and some with both a key and a seal, the latter for both locking and sealing a casket. See Appletons' Cyclop. s.v.; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Ring (In Espousals)[[@Headword:Ring (In Espousals)]]

             In early times it was customary for the man, together with other espousal gifts, to give the woman a ring as a further token and testimonial of the contract. This ceremony was used by the Romans before the introduction of Christianity, and in some measure admitted by the Jews, whence it was adopted among the Christian rites of espousal without any opposition. That the ring was used in espousals, and not in the solemnity of marriage itself, seems evident from the account given by pope Nicholas, A.D. 860 (Nicol. Respons. ad Consulta Bulgarorum, Conc. t. 8, p. 517). “In the espousals,” says he, ”the man first presents the woman with the arroe, or espousal gifts; and among these he puts a ring upon her finger,” etc. St. Ambrose (Ep. 34) and Tertullian (Apol. cap. 6) also speak of the annulus pronubus, or ring of espousal. Pliny mentions an iron ring as worn by a person betrothed. In the ancient Greek Church a special ceremony was observed in presenting the ring. With a golden ring the priest made the sign of the cross upon the head of the bridegroom, and then placed it upon the finger of his right hand, thrice repeating these words: “This servant of the Lord espouses this handmaid of the Lord, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, both now and forever, world without end, Amen.” In like manner and with the same form of words he presents the bride with a silver ring. The groomsman then changes the rings while the priest, in a long prayer, sets forth the import of the rings; after which the whole is closed with a prescribed form of times. The upper figure shows the three parts brought together; the lower figure, the parts separately. In  Iceland the ceremony of betrothal used to be accompanied by the bridegroom passing his four fingers and thumb through a large ring and in this manner receiving the hand of the bride (Bingham, Christ. Antiq. 22, 35; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.).

## Ring (In Investitures)[[@Headword:Ring (In Investitures)]]

             A ring was anciently given to bishops on their consecration with these words: “Accipe annulum discretionis et honoris, fidei signum,” etc. The ring was emblematical of his espousal to the Church, in imitation of the ancient ceremony of presenting a ring on the espousal of parties in marriage. It was called the ring of his espousals, annulus sponsalitius pronubus, and sometimes annulus palatii. The ring was formerly worn on the middle finger of the right hand, as indicative of silence and discretion in communicating the mysteries, in giving the benediction, but was shifted to the annular finger in celebrating mass. The ring is mentioned by the Councils of Orleans, 511; Rome, 610; fourth of Toledo, 633; Hincmar of Rheims, Isidore of Seville, and the sacramentaries of Gelasius and Gregory the Great, 590. These rings usually had monograms (sigloe), or engraved subjects, and were used as signets till the 11th century in official correspondence, and for sealing a neophyte's confession of faith, and, by pope Sergius's order (687-701), for sealing the font from the beginning of Lent to Easter eve in France and Spain. They were, in consequence, sometimes called church rings. Every bishop had also a jeweled pontifical ring. This ring represented fidelity to Christ; the duty of sealing and revealing; and, lastly, the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The best rings of suffragans at their decease were the perquisite of the primate, and, in the vacancy of the archiepiscopal chair, of the crown. Priests, as friends only of the bridegroom, did not wear rings (Coleman, Christ. Antiq.; Walcott, Sacred Archceol. s.v.).

## Ring (In Matrimony)[[@Headword:Ring (In Matrimony)]]

             Originally the gift of the ring was made at the time of espousal, and not at the solemnization of marriage. Calroer (Ritual. Eccles.) traces the origin of the marriage ring to the 10th century. He supposes it to have been introduced in imitation of the ring worn by bishops, and to have been regarded as a kind of phylactery, or charm. According to Rome, the delivery of the ring by the husband to the wife indicated that she was admitted into his confidence. Another explanation is that the ring  symbolizes eternity and constancy; and it has been alleged that the left hand was chosen to denote the wife's subjection to her husband, and the third finger because it thereby pressed a vein which was supposed to communicate directly with the heart (Riddle, Christ. Antig. 7, 1; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.). SEE RING (in Espousals).

## Ring, Fishermans[[@Headword:Ring, Fishermans]]

             is that worn by the pope as the descendant of Peter, with an engraving of Peter casting his net.

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

             a prominent Anabaptist leader in the landgravate of Hesse in the period of the Reformation, was at first a school teacher and chaplain at Hersfeld. Having become a zealous disciple of Thomas Munzer (q.v.), he appeared in Sweden in 1524 in company with M. Hoffmann and Knipperdolling (q.v.), and by the fanaticism of his sermons excited a riot in Stockholm against images, which he justified as being the work of the Spirit of God. Towards the close of 1524 he returned to Germany in order to participate as a leader in the Peasants' War; and, after the bloody catastrophe at Frankenhausen, he fled to Switzerland, where he found a fruitful soil and a cordial reception. A murder committed by one of his adherents, professedly in obedience to the inspiration of God, obliged Ring, in 1527; to flee to the neighborhood of his early home. He now became a peripatetic preacher, made the teaching of Luther the subject of bitter attack, characterized the evangelical preachers as the expounders of a corrupt and dead faith, and by such means secured a large following. Disputations held with him failed to convince, and a threat of expatriation failed to alarm him. He eventually fled to East Friesland, which had become a rallying place for Anabaptists generally, and while there employed every method to inspire his followers with a fanatical contempt for Scripture and the Lord's supper. It was difficult to restrain the fanatical tendencies thus implanted in the populace; but the Lutherans finally secured a preponderating influence, and Ring was  compelled to flee once more. He labored in his characteristic method in Hesse and Saxony and met with some success, but was repeatedly imprisoned. He would seem to have died in connection with the Münster revolt. The teaching of Ring may be briefly stated as follows. Original sin involves no condemnation for persons of immature mind, etc. The curse in Genesis 3 imposes spiritual death only, consequently death does not come to children on account of sin. Infant baptism is blasphemous, and cannot be justified on scriptural grounds. Christ is not God according to his nature, and does not derive human nature from Mary. He died and suffered, not for purposes of redemption and forgiveness of sins, but simply as an example and type; and they who would profit by his work must follow him with like works and sufferings. Christ's body and blood are not present in the sacrament. Man has the ability by nature to prepare himself to believe and come to the Spirit of God. See Krohn, Gesch. d. fanat. u. enthus. Wiedertlufer, etc. (Leips. 1758); Mittheilungen aus d. prot. Sektengesch. in Hessen, in Niedner's Zeitschr. f. d. hist. Theologie, 1858, p. 541-553, and 1860, p. 272 sq.

## Ring, The Decade[[@Headword:Ring, The Decade]]

             a modern substitute for the rosary during the existence of the penal laws, being more easily concealed. It has on it ten knobs, on each of which, as it passed under the fingers, an Ave was said, and on the eleventh, which is distinguished by a cross, a Paternoster.

## Ring-streaked[[@Headword:Ring-streaked]]

             is the rendering of the English Version (“ring-straked”) of the Heb. עָקֹד, akod (Genesis 30; Genesis 31), as applied to the parti-colored rams of Jacob's flock. The Hebrew word literally means banded, or striped, and seems to refer especially to a variegation of color in the feet (Symmachus λευκόποδες, Saadias similarly).

## Ringgli, Gotthard[[@Headword:Ringgli, Gotthard]]

             an excellent Swiss artist, was born at Zurich, Jan. 27, 1575. Of his early life, education, and progress we are not informed. He was chosen by the magistracy of Berne to decorate with paintings of large size the senate house and minster of that metropolis, and had the freedom of the city conferred on him. For the public library of Zurich he painted the arms of the state and its dependencies, supported by Religion and Liberty. Death lies at the feet of Religion, but to the usual allegorical implements in her hands he added a bridle, to distinguish her from Fanaticism and Superstition. One of the most remarkable of his easel pictures, in the house of Werdmuller, is Job Listening to his Wife's Invectives. Perhaps his most valuable remains arc designs, generally drawn with a pen and washed with India ink. Among these are Our Savior's Burial: — Susannah with the Elders: — Faith Sheltered from Persecution. He died in 1635.

## Ringoraldt, Bartholomew[[@Headword:Ringoraldt, Bartholomew]]

             a German hymnologist, born at Frankfort-on-the-Oder in 1530, was preacher at Langenberg, in Neumark; but his principal fame was achieved as a writer of spiritual hymns, some of which are still in common use (e.g. Es ist gewisslich an der Zeit). His writings other than hymns are nearly all  lost from sight. He believed that the end of the world was near, and had even calculated its date to fall in the year 1684; and his first book, Die lautere Wahrheit (1585), expresses his yearning for the eternal world and warns against the condemnation of hell; while his second book, Christliche Warnung des treuen Eckert (Frankfort-on-the-Oder, 1588), serves as a guide to the mysteries of heaven and hell, which places Eckert traverses in a trance. See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 2d ed. 1, 156 sq.; Langbecker, Das deutsch-evang. Kirchenlied (1830), p. 201 sq.; Virkel, Ehrengedachtniss evangel. Glaubenshelden u. Sanger (1830), 2, 98; Wendebourg, B. Ringoraldt's geistliche Lieder, etc.

## Rinkart, Martin[[@Headword:Rinkart, Martin]]

             preacher and archdeacon at Eilenburg, in Saxony, was born there, April 23, 1586. His official life began at Leipsic, where he obtained the master's degree, and at Eisleben and Endeborn, where he first engaged in the duties of the ministry of the Word. His pastorate in his native town extended over thirty-two years, and covered the entire period of the Thirty Years' War. It is related that a forced contribution of 30,000 thalers having been demanded from the town, Rinkart held a prayer meeting on Feb. 21, 1639, to invoke God's help in the emergency, with the result that the sum demanded was reduced to 8000 florins, then to 4000, and finally to 2000. Pastor Rinkart was also a poet, and wrote hymns which are sung in the churches of Germany today, and are worthy of note because of their jubilant spirit, e.g. Nun danket Alle Gott, etc. Of his writings in other departments, though they were once numerous, but few have been preserved, and they contain nothing that possesses importance at this day. He died Dec. 8, 1649. See Plato, M. Martin Rinkart, etc. (Leips. 1830); Vorkel, Ehrengedachtniss evang. Glaubenshelden u. Sange? (ibid. 1830), 2, 21 sq., 127 sq.; Koch, Gesch. d. deutsch. Kirchenliedes, 2d ed. 1, 144 sq.; 4, 567 sq.

## Rinnah[[@Headword:Rinnah]]

             (Heb. Rinnah', רַנָּה, a shout; Sept. ῾Ραννών v.r. Α῾νά), a son of Shimon, of the tribe of Judah (1Ch 4:20). B.C. prob. ante 1618.

## Riper Years[[@Headword:Riper Years]]

             In one of the offices for baptism, this phrase is used to designate those who are beyond the age of children and “able to answer for themselves.” This definition is not only that given by the Church, but is implied in the words themselves, which embrace both adults and those in age between the latter and children. In the ordinal this and kindred terms are used, as in the exhortation of priests, “that by daily reading and weighing the Scriptures ye may wax riper and stronger in your ministry.”

## Riphaeus[[@Headword:Riphaeus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the largest of the centaurs, whose monstrous head towered far above the tallest trees of the forest. He was killed by Theseus while present at the marriage of Pirithous.

## Riphath[[@Headword:Riphath]]

             (Heb. Riphath', רַיפִת, perhaps spoken; Sept. ῾Ριφάθ v.r. ῾Ριφαε; Vulg. Riphath), the second son of Gomer and the brother of Ashkenaz and Togarmah (Gen 10:3). B.C. cir. 2450. The Hebrew text in 1Ch 1:6 gives the form Diphath (q.v.); but this arises out of a clerical error similar to that which gives the forms Rodanim and Hadad for Dodanim and Hadar (vers. 7:50; Gen 36:39). The name Riphath occurs only in the genealogical table, and hence there is little to guide us to the locality which it indicates. The name itself has been variously identified with that of the Rhipaean Mountains (Knobel); the river Rhebas, in Bithynia (Bochart); the Rhibii, a people living eastward of the Caspian Sea (Schulthess); and the Riphaeans the ancient name of the Paphlagonians (Joseph Ant. 1, 6, 1). This last view is certainly favored by the contiguity of Ashkenaz and Togarmah. The weight of opinion is, however, in favor of the Rhipaean Mountains, which Knobel (Volkert. p. 44) identifies etymologically and geographically with the Carpathian range in the northeast of Dacia. The attempt of that writer to identify Riphath with the Celts or Gauls is evidently based on the assumption that so important a race ought to be mentioned in the table, and that there is no other name to  apply to them; but we have no evidence that the Gauls were for any lengthened period settled in the neighborhood of the Carpathian range. The Rhipaean Mountains themselves existed more in the imagination of the Greeks than in reality; and if the received etymology of that name (from ῥιπαί, “blasts”) be correct, the coincidence in sound with Riphath is merely accidental, and no connection can be held to exist between the names. The later geographers, Ptolemy (3, 5, § 15, 19) and others, placed the Rhipaean range where no range really exists, viz. about the elevated ground that separates the basins of the Euixine and Baltic seas. SEE ETHNOLOGY.

## Ripidium[[@Headword:Ripidium]]

             (Gr. ῥιπίδιον, a bellows) was a fan made of parchment, peacocks' feathers, or linen, and was used in the ancient churches to drive away all such insects as might drop into the cups or infest the altar. The author of the Fasti Siculi or Chronicum Alexandrinum (p. 892), calls them τιμία ῥιπίδια, and reckons them among the holy utensils of the altar which were laid up among the rest in the scenophylacium, or vestry of the church. Suicer thinks that in most of the writings the word ripidia signifies one of their holy vessels, a basket or the like, in which they used to carry the sacred elements to and from the altar. In the liturgies of Chrysostom and Basil it is taken in the common sense of Greek authors, and it is used in the Constitutions for a fan to blow with: for in Chrysostom's liturgy the deacon is to ventilate, or blow over, the elements with a fan; or, if there be no fan, then to do it with the covering of the cup. See Bingham, Christ. Antiq. 8, 6, 21; 15, 3, 6.

## Ripley, Ezra[[@Headword:Ripley, Ezra]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Woodstock, Conn., May 1, 1751. He followed farming until he was sixteen, when he began to study, and was admitted into Harvard College, July 1772. After his graduation he taught in Plymouth, and studied theology under Rev. Jason Haven, of Dedham. He was ordained pastor of the Church in Concord, Mass., Nov. 7, 1778. He was honored with the degree of D.D. in 1816. Dr. Ripley was an ardent advocate of the temperance cause, and was a member of the old Massachusetts Society for the Suppression of Intemperance. His death took place Sept. 18, 1841. His publications are Sermons and Charges  (1791-1829): — History of the Concord Fight (1827). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 112.

## Ripley, George, LL.D[[@Headword:Ripley, George, LL.D]]

             a Unitarian divine and author, was born at Greenfield, Massachusetts, October 3, 1802. He graduated from Harvard College in 1823, and from the Cambridge Divinity School in 1826; the following year became pastor of the Purchase Street Unitarian Church, Boston. After remaining a few years he resigned, and devoted himself exclusively to literary pursuits. In 1847 he became literary editor of the New York Tribune, and retained that  position until his death, July 4, 1880. He published, Discourses on the Philosophy of Religion (1839): — Letters on the Latest Forms of Infidelity (1840): — Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature (1842). Among his greatest literary labors are, Appleton's New American Cyclopaedia, which subsequently was revised and greatly enlarged. He was also editor of an Annual Cyclopcedia, published by the same house. He translated Philosophical Essays, by M. Victor Cousin (Edinburgh, 1857). He edited, in connection with R.W. Emerson and S.M. Fuller, The Dial, and with C.A. Daia, Parke Godwin, and J.S. Dwight, The Harbinger. He contributed numerous articles to the Christian Examiner, and Putnalm's and Harper's Magazines. See (N.Y.) Observer, July 8, 1880; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (W.P.S.)

## Ripley, Henry Jones, D.D.[[@Headword:Ripley, Henry Jones, D.D.]]

             a distinguished Baptist divine and Biblical scholar, was born in Boston, Jan. 28, 1798. He entered Harvard University, a medal scholar from the Boston Latin School, at the early age of fourteen, and graduated with the class of 1816. He took the full course of theological study at Andover, where he graduated in 1819. He was ordained as an evangelist Nov. 7, 1819, and spent some time in Georgia, devoting himself especially to the religious welfare of the colored people in the section of the state where he labored. The length of his ministerial service at the South was not far from seven years, 1819-1826. One year during this period he spent in Eastport, Me. Soon after the founding of the Newton Theological Institution, Dr. Ripley was elected, in 1826, professor of Biblical literature and pastoral duties, which office he held until 1832, when the election of another officer allowed him to direct his whole attention to Biblical interpretation. In 1839 he was transferred to the chair of sacred rhetoric and pastoral duties, which position he occupied with ability for seventeen years. The last three years of his connection with the institution he was associate professor of Biblical literature. After a service of thirty-four years, he resigned his professorship. After his resignation he was occupied some five years in literary work, and for a time was engaged in evangelical labors among the freedmen of Georgia. Returning to the institution at Newton, he accepted an appointment as librarian, which position he held during the remainder of his life. He died at Newton Center, Mass., May 21, 1875. Prof. Ripley made diligent use of his pen during his life. He published quite a number of carefully prepared articles in the American Baptist Magazine, the Christian Review, and the Bibliotheca Sacra. He was also the author of the following works: Memoir of Rev. Thomas S. Winn: — Christian Baptism, an examination of Prof. Stuart's essay on the mode of baptism: — Notes on the Four Gospels: — Notes on the Acts of the Apostles: — Notes on the Epistle to the Romans:: — Notes on the Epistle to the Hebrews, with new translation: — Sacred Rhetoric, composition and delivery of sermons: — Exclusiveness of the Baptists, a review of Rev. A Barnes's pamphlet on exclusivism: — Church Polity, a treatise on Christian churches and the Christian ministry. He prepared also an edition of Campbell's Lectures on Systematic Theology, and edited the Karen Apostle by Rev. Francis Mason. See Stearns, Hovey, and Clarke, Funeral Addresses. (J.C.S.)

## Ripley, Hezekiah, D.D.[[@Headword:Ripley, Hezekiah, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Windham, Conn.. Feb. 3 (O.S.), 1743. He graduated at Yale College in 1763, and was ordained, Feb. 11, 1767, pastor at Green's Farms, where he labored until his death, December 1831. He was made a member of Yale College Corporation in 1790, and remained such for twenty-seven years. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 647.

## Ripley, John Bingham[[@Headword:Ripley, John Bingham]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ellsworth township, Mahoning Co., O., April 18, 1824. He was converted when eighteen years of age; graduated at Jefferson College, Pa., in 1846, and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N.J., in 1850. His labors in the ministry began in Burlington, N.J., where he was invited to settle, but did not do so. He subsequently accepted an agency from the American and Foreign Christian Union, and labored in Ohio and Michigan. He was ordained and installed by the Philadelphia Presbytery as pastor of the Mariners' Church, Philadelphia, in 1854, and here he continued to labor until his death, March, 1862. This was a very interesting charge. The sailors were his friends, and nothing that he could do for them by the instrumentality of books, visits, letters of entreaty, and prayer was ever omitted. He sought the mariner at the tavern, the cellar, the refectory, the boarding house, the sailors' home, and on board of ship. Besides many articles in the religious press, he was the author of several works, viz.: — Thoughts for the Forecastle: — Seven Diamonds: — Plain Words for Young Men, besides several Tracts. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 200. (J.L.S.)

## Ripley, Lincoln[[@Headword:Ripley, Lincoln]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Woodstock, Conn., in 1761. Late in life he entered Dartmouth College, where he graduated in 1796. He soon after entered the ministry and settled at Waterford, Me., then a wilderness. His life was identified with the early history of the Church and town of Waterford. He severed his connection with that Church in 1821, and died July 14, 1858. See Amer. Cong. Yearbook, 1859, p. 128.

## Ripley, Samuel[[@Headword:Ripley, Samuel]]

             son of Ezra, was born in Concord, Mass., March 11, 1783, and graduated from Cambridge in 1804. He was ordained, Nov. 22, 1809, pastor of the Church at Waltham. After the death of Rev. B. Whitman, it was proposed to unite the two Unitarian societies; but Mr. Ripley, thinking it too great a burden, resigned shortly before (Oct. 27, 1841), and soon after took the pastoral charge of the Unitarian Church in Lincoln. In 1846 he removed to Concord, where he died, Nov. 24,1847. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 8, 116.

## Ripley, Thomas B.[[@Headword:Ripley, Thomas B.]]

             a Baptist minister, and brother of Dr. H.J. Ripley, was born in Boston Nov. 20, 1795, and was a graduate of Brown University, in the class of 1814. He studied theology with the Rev. Dr. Staughton, of Philadelphia, and was ordained as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Portland, Me., July 24, 1816, where he remained till March 1828. He removed to Bangor, Me., and was pastor of the First Baptist Church in that city from Sept. 10, 1829, until, in 1834, he resigned. After supplying two churches for a time, he removed to Tennessee, teaching and preaching in several places in that state, and performing ministerial service at Holly Springs, Miss. He returned to Portland, Me., in 1852, and acted as city missionary for several years. He died May 4, 1876. (J.C.S.)

## Rippon, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Rippon, John, D.D.]]

             an English Baptist minister of distinction, was born in Tiverton, Devonshire, April 29, 1751, and was the son of a Baptist minister. He pursued his studies at Bristol, and for many years was the successor of the Rev. Dr. Gill in the pastorate of the Baptist Church on Grange Road, Southwark. The testimony of Dr. Rippon with regard to the stand taken by the Baptist ministers of London and vicinity in the War of the Revolution is interesting. “I believe,” he remarks, in a letter to Pres. Manning, of Brown University, dated May 1, 1784, “all our Baptist ministers in town except two, and most of our brethren in the country, were on the side of the Americans in the late dispute. But sorry, very sorry, were we when we heard that the college was a hospital, and the meeting houses were forsaken, and occupied for civil or martial purposes. We wept when the thirsty plains drank the blood of your departed heroes, and the shout of a king was among us when your well-fought battles were crowned with  victory. And to this hour we believe that the independence of America will for a while secure the liberty of this country; but that if the continent had been reduced, Britain would not long have been free.” Dr. Rippon died Dec. 17, 1836. (J.C.S.)

## Ripundshaya[[@Headword:Ripundshaya]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a mythical king, in whose reign great religious changes are said to have been brought about. It would seem that Buddhism took root, and under his protection spread throughout all India.

## Risabha[[@Headword:Risabha]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the oldest of the twenty-three Buddhas who have appeared in India, belonging to the race of king Ikswara. He is frequently represented as an ox, though more generally as a man with the head of an ox, or as a man with horns. The ox, as a symbol of wisdom, is peculiar to him, and always accompanies him, even when he is simply represented on the altar by a variously colored head.

## Risco, Manuel[[@Headword:Risco, Manuel]]

             a learned Spanish ecclesiastic of the Augustinian Order, was born at Haro about 1730, and died about the close of the century. He acquired such reputation for knowledge in ecclesiastical history that he was appointed by the king, Charles III, to continue the history of which Florez published 29 vols. 4to. To these he added six volumes, written with equal ability and liberality of sentiment. The work was entitled Espana Sagrada. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Rishis[[@Headword:Rishis]]

             in Hindu mythology, are ten sons of Brahma, who are infinitely wise and pious, and thus resemble the gods, with whom they share the power to create men and gods. All things owe their existence immediately to these Rishis in common with the gods, and they are accordingly termed the ten ancestors, or lords, of all created beings. Their names are Daksha, Pulastya, Agni, Wasishta, Atri, Maritshi, Brigu, Narada, Pulagen, and Kratu. The seven Menus — Suagarabhara, Svaroshisha, Anttami, Tamasa, Raivatta, Chakshusha, and Vaivasvata — are sometimes classed with the Rishis.

## Rishton, Edward[[@Headword:Rishton, Edward]]

             a Roman Catholic writer, was born in Lancashire, and died in 1586 at Louvain of the plague. He published Synopsis Rerum Ecclesiasticarum ad Annum Christi 1577, and a Profession of Faith. He was the first publisher of Nicholas Sanders's De Origine et Progressu Schismatis Anglicani (1585, 8vo), to which he added a third part; and a fourth part, by way of appendix, appeared in 1628. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rising In The Air[[@Headword:Rising In The Air]]

             the name of a belief (prevalent in the Middle Ages) that the bodies of holy persons were sometimes lifted up and suspended in the air during the continuance of a religious ecstasy. Calmet states in his work on apparitions that this singular phenomenon might be produced by the fervor of the Holy Spirit, by the ministry of good angels, or by a miraculous favor of God, who desired thus to honor his servants in the eyes of men. Numerous instances are recorded in the Acta Sanctorum, and their relation accounts for the frequency with which representations of saints are exhibited in an aerial position in medieval paintings, etc. This belief falls in with one of the alleged phenomena of modern spiritialism.

## Risler, Jeremiah[[@Headword:Risler, Jeremiah]]

             a distinguished bishop and writer of the Moravian Church, was born at Miihlhausen, in Upper Alsace, Nov. 9, 1720. He was a graduate of the University of Basel, and entered the ministry of the Reformed Church, laboring at Lubeck and St. Petersburg, from 1744 to 1760. In the latter year he joined the Moravian Church, and took charge of a parish at Neuwied, on the Rhine, where he remained for twenty-five years. In 1782 he was consecrated to the episcopacy, and in 1786 was elected to the executive board of the Unitas Fratrum, known as the Unity's Elders' Conference, of which body he continued a member until his death. His ministerial career embraced a period of sixty-six years, fifty of which he devoted to the Moravian Church. He was a zealous servant of Christ, an eloquent preacher, and a faithful overseer of the flock. He died at Berthelsdorf, Saxony, Aug. 23, 1811. The following are his principal works: A French Translation of Zinzendorfs Discourses, and a new edition of the French Hymnal of the Church (1785): — La Sainte Doctrine (1769), translated into German and English: — Historischer Auszug aus  den Buchern des A. T. (1794): Leben von A.G. Spangenberg (1794): — Spangenberg's Reden an die Kinder, two collections (1792 and 1797): — Zinzendorfs Gedanken uber verschiedene evangelische Wahrheiten (1800): — Betrachtungen der Weisheit Gottes im dem Kreuzestod Jesu: — and three volumes of Erzahlungen aus der Brudergeschichte. (E. de S.)

## Risley, Ashabel Linn[[@Headword:Risley, Ashabel Linn]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bullitt County, Ky., Feb. 14, 1804. He united with the Church Sept. 5, 1825, although he did not find peace until the 11th of the same month. He was licensed to preach July 27, 1827, and entered the itinerant ministry Sept. 16, 1827. He labored in the Kentucky, Rock River, and Southern Illinois Conference until 1866, when he took a superannuated relation, and removed to Lebanon, where he remained until the time of his death, Aug. 24, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 126.

## Rissah[[@Headword:Rissah]]

             (Heb. Rissah', רַסָּה, a ruin; Sept. ῾Ρεσσά v.r. ῾Ρεσσάν and Δεσσά), the twentieth station of the Hebrews in the desert (Num 33:21-22). It lies, as there given, between Libnah and Kehelathah, and has been considered identical with Rasa in the Peuting. Itiner., thirty-two Roman miles from Ailah (Elah), and 203 miles south of Jerusalem, distinct, however, from the ῾Ρῆσσα of Josephus (Ant. 14, 15, 2). SEE EXODE.

## Rist, Johann Von[[@Headword:Rist, Johann Von]]

             a German hymn-writer, was born March 8, 1607, at Pinneburg, Holstein, and died August 31, 1667. He is the author of about six hundred and fifty- eight religious hymns and poems. Some are, indeed, of little value; but very many of them are really good, and some belong to the first rank. They were even read with delight among Roman Catholics, and an empress once lamented "that it were a great pity if the writer of such hymns should be sent to hell." Rist was very much honored, and attained the highest titles in Church and State open to a clergyman, and the emperor honored him in 1654 with the crown of poet-laureate and a patent of nobility. Quite a number of Rist's hymns have been translated into English, as "Auf, auf, ihr Reichsgenossen" ( Lyra Germ. 2L23): — "Wach' auf, wach' auf, du sich're Welt" (ibid. 1:4): — "Wie wohl hast du gelabet" (ibid. 2:144): — "Folget mir. ruft uns das Leben" (ibid. 1:188): — "Werde munter mein Gemuthe" (ibid. 2:112): — "Ehr' und Dank sei dir gesungen" (ibid. 1:205): — “O Traurigkeit, O Herzeleid" (Christian Singers, page 191): — "Werde Licht, du Volk der Heiden" (ibid. page 30): — "Gott sei gelobet, der alleine" (ibid. page 192): — "O Ewigkeit du Donnerwort" (Jacobi, Psalmodia Germ. 1:97). (B.P.)

## Ristubgrad[[@Headword:Ristubgrad]]

             in Norse mythology, was a pentagon known as Druid's foot or pentagram. It was a sacred symbol among the ancient Celts and Germans.

## Risus[[@Headword:Risus]]

             in Roman mythology, i.e. laughter, is said to have been venerated as a deity by several tribes of Italy.

## Rite[[@Headword:Rite]]

             (Lat. ritus) is, in general, an external sign or action employed in religious services, and designed either to express or to incite a corresponding internal religious feeling. Such are, for instance, the uplifting or outstretchting of the hands in prayer, the imposition of hands, etc. The  name rite is sometimes used to signify the aggregate of all the ceremonies used in a particular religious office, as a “rite of baptism“ or of the eucharist. In a still wider sense, it is used of the whole body of distinctive ceremonial, including the liturgy employed by a particular community of Christians. In this way we speak of the “Roman rite,” the “Greek rite,” or the “Slavonic rite.” SEE CEREMONY.

## Rites Of Baptism[[@Headword:Rites Of Baptism]]

             SEE BAPTIST, CEREMONIES OF.

## Rites, Congregation Of[[@Headword:Rites, Congregation Of]]

             the name of a committee of cardinals in the Roman Catholic Church, founded by pope Sixtus V. It was originally composed of six cardinals, with a number of secretaries and consulters. The reigning pope decides the number of members. In 1875 it comprised seventeen cardinals, twenty-five consulters, and eleven officials, including secretary, promoters of the faith, assessors, and masters of ceremonies. The matters of which it has cognizance are the liturgy, the rites of the administration of the sacraments, the rubrics of the missal and breviary, the ceremonial of the Church in all public functions, and the proceedings in the beatification and canonization of saints. The congregation meets once a month at the residence of the prefect, who is always the senior cardinal of the board. See Appletons' New Amer. Cyclop. s.v.

## Rithmah[[@Headword:Rithmah]]

             (Heb. Rithmah', רַתְמָה, heath; Sept. ῾Ραθαμᾶ), the seventeenth station of the Hebrews in the wilderness (Num 33:18-19). About half a day's journey south from Wady Kiseima, SEE AZMON is found a valley called Wady Rithimath, or Wady Abu-Retemat. Rothem literally is a broom bush; hence Rithmah, the region of the brush or heath, and near this wady the broom bushes are abundant. So Schwarz (Palest. p. 212), who identifies Rithmah with Kerdesh-Barnea. It probably lay immediately west of that place. SEE EXODE.

## Ritschl, Georg Karl Benjamin[[@Headword:Ritschl, Georg Karl Benjamin]]

             an eminent minister of the evangelical Church of Prussia, was born Nov. 1, 1783, at Erfurt. He studied theology at Erfurt and Jena, was licensed to preach in 1802, and came to Berlin in 1804, serving first as a private tutor,  next as an adjunct professor in a gymnasium, and finally as a preacher in St. Mary's Church. Eighteen years were given to the duties of that station, during which he approved himself both as a pulpit speaker and an instructor of the young. In 1816, Ritschl was made a member of the consistory having supervision over Brandenburg, and distinguished himself in the conduct of the examination of candidates for the ministry to a degree that secured for him the title of doctor of divinity. He also aided in the preparation of the Berliner Gesangbuch of 1829, a task for which he was qualified by the possession of musical talent and thorough musical culture. In August, 1827, Ritschl was appointed bishop of the evangelical Church and general superintendent of Pomerania, etc., and in the spring of the following year he entered on the duties of his high station. The plan of union in the Prussian evangelical Church was successfully introduced during his administration, and the visitations devolved on the superintendency were so efficiently performed that he sustained direct and personal relations with the entire clergy of the province, and was acquainted with the character of each individual in its membership. Having reached the age of seventy years, and having completed a public career of half a century, Ritschl resigned his position in 1854. He was, however, constituted an honorary member of the Supreme Ecclesiastical Council of Prussia, and thus induced to give his thought and labors to the Church down to the close of his life. He died June 18, 1858. See Herzog, Real- Encyklop. s.v.

## Rittangelius, Or Rithangel, John Stephen[[@Headword:Rittangelius, Or Rithangel, John Stephen]]

             a German writer of the 17th century, was a native of Forchheim, in the bishopric of Bamberg, and is said by some writers to have been born a Jew; but others assert that he was first a Roman Catholic, then a Jew, and lastly a Lutheran. This, however, is certain that he published several books containing Judaical learning, was professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Königsberg, and died about 1652. His works are, Commentary on Jezirah (Amsterd. 1642, 4to): — De Veritate Religionis Christianoe (Franeker, 1699): — Libra Veritatis (1698): — Letters: — German Translation of Prayers used by Jews in their Synagogues, etc. Rittangelius maintained this paradox, that the New Testament contains nothing but what was taken from the Jewish antiquities. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Ritter, Erasmus[[@Headword:Ritter, Erasmus]]

             a Bavarian, the Reformer of Schaffhausen, lived in the middle of the 16th century. He was at first opposed to the Reformation, and, being possessed of oratorical talents, was invited to Schaffhausen in 1522 to confront Seb. Hofmeister (q.v.); but being led to study the Scriptures in the progress of his work, he was converted, and at once entered on the work of strengthening the evangelical cause. He displayed great prudence and moderation, but nevertheless his Zwinglian principles involved him in angry disputes with Burgauer (1528 sq.), the successor of Hofmeister, in consequence of which it was found advisable to dismiss both the controversialists. Ritter went to Berne, where new troubles awaited him. The condition of his later life is not known. He married in 1529 the sister of the abbot of All-Saints in Schaffhausen, and was long in steady correspondence with Zwinlgli. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Ritter, Heinrich[[@Headword:Ritter, Heinrich]]

             a philosophical writer of Germany, was born at Zerbst, November 11, 1791. He commenced his academical career at Berlin in 1817, was professor of philosophy in 1824, in 1833 at Kiel, in 1837 at Gottingen, and died Feb. 2, 1869, doctor of theology. He wrote, Der Paintheismus und  die Halb-Kantianer (Berlin, 1827): — Ueber die Erkenntniss Gottes in der Welt (Hamburg, 1836): — Ueber das Bose (Kiel, 1839): — Ueber die Emanationslehre (Gottingen, 1847): — Ueber Lessings philosophische und religiose Grundsatze (1848): — Unsterblichkeit (Leipsic, 1851): — Die christliche Philosophie nach ihrem Begriff (1858-59, 2 volumes): — Encyclopadie der philosophischen Wissenschaten (1864, 3 volumes): — Ueber das Bose und seine Folgen (Gotha, 1869): — Philosophische Paratdoxa (Leipsic, 1867). (B.P.)

## Ritter, Joseph Ignaz[[@Headword:Ritter, Joseph Ignaz]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Schweinitz, in Silesia, April 12, 1787. In 1811 he received his first orders; in 1813 he was chaplain at Grottkau; in 1818 at Berlin; and from thence he was called, in 1823, as ordinary professor of theology to Bonn. In 1830 he was created doctor of divinity and appointed professor of theology and member of the chapter at Breslau, and advanced in 1846 as cathedral dean, which position he occupied till his death, Jan. 5, 1857. He wrote, Manual of Church History (5th ed. Bonn, 1854, 2 vols.): — Irenikon, or Letters for Promoting Peace and Concord between Church and State (Leips. 1840): — History of the Breslau Diocese (Breslau, 1845): — Popular Lectures on the History of the Church in the First Four Centuries (Paderborn, 1849): — On Bunsen and Stahl (Breslau, 1856, etc.). See Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 2, 1073; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 543, 586, 598, 607, 887; 2, 736; Supplement, p. 156, 296; Niedner, Kirchengeschichte, p. 864. (B.P.)

## Ritter, Karl[[@Headword:Ritter, Karl]]

             an eminent German geographer, was born Aug. 7, 1779, in Quedlinburg, Prussia. He studied at Halle, and after traveling in Switzerland, France, and Italy, was appointed professor extraordinary of geography at the University of Berlin in 1820. He was also director of studies of the military school. Ritter was the founder of general comparative geography, and exercised a  decisive influence on its study, remodelling the whole science, and attracting general attention to its problems and results. He died at Berlin, Sept. 25, 1859. His chief works are, Die Erdkunde im Verhaltnisse zur Natur und Geschichte des Menschen (Berlin, 1822-54, 17 vols. [19 pts.]): — Europa, ein geographischhistorisch-statistisches Gemalde (Frankfort, 1807, 2 vols.): — Die Stupas, oder die architect. Monumente, etc. (Berlin, 1838): — Die Colonisirung von Neu-Zealand (ibid. 1842): — Blick auf das Nilquelland (ibid. 1844): — Der Jordan und die Beschiffung des Todten Meeres (ibid. 1850): — Ein Blick auf Palastina und die christliche Bevolkerung (ibid. 1852). Parts of his works have been translated into English by Gage: Comparative Geography (Edinb. 1865), and The Comparative Geography of Palestine and the Sinaitic Peninsula (ibid. 1866, 4 vols.). See Gage, Life of Karl Ritter, in the For. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1837; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Ritu[[@Headword:Ritu]]

             the seasons of the Hindus, which are six in number — two summers, two springs, and two winters. Their names are Sisar, the season of dew; Himant, of cold; Vassant, of bloom; Grishna, of heat; Varsa, of rain; and Sarat, of thaw.

## Ritual[[@Headword:Ritual]]

             (from ritus, a ceremony) has been defined as “the external body of words and action by which worship is expressed and exhibited before God and man;” also “the book containing the particular ordinances of any single Church.” The necessity of ritual, whether of a more or less elaborate kind, may be supported

(1) on historical grounds. Its traces may be found in all ages; and every form of religion, true or false — Christianity, Mohammedanism, Buddhism, and the different forms of idolatry — has had a ritual of its own.

(2) On internal grounds. From the two-fold constitution of man as body and spirit. As long as the body is an essential element of man, so long, it is urged, will ritual be a necessary feature in his worship. Objection is made that the Jewish system of external observances, and, by inference, all worship of a similar kind, was abolished by our Lord when he said, “God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth” (Joh 4:24); and that all attempts to reintroduce a system of ritual are a  violation of the genius and intention of the Founder of Christianity. This was the basis of the teaching of George Fox (A.D. 1647). But it appears, from Christ's own conduct in the institution of baptism and the Lord's supper, and those recorded acts of worship (Luk 18:13; Luk 21:2-3; Luk 22:4) which secured his sanction or approval, that the real object of his animadversion was a permanent external worship from which the heart and affections were absent. The special objects of Christian ritual are (1) to impart the historic truths of religion. By the various festivals (e.g. Easter, Whit-Sunday) of the Church and their attendant ceremonies, Christians have their attention drawn to the divine origin of their religion. (2) A constant witness to moral and doctrinal truth. Thus baptism shows the corruption of human nature and the necessity of purity, and is a symbol of the inward “washing of regeneration.” Mosheim (Eccles. Hist. [Amer. ed.] 1, 84) states that Christ only “established two rites, which it is not lawful either to change or abrogate, viz. baptism and the Lord's supper,” and infers from this that “ceremonies are not essential to the religion of Christ, and that the whole business of them is left by him to the discretion and free choice of Christians.” In the 2d century ceremonies were much increased, for which Mosheim (1, 132) assigns the following reasons:

(1) To conciliate the Jews and pagans:

(2) to rebut the charge of atheism made against the Christians, because they had not the external paraphernalia of religion;

(3) imitation of language in the New Test., such as terms borrowed from the Jewish laws. The bishops were first innocently called high priests, the presbyters priests, etc. These titles were abused by those to whom they were given, who claimed that they had the same rank and dignity, and possessed the same rights and privileges, with those who bore them under the Jewish dispensation. Hence the splendid garments, and many other things.

(4) Among the Greeks and other people of the East nothing was considered more sacred than the Mysteries. This circumstance led the Christians, in order to impart dignity to their religion, to claim similar mysteries. Without discussing the general subject further, we present the rituals of the various prominent Christian churches.

1. Church of Rome. — The ceremonial of the offices of the Roman Church administered by bishops is contained in the books entitled Pontificale and  Ceremoniale Episcoporum. The priestly offices are detailed in the Ritual. In its present form it dates from the Council of Trent, which directed a revision of all the different rituals then extant. An authoritative edition was published by Paul V in 1614, which has been frequently reprinted, and of which a revision was issued by Benedict XIV. Besides the Roman Ritual, there are many diocesan rituals, some of which are of much historical interest. The most approved commentary on the Roman Ritual is that of Barrufaldo (Florence, 1847, 2 vols.). SEE BREVIARY; SEE MISSAL; SEE RITUALE ROMANUM

2. English Church. — Originally each bishop had the power to form his own liturgy, and to regulate its attendant ritual, provided that the essential features of Christian worship were retained, and that nothing commanded in Scripture or derived from apostolic times was omitted. St. Basil (A.D. 329-379) composed a liturgy for the Church of Ceesarea, which received the sanction of its bishop, Eusebius (Greg. Naz. Orat. 20). As a consequence, great variety existed, with a tendency to increase. Two early but unsuccessful attempts were made to introduce a uniformity of worship throughout England. The Council of Cloveshoe (A.D. 747) recommended the adoption of the Roman liturgy to all the English dioceses, but its recommendation was never more than partially carried out. In 1085 St. Osmund compiled the Sarum Breviary and Missal, which obtained a wide circulation, but were never universally accepted to the exclusion of those previously existing. It was, in a great measure, to remedy the inconveniences resulting from this variety that the First Book of Common Prayer, compiled by a committee of Convocation (first appointed in A.D. 1542), was issued in the second year of king Edward VI (A.D. 1549). This book, after receiving various additions and alterations in A.D. 1552, 1560, 1604, and 1662, is still the guide of the English Church in all matters connected with the performance of divine service and ritual. SEE COMMON PRAYER, BOOK OF.

3. Greek Church. — In the Greek Church, as in the other Eastern communions, the ritual forms part of the general collection (which contains also the eucharistic service) entitled EUCHOLOGION SEE EUCHOLOGION (q.v.).

4. The Methodist Churches. — The ritual of these churches embraces directions for public worship, for the administration of baptism and the Lord's supper, for solemnizing matrimony, burial of the dead, reception of  members, laying cornerstones, dedication of churches, consecration of bishops, and ordination of deacons and elders. The chief part of this ritual was prepared by Mr. Wesley, and was adopted by the General Conference of 1784. Methodists do not believe that any precise form of ritual is essential, but that, as far as practicable, a uniform system should be adopted for the sake of propriety and order. See Blunt, Dict. of Theol.; Chambers's Encyclop.; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Mosheim, Church Hist. vol. 1; Barnum, Romansism.

## Ritual Choir[[@Headword:Ritual Choir]]

             The part of the church actually used for the choir, and distinct from the architectural or constructional choir. — Walcott, Sac. Archoeol. s.v.

## Ritual of the Dead[[@Headword:Ritual of the Dead]]

             is the name given by Egyptologists to the oldest sacred book of the Egyptian theology. Portions of this book data from the time of king Gagamakhem, a monarch of the third dynasty, the text itself being in many places accompanied by a gloss, which was added at a later period, to render it intelligible. The deities principally mentioned in it are Osiris, Anubis, Horus, and Tum; Amen Ra, as a distinct divinity, being only indirectly referred to. Although the mystical work is now treated as one book, it' is really made up of a collection of not less than eighteen separate treatises, including three supplemental chapters and two litanies, which seem to have been added at the time of the new empire. Selections from chapters and illustrations from the ritual abound on the walls of many of the tombs of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties, and notably on that of Seti-Menepthah I, in the Biban el-Moluk. Other chapters were used as mystical formulae to avert diseases, otlers as a part of the religious worship of the Egyptians, and a few obscure passages as secret mysteries, the meaning of which is now lost. Many hundred of papyri have been found in the mummy-cases, which contain different portions of the ritual, with their accompanying vignette and rubric, but a complete recension and comparison of all the existing texts have not yet been effected. The text of the ritual underwent no less than three different revisions, viz., in the ancient empire, in the period of the nineteenth dynasty, and in the reign of the Saitic kings. This last was the edition which is most commonly met with, but there appears to have been an attempt at a partial re-edition in the Ptolemaic period. The chief divisions or books of which the Ritual of the Dead is composed are as follows:  CHAPTERS

1. The Manifestation of Light (first book) — 1-16.

2. The Egyptian Faith — 17-20.

3. The Resurrection of the Deceased — 21-26.

4. The Preservation of the Body in Hades — 27-42.

5. The Protection in Hades — 43-51.

6. The Celestial Diet — 52-53.

7. The Manifestation of Light (second book) — 51-75.

8. The Metamorphoses — 76-90.

9. The Protection of the Soul; or, Forms for Various Occasions - 91-116.

10. The Going into and out of Hades — 117-124.

11. The Hall of the Two Truths — 125.

12. The Gods, of the Orbit — 126-129.

13. The Passage of the Sun, or Adorations of the Sun — 130-140.

14. The Festival (Litany) of the Names of the Gods — 141-143.

15. The House of Osiris; or, The Chapter of Making the Amulets - 144- 161.

16. The Orientation — 162, 163.

17. The Three Supplemental Chapters — .164-166.

18. The Assistances of Horus — 1, 2.

From these it will be seen that the arrangement of the chapters is inconsecutive so far as their subjects are concerned, and there is every reason to believe that the order in which they now occur, especially in the English translation, is somewhat arbitrary. The ritual is rarely found written in Hieratic, and still more rarely in Demotic. The finest examples are those in the museums of the Louvre and Turin.

## Rituale Romanum[[@Headword:Rituale Romanum]]

             Various rituals (ordines Romani) had been issued from time to time in behalf of the worship of the Roman Catholic Church, SEE ORDO ROMANUS; but the later popes, since the Council of I Trent (comp. sess. 25, De Indice Librorum) were concerned to promote ecclesiastical unity by introducing a common ritual. Pius V accordingly published the Breviarium and the Missale Romanum, and Clement VIII the Pontificale and Ceremoniale (see the respective articles); and Paul V followed their example by causing certain cardinals to compile a new service book from several of the older rituals, especially that of cardinal Julius Antonius (Sanctoe Severinoe), which was issued under the title Rituale Romanum, June 16, 1614, and its use made obligatory. It contains the sacraments to be administered by priests, sacramentalia, processions, forms, for use in records of the Church, etc. Other service books gradually gave way before it in the general use of the Church, though special books were still prepared, particularly for use in the churches in the city of Rome. See Catalani, Sacrarum Coeremoniarum, etc. (Rome, 1750, 2 vols. fol.).

## Ritualism[[@Headword:Ritualism]]

             a term popularly applied to a movement in the Church of England, and in the Protestant Episcopal Church. The revival of ecclesiastical learning, which was so conspicuous a feature of the Tractarian (q.v.) movement, necessarily made the clergy better acquainted with the primitive liturgies, and with the ancient service books of the Church of England. This study of ecclesiology, as the science came to be called, was soon brought to bear  upon the restoration of old churches and the construction of new ones, as well as upon the service of the Church. There was also the feeling that prayer, praise, and the holy eucharist are offered to God, as well as used for the spiritual advantage of man. It was under such circumstances, and under such influences, that “Ritualism” took its rise.

The principles of Ritualism, according to its advocates, are three. They say, in the first place, that it rests on the declaration of the Convocation of Canterbury (1571), “that preachers should, in the first place, be careful never to teach anything from the pulpit, to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and collected out of that very doctrine by the catholic fathers and ancient bishops.” This was thought to establish the doctrinal identity of the Church of England with the primitive Church. Consequently the apostolic episcopate and sacramental grace are specially insisted on, baptismal regeneration is strenuously asserted, and the holy eucharist has been made the central object of teaching and the highest object of worship. The voluntary use of private confession and absolution as a preparation for the reception of the holy communion has also made considerable progress. The second great principle of the Ritualist is stated in the thirtieth canon: “So far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, or any such like churches, in all things which they held and practiced, that, as the apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men.” This principle, it is alleged, establishes the fraternal readiness of the Church of England for visible union with other branches of the apostolic Church, and the Ritualists assert a willingness to do any and every thing lawful to approximate towards the Continental Church. The third principle is found in the Ornaments Rubric: “The chancels shall remain as they have done in times past . . . that such ornaments of the church and of the ministers thereof, at all times of their ministration, shall be retained and be in use as they were in this Church of England, by the authority of Parliament, in the second year of the reign of king Edward VI.” This was interpreted to mean that the chancels, vestments, ornaments of the church and ministers, should be the same as before the Reformation. This principle was fully developed at several churches in London, Oxford, Leeds, and elsewhere. Depending upon the above mentioned principles, there are six chief points insisted upon by the Ritualists:

1, the eastward position of the celebrant in the sacrament of the holy communion, with his back to the people;

2, the eucharistic vestments;

3, lights, burning at the time of celebration;

4, incense;

5, the mixed chalice, a little water being mixed with the wine;

6, unleavened (or wafer) bread.

The Directorium Anglicanum, being a manual of directions for the right celebration of a holy communion, for the saying of matins and evensong, and for the performance of other rites and ceremonies of the Church, according to ancient uses of the Church of England, by the Rev. John Purchas, was published in 1858. A full development of ritualistic usages on the principle thus indicated was established at St. Alban's Church, Holborn, and at a later date at a Brighton chapel, of which Mr. Purchas became incumbent. The ceremonial of divine service was raised to a much higher standard than had been contemplated by the older school of Ritualists, and provoked opposition from them, for it was chiefly copied from modern Continental customs, and was much mixed up with a sentimentalism about candles and flowers, as well as with an excessive minuteness in regard to postures and gestures, which made it easy to charge the school with trifling and want of manliness.

There have been a number of legal cases arising out of the teaching and practices of the Ritualists. The Church of Barnabas, Pimlico, was opened in 1850 for the purpose of carrying out completely and honestly the principles of Ritualism. This led to litigation, which ultimately brought both advocates and opponents before the Privy Council in 1857. The council considered some portions of the furniture of the church to be unsanctioned by the existing law, but the principle then contended for by the Ritualists was affirmed by their interpretation of the Ornaments Rubric, respecting the various forms of which they decided that “they all obviously mean the same thing, that the same dresses and the same utensils or articles which were used under the First Prayer book of Edward VI may still be used.” This decision left the Ritualists in possession of the field. Suits were also instituted against Mr. Mackonochie, vicar of St. Alban's, and Mr. Purchas, incumbent of St. James's Chapel, Brighton, which were carried up to the Privy Council, and all the six above mentioned usages, and some others, were condemned. Of more importance than these cases was that of the Rev. W.J.E. Bennett, vicar of Frome, who published a sermon in which he  taught “the real and actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our churches.” The Court of Arches, through Sir Robert Phillimore, decided in Mr. Bennett's favor, and the appeal to the judicial committee of the Privy Council was dismissed by them (1872). In 1867 a royal commission was appointed “to inquire into and report upon different practices which had arisen, and varying interpretations which were put upon the rubrics, orders,” etc.; also to reconstruct the tables of lessons used at morning and evening prayer. Its reconstructed lectionary was authorized for use by Parliament and Convocation (1871). The Ritualists have paid great attention to the study of the liturgies and rituals of all ages, and to that of hymnology. They have encouraged the revival of religious orders, and have communities of women devoted to labor in hospitals and like institutions. The ritualistic movement of England has received more or less sympathy in the United States, but with much less development of detail. In 1874 a general canon was passed, which was regarded as a nearly unanimous expression of opinion unfavorable to ritualistic extremes, but no occasion has arisen for putting it in force. SEE OXFORD TRACTS.

## Ritualist[[@Headword:Ritualist]]

             SEE RITUALISM.

## Ritzema, Johannes[[@Headword:Ritzema, Johannes]]

             one of the leading ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church during the last century. He was born in Holland, 1710, and thoroughly educated in that country. He was pastor of the Collegiate Reformed (Dutch) Church in New York from 1744 to 1784. His sermons were “of a high order.” He is represented as a man of great prudence, and of most estimable character in the Church and in the community. Although at first he was regarded as “a conservative ccetus man” in the great controversy which rent the Church, he soon, with his colleague Rev. Lambertus De Ronde, went over to the Conferentie and became an active partisan with those who opposed the ordination of ministers in this country. His consistory remained neutral. He wrote several pamphlets in opposition to Rev. John Leydt, who favored independence. During the Revolutionary war, he and De Ronde were compelled to leave the city, and remained in their old age in their places of exile. His last four years (1784-88) were spent at Kinderhook, N.Y. He was a trustee of Kings, now Columbia College, N.Y.; and at one time,  when it was proposed to establish a divinity professorship in that institution, he was prominently named for that office by his friends. See De Witt, Historical Discourse; Gunn, Life of J.H. Livingston; Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church. (W.J.R.T.)

## River[[@Headword:River]]

             In the sense in which we employ the word, viz. for a perennial stream of considerable size, a river is a much rarer object in the East than in the West. SEE WATER. The majority of the inhabitants of Palestine at the present day have probably never seen one. With the exception of the Jordan and the Litany, the streams of the Holy Land are either entirely dried up in the summer months, and converted into hot lanes of glaring stones, or else reduced to very small streamlets deeply sunk in a narrow bed, and concealed from view by a dense growth of shrubs. The cause of this is twofold: on the one hand, the hilly nature of the country --a central mass of highland descending on each side to a lower level — and on the other the extreme heat of the climate during the summer. There is little doubt that in ancient times the country was more wooded than it now is, and that, in consequence, the evaporation was less, and the streams more frequent; yet this cannot have made any very material difference in the permanence of the water in the thousands of valleys which divide the hills of Palestine.

“River” is the rendering in the A.V. of seven distinct Hebrew words. These are not synonymous. Most of them have definite significations, and were used by the sacred writers to set forth certain physical peculiarities. When these are overlooked, the full force and meaning of the Scriptures cannot be understood; and important points of physical geography and topography fail to be apprehended.

1. אוּבָל (or אֵבָל), ubal, used only in three passages of Daniel (Dan 8:2-3; Dan 8:6). “I was by the river of Ulai.” It comes from the root יבל, which, like the corresponding Arabic, signifies to flow copiously. Its derivative, מִבּוּל, is the Hebrew term for deluge.

2. אָפַיק, aphik, from אפק, to hold or restrain. It thus comes to signify “a channel,” from the fact of its “holding” or “restraining” within its banks a river. It is said in 2Sa 22:16, “The channels of the sea appeared, the foundations of the world were discovered” (comp. Psa 18:15).  The psalmist gives it very appropriately to the glens of the Negeb (south), which are dry during a great part of the year: “Turn again our captivity, O Lord, as the channels in the Negeb.” The beauty of this passage is marred by the present translation, “streams in the south” (Psa 126:4). The word is rightly translated “channels” in Isa 8:7. It ought to be rendered in the same way in Eze 32:6 : “And the channels (rivers) shall be full of thee.” But the most striking example of a wrong rendering is in Joe 3:18 : “And all the rivers of Judah shall flow with waters.” SEE APHIK.

3. יְאוֹר (or יְאֹר), yeor, is an Egyptian word, which is applied originally, and almost exclusively, to the river Nile, and, in the plural, to the canals by which the Nile water was distributed throughout Egypt, or to streams having a connection with that country. It properly denotes a fosse or river (it was expressed by ioro in the dialect of Memphis, and by iero in that of Thebes, while it appears as ior in the Rosetta inscription). It was introduced into the Hebrew language by Moses, and is used more frequently in the Pentateuch than in all the rest of the Bible. As employed by him it has the definiteness of a proper name. Thus, “Pharaoh stood by the river” (Gen 41:1; comp. ver. 2, 3, 17, etc.): “Every son that is born ye shall cast into the river” (Exo 1:22). The Nile was emphatically the river of Egypt. Subsequent writers, when speaking of the river of Egypt, generally borrow the same word (Isa 7:18; Isa 19:6; Jer 46:7; Eze 29:3; Amo 8:8, etc.). In a few places it is employed to denote a large and mighty river, not like the rivulets or winter torrents of Palestine. Thus in Isa 23:10 : “Pass through the land as a river, O daughter of Tarshish” (comp. 33:21). The usual rendering of this word in the A.V. is “river;” but it is translated “streams” in Isa 33:21; “flood” in Jer 46:7-8; Amo 8:8, etc.; and “brooks” in Isa 19:6-8, where reference is manifestly made to the “canals” which convey the water of the Nile to different parts of Egypt. SEE NILE.

4. יוּבִל, yubal, is found only in Jer 17:8 : “He shall be as a tree ... that spreadeth out her roots by the river.” The word is radically identical with אוּבָל(No. 1), and its meaning is the same.

5. נָהָר, nahar, from the root נהר, which signifies to flow; and it may be regarded as the proper Hebrew equivalent for our word river. The cognate Arabic nahr has the same meaning, in which language also, as in Hebrew, it includes canals, as the “Naharawan of Khuzistan;” and the Scripture must  mean the Euphrates and its canals, where it speaks of “the rivers (naharoth) of Babylon” (Psa 137:1). It is always applied to a perennial stream. It is possibly used of the Jordan in Psa 66:6; Psa 74:15; of the great Mesopotamian and Egyptian rivers generally in Gen 2:10; Exo 7:19; 2Ki 17:6; Eze 3:15, etc. It is often followed by the genitives of countries, as “the river of Egypt” (Gen 15:18), that is, the Nile; “the river of Gozan” (2Ki 17:6); “the rivers of Ethiopia” (Isa 18:1); “the rivers of Damascus” (2Ki 5:12). With the article, הִנָּהָר, han-nahar, the word is applied emphatically to the Euphrates; thus in Gen 31:21, “He rose up, and passed over the river;” and Exo 23:31, “I will set thy bounds ... from the desert unto the river” (Num 24:6; 2Sa 10:16, etc.). The Euphrates is also called “the great river” (Gen 15:18; Deu 1:7, etc.). In one passage this word, without the article, evidently signifies the Nile (Isa 19:5); though in poetry, when thus used, the Euphrates is meant (7:20; Psa 72:8; Zec 9:10). In a few passages the word is translated “flood” (Jos 24:2; Job 14:11; Psa 66:6); but with a few exceptions (Jos 1:4; Jos 24:2; Jos 24:14-15; Isa 59:19; Eze 31:15), nahar is uniformly rendered “river” in our version, and accurately, since it is never applied to the fleeting fugitive torrents of Palestine. SEE TOPOGRAPHICAL TERMS.

6. נִחִל, nachal, is derived from the root נָחִל, which signifies to receive or to possess. Its usual meaning is a valley, probably from the fact of its receiving the surface water after rains, and affording a bed for a stream. Sometimes it is applied to a valley or glen, apart altogether from the idea of a stream. Thus in Gen 26:17, Abraham “pitched his tent in the valley of Gerar.” As many of the valleys of Palestine were the beds of winter streams, the word was sometimes applied to the stream itself, as in Lev 11:9-10; the “valley,” the “brook,” and the “river” Zered (Num 21:12; Deu 2:13; Amo 6:14); the “brook” and the “river” of Jabbok (Gen 32:23; Deu 2:37), of Kishon (Jdg 4:7; 1Ki 18:40). Comp. also Deu 3:16, etc. Jerome, in his Quoestiones in Genesim, 26, 19, draws the following curious distinction between a valley and a torrent: “Et hic pro valle torrens scriptus est, nunquam enim in valle invenitur puteus aquae vivae.” Sometimes, however, the rendering is incorrect, and conveys a very wrong impression. In Num 13:23 “the brook Eshcol” should manifestly be “the valley of Eshcol;” and in Deu 3:16 the same  word is rendered in two ways — “unto the river Arnon half the valley” (comp. Jos 12:2). Again, in Jos 13:6 the sacred writer is represented as speaking of “a city that is in the midst of the river;” it means, of course, valley (comp. 2Sa 24:5). Frequent mention is made of the “brook Kidron” (2Ki 23:6; 2Ki 23:12; 2Ch 15:16; 2Ch 29:16; 2Ch 30:14); but valley is the true meaning. In Psa 78:20 is the following: “He smote the rock, that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed.”

Neither of these words expresses the thing intended; but the term “brook” is peculiarly unhappy, since the pastoral idea which it conveys is quite at variance with the general character of the wadys of Palestine. Many of these are deep abrupt chasms or rents in the solid rock of the hills, and have a savage, gloomy aspect, far removed from that of an ordinary brook. For example, the Arnon forces its way through a ravine several hundred feet deep and about two miles wide across the top. The Wady Zerka, probably the Jabbok, which Jacob was so anxious to interpose between his family and Esau, is equally unlike the quiet “meadowy brook” with which we are familiar. And those which are not so abrupt and savage are in their width, their irregularity, their forlorn arid look when the torrent has subsided, utterly unlike “brooks.” Unfortunately, our language does not contain any single word which has both the meanings of the Hebrew nachal and its Arabic equivalent wady, which can be used at once for a dry valley and for the stream which occasionally flows through it. Ainsworth, in his Annotations (on Num 13:23), says that “bourne” has both meanings; but “bourne” is now obsolete in English, though still in use in Scotland, where, owing to the mountainous nature of the country, the “burns” partake of the nature of the wadys of Palestine in the irregularity of their flow. Burton (Geog. Journ. 24, 209) adopts the Italian fiumana. Others have proposed the Indian term nullah. The double application of the Hebrew nachal is evident in 1Ki 17:3, where Elijah is commanded to hide himself in (not by) the nachal Cherith, and to drink of the nachal. This word is also translated “flood” in 2Sa 22:5; Job 28:4, etc. SEE BROOK.

The frequent use of the word nachal in Scripture, and the clear distinction drawn between it and nahar by the sacred writers, are indicative of the physical character of Palestine — “a land of hills and valleys;” a land in which nearly all the valleys are dry in summer, and the beds of torrents during the winter rains. The Arabic word wady is the modern equivalent of  the Hebrew nachal. It means a valley, glen, or ravine of any kind, whether the bed of a perennial stream or of a winter torrent, or permanently dry. Like its Hebrew equivalent, it is also sometimes applied to the river or stream which flows in the valley; but not so commonly as nachal. In reading the Hebrew Scriptures the context alone enables us to decide the meaning attached by the writer in each passage to the word nachal. In a few instances it appears to be used in two senses in the very same sentence (comp. 1Ki 17:3-7, etc.). See a picturesque allusion to such brooks in Job 6:15. When the word stands alone it seems to denote a mere winter torrent, a permanent stream being indicated by the addition of the word איתן, “perennial,” as in Psa 74:15; Deu 31:4; Amo 5:24. SEE VALLEY.

A few brooks are specially designated (in addition to the above), as the Brook of Willows (Isa 15:7), a stream on the east of the Dead Sea, probably the present Wady el-Ahsy, which descends from the eastern mountains and enters the eastern end of the Dead Sea; the Besor (the cold), a torrent emptying itself into the Mediterranean near Gaza (1Sa 30:9-10; 1Sa 30:21); and the Kanah, a stream on the borders of Ephraim and Manasseh (Jos 17:9). “The brook of Egypt,” mentioned in Num 34:5; Jos 15:4; Jos 15:47; 1Ki 8:65; 2Ki 24:7; Isa 27:12, which is also called simply” “the brook” (Eze 47:19; Eze 48:28), and described as on the confines of Palestine and Egypt, is unquestionably the Wady el-Arish, near the village of that name, which was anciently called Rhinocorura. The “river (yeor) of Egypt” is, however, the Nile; and it is unfortunate that the two are riot so well distinguished in the A.V. as in the original. Other examples are the valley of Gerar (Gen 26:17 ) and the valley of Sorek (Jdg 16:4), so called probably from its vineyards, which Eusebius and Jerome place north of Eleutheropolis and near to Zorah. The valley of Shittim (“acacias”) was in Moab, on the borders of Palestine (Joel 4:18; comp. Num 25:1; Jos 2:1; Jos 3:1; Mic 6:5). See each name in its place.

7. פֶּלֶג, peleg. The root of this word appears to be the same as that of φλέω, φλύω, fleo, fluo, pluo, and the English flow; its meaning is “to gush” or “flow over.” Peleg is equivalent to the Arabic palg, “a stream,” and is always given to something flowing. Thus in Job 29:6, “The rock poured me out rivers of oil;” and Lam 3:48, “Mine eye runneth down with rivers of water.” In the Bible it is used ten times, and is  translated “rivers,” except in Psa 46:4, where it is rendered “streams,” and in Jdg 5:15-16, “divisions,” where the allusion is probably to the artificial streams with which the pastoral and agricultural country of Reuben was irrigated (Ewald, Dichter, 1, 129; Gesen. Thesaur. col. 1103 b); or perhaps to the gullies that intersect that high table land. SEE MOAB.

8. What is commonly rendered “conduit” (2Ki 18:17; 2Ki 20:20; Isa 7:3; Isa 36:2), once a “watercourse” (Job 28:25), is in one verse transformed into “little rivers,” but with “conduits” on the margin (Eze 31:4). The word is תְּעָלָה, tealah, and means simply a channel or conduit for the conveying of rain or water of any sort. SEE CONDUIT.

Rivers were worshipped by many nations of antiquity (Spanheim, on Callim. Apol. 112; Cerer. 14; Voss, Idololat. 2, 79 sq.), and especially in the East. Comp. Herod. 1, 138; Strabo, 15, 732; Arnob. Adv. Gent. 6, 11. On the Persians, see Heliodor. AEth. 9, 9; so the Egyptians. Some trace of the reverence for them so generally felt has been supposed by some to have existed among the idolatrous Hebrews (from Isa 57:6; Bosseck, De Cultu Fluminum [Lips. 1740]; Van Speren, in Biblioth. Hag. 4, 1, 81 sq.), but without ground (see Rosenmüller and Gesen. in Jes. ad loc.). The principal rivers mentioned in the Bible are the Euphrates, the Nile, and the Jordan (see each). See Swedie, Lakes and Rivers of the Bible (Lond. 1864). SEE PALESTINE.

## River Brethren[[@Headword:River Brethren]]

             a sect deriving their origin from the Mennonites. A revival of religion occurred during the Revolutionary war in Lancaster Co., Pa., and a number  of Germans being converted, some of them associated with United Brethren, and others were organized into a body called the River Brethren. The name is applied to them partly from the locality in which they were first found — near the Susquehanna and Conestoga-- and chiefly from their baptizing only in rivers. They now extend into Ohio, Canada, and elsewhere. They recognize three orders of clergy — bishops, elders, and deacons. Their preachers — generally uneducated men, engaged in secular pursuits during the week, and receiving no salary for services — are chosen by votes, and in case of a tie they have recourse to the lot. Their services are generally in the German language, and held in private houses. This denomination reject infant baptism, and baptize adults by trine immersion. They hold to feet washing, baptism, the Lord's supper, and communion (love feast), and wear their beards unshorn. They have never published a confession of faith. They are opposed to war, and cannot therefore serve. in the army. See Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.; Porter. Hand-book of Religions, s.v.

## River Of Egypt[[@Headword:River Of Egypt]]

             This term occurs eight times in the Old Test. (Gen 15:18; Num 34:5; Jos 15:4; Jos 15:47; 1Ki 8:65; 2Ki 24:7 Isa 27:12, in the last passage translated “the stream of Egypt”). In the first of these the word translated river is נָהָר, nahar, while in all the others it is נִחִל, nachal. The preceding remarks on these two terms, and the clear distinction drawn between them by the sacred writers, will show that in the above passages they can scarcely be regarded as identical in meaning, and that in all probability Nehar Mitzrayim is to be regarded as distinct from Nachal Mitzrayim. To determine this point, it will be necessary to examine critically the several passages in which the words occur, and the light that may be thrown upon them by parallels. Geographically, the question is of importance, as determining the southern border of “the land of promise” and of “the land of possession.”

1. Nehar Mitzrayim (נְהִר מַצְרִיַם, “The river of Egypt”). The land which the Lord gave in covenant promise to Abraham is thus described in Gen 15:18 : “Unto thy seed have I given this land, from the river of Egypt unto the great river, the river Euphrates.” The Sept. renders the phrase, ἀπὸ τοῦ ποταμοῦ Αἰγύπτου; and the Vulg., a fluvio AEgypti. The word נהר, as has been stated, like ποταμός and fluvius, means river. But the Nile is the only river of Egypt, and hence it is natural to conclude that the Nile is meant, and here — as the western border of the promised land, of which the eastern border was the Euphrates — the Pelusiac or easternmost branch. So it is understood by most commentators (Kalisch, Delitzsch, etc., ad loc.). It is true the extent of territory thus defined was never actually occupied by the seed of Abraham; nor was it possessed except, perhaps, during the reigns of David and Solomon. SEE PALESTINE.

2. Nachal Mitzrayim (נִחִל מ) occurs seven times in the Bible. In six of these the A.V. translates “river,” and in one “stream” (Isa 27:12). The Sept. has χειμάῤῥοος in Num 34:5; Jos 15:47; 2Ki 24:7; and 2Ch 7:8; φάραγξ in Jos 15:4; ποταμός in 1Ki 8:65; and ῾Ρινοκορούρων in Isa 27:12. The Vulg. has rivus in 1Ki 8:65 and 2Ki 24:7, but torrens in the others. The proper meaning of nachal is “valley,” though it is sometimes, as has been stated (see above), applied to the winter streams of Palestine. It could not with any propriety be applied to a large permanent river like the Nile. What, therefore, do the sacred writers mean by Nachal Mitzrayim?

In describing to Moses the land of Canaan, which the Israelites were about to enter and possess, the Lord stated that the southern boundary should extend from Kadesh-Barnea to “the river of Egypt,” or more correctly “the wady (valley) of Egypt” (Num 34:5). After the conquest, the southern border of Judah extended to the same points (Jos 15:4; Jos 15:47). The country over which the Israelites had spread in the time of Solomon was “from the entering in of Hamath unto the river of Egypt” (1Ki 8:65; 2Ch 7:8). In all these passages it will be observed that the country described is much smaller than that given in covenant promise to Abraham, extending only on the north as far as the entrance of Hamath. This has already been explained in the article PALESTINE.  Two other passages in which the term is employed are more difficult. In 2 Kings 24 “the river of Egypt” is mentioned as the proper boundary of that country; and it is said of the king of Babylon, that he had taken “from the river of Egypt to the river Euphrates all that pertained to the king of Egypt.” The expression nearly resembles that in Gen 15:18, where the river Nile is meant (see above). A similar form is used by Isaiah (Isa 27:12); and there the Sept. has rendered Nachal Mitzrayim by Rhinocorura, which was the name of a town now called el-Arish. If this be correct, then Nachal Mitzrayim must be identified with Wady el-Arish, a valley and small winter stream which falls into the Mediterranean near this town. This is the view adopted by most of the old commentators (see in Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 872; Reland, Palest. p. 969, and authorities there cited). Jerome states that Rhinocorura was situated on the borders of Palestine and Egypt, and that the “river (torrens) of Egypt” was near it (Comment. ad Jes. xix et xxvii; ad Amos vi). Ancient geographers and historians describe Egypt as extending to this city (Eusebius, Onomast. s.v.; Diod. Sic. 1, 60; Strabo, 16, p. 780; Reland, p. 286). This torrent, or valley, derived its notoriety from being the boundary of two great countries; and hence in Eze 47:19; Eze 48:28 it is called emphatically “the valley” (A.V. “the river”).

There is nothing, therefore, in any of the passages of Scripture in which this term occurs, nor in the geographical notices in other passages, nor is there anything in the old geographers or historians tending to identify Nachal Mitzrayim with the Nile. This appears more clearly when the proper distinction is drawn between the country given in covenant promise to Abraham, and that actually allotted to the Israelites (Bochart, Opera, 1, 62).

It may be inferred that the first term, Nehar Mitzrayim, ought to be translated “the river of Egypt;” and that it was the designation of the Nile in Abraham's time, before the Egyptian word yeor became known. The other term, Nachal Mitzrayim, might be rendered “torrent, or wady, of Egypt.” It was applied to Wady el-Arish, which acquired its importance and notoriety from the fact of its marking the boundary between Palestine and Egypt. SEE EGYPT, BROOK OF.

## River-gods[[@Headword:River-gods]]

             Deities of streams were worshipped at all times by the Greeks and Romans, each bearing the name of the river over which he ruled.

## Rivers, The Four[[@Headword:Rivers, The Four]]

             In ancient art our Lord is frequently represented, either in person or under the figure of a lamb, standing upon a hillock from whence issue forth streams of water. These are supposed by many to signify the four rivers of  Eden, which went forth to water the earth (Gen 2:10); others (Cyprian, Ep. 73, § 10, ad Jubaian.; Bede, Expos. in Genesis 2; Theodoret, In Psalms 45; Ambrose, De Paradiso, c. 3) discern in them the four gospels, flowing from the source of eternal life to spread throughout the world the riches and the life-giving powers of the doctrine of Christ, Ambrose, again (ibid.), is of opinion that the four riversare emblems of the four cardinal virtues. The first four oecumenical councils, so often by early writers placed on a par with the gospels themselves, are sometimes compared to the four rivers of Paradise. Jesse, bishop of Amiens in the 8th century, in writing to his clergy, thus illustrates the veneration due to these august assemblies (Longueval, Hist. de ql. Gallicane, 5:144). In several sarcophagi of ancient Gaul we find two stags quenching their thirst at these streams; these are supposed to represent Christians partaking of the gospels and the eucharist of the "well of water springing up into everlasting life." See Cross. The two stags are occasionally found in mosaics; in that of the ancient Vatican, for example (Ciampini, De Sacr. AEdif. tab. 13).

## Rives, Basile[[@Headword:Rives, Basile]]

             a Protestant theologian of France, was born at Mazamet in 1815. In 1844 he was called as pastor to Pont-de-Learn, Tarn, and died in 1876. He published, Le Christianisme Orthodoxe et le Christianisme Liberal: — Le Chretien, le Vrai Chretien: — Le Dogme de l'Eglise: — Opinion d'un Pasteur de Compagne sur la Crise du Protestantisme Francais: — Le Grande Foi de Toutes les Orthodoxies, etc. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rivet (De Champvernon), Guillaume[[@Headword:Rivet (De Champvernon), Guillaume]]

             brother of Andre, was born at Saint-Maxent, May 2, 1580. He was ordained in 1601, and was pastor of the church at Saillebourg. He was member of various synods, and assisted at the political assembly of Saumur. He died in 1651. Rivet was a man of great prudence; and though his learning was not so extensive as that of his brother, his mind was fully as clear and forcible. Of his writings we mention, Libertatis Ecclesiasticoe Defensio (Geneva, 1625, 8vo): — De la Defense des Droits de Dieu (Saumur, 1634, 8vo): — Vindicioe Evangelicoe de Justificatione (Amst. 1648, 4to). These works are very rarely to be found.

## Rivet (De La Grange), Antoine[[@Headword:Rivet (De La Grange), Antoine]]

             a learned French Benedictine, was born at Confolens in 1683. He opposed the bull Unigenitus uttered by Clement XI, for which he was punished by confinement in the monastery at Mans. His death occurred in 1749. He projected a great work entitled The Literary History of France, of which he composed nine volumes (1733-50), and which was continued by Clemencet and others.

## Rivet, Andre[[@Headword:Rivet, Andre]]

             a celebrated French Protestant theologian, was born at Saint-Maxent, Aug. 5, 1573. He studied theology at the Academy of Orthez under Lambert Daneau, and afterwards at La Rochelle under Rotan. He was ordained in 1595, and went to Thouars as chaplain to the duke de la Tremoille. After the death of his patron he remained in Thouars, and his reputation as a preacher and theologian steadily increased. In 1620 he was called to the chair of theology in the University of Leyden. He married, in 1621, the sister of the celebrated Pierre du Moulin, and while in England received a fellowship at Oxford. The Synod of Castres endeavored to persuade Rivet to return to France and devote his talents to the work of building up the Protestant Church in his native country, but nothing could induce him to leave Holland. He received from prince Frederick Henry a most distinguished mark of esteem, being chosen tutor and adviser for the young prince William. In 1632 he left Leyden to become director of the College of Orange, at Breda. Here he remained till his death, which occurred Jan. 7, 1651. Rivet was a firm Calvinist, and always ready to combat any of the foes of orthodoxy. He left a great number of works, a complete list of which may be found in La France Protestante. Among the most important are, Comment. in Hoseam (Leyden, 1625, 4to): — Catholicus Orthodoxus, etc. (ibid. 1630, 2 vols. 8vo): — Isagoge, seu Introductio Generalis ad Scripturam Sacram (ibid. 1627, 4to):--Theologicoe et Scholasticoe  Exercitationes in Genesim (ibid. 1633, 4to): — Commentarii in Librum Secundum Mosis (ibid. 1634, 4to). The theological works of Rivet have been published in three volumes (Opera Theologica [Rotterdam, 1651-60, fol.]). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Rixa[[@Headword:Rixa]]

             i.e. strife, in Roman mythology, is the same as the Greek Eris, the goddess of discord.

## Rizpah[[@Headword:Rizpah]]

             (Heb. Ritspah', רַצְפָּה, a live coal, as in Isa 6:6; Sept. ῾Ρεσφά v.r. ῾Ρεφφάθ; Josephus, ῾Ραισφά [Ant. 7, 1, 4]), a concubine of king Saul, and mother of two of his sons, Armoni and Mephibosheth. B.C. cir. 1080. Like many others of the prominent female characters of the Old Test. — Ruth, Rahab, Jezebel, etc.--Rizpah would seem to have been a foreigner, a Hivite, descended from one of the ancient worthies of that nation, Ajah or Aiah, son of Zibeon, whose name and fame are preserved in the Ishmaelitish record of Genesis 36. After the death of Saul and the occupation of the country west of the Jordan by the Philistines, Rizpah  accompanied the other inmates of the royal family to their new residence at Mahanaim; and it is here that her name is first introduced to us as the subject of an accusation levelled at Abner by Ishbosheth (2Sa 3:7) --a piece of spite which led first to Abner's death through Joab's treachery, and ultimately to the murder of Ishbosheth himself. The accusation, whether true or false-- and from Abner's vehement denial we should naturally conclude that it was false — involved more than meets the ear of a modern and English reader; for among the Israelites it was considered “as a step to the throne to have connection with the widow or the mistress of the deceased king” (see Michaelis, Laws of Moses, art. 54). We hear nothing more of Rizpah till the tragic story which has made her one of the most familiar objects to young and old in the whole Bible (2Sa 21:8-11). Every one can appreciate the love and endurance with which the mother watched over the bodies of her two sons and her five relatives, to save them from an indignity peculiarly painful to the whole of the ancient world (see Psa 79:2; Homer, Il. 1, 4, 5, etc.). But it is questionable whether the ordinary conception of the scene is accurate. The seven victims were not, as the A.V. implies, “hung;” they were crucified. The seven crosses were planted in the rock on the top of the sacred hill of Gibeah — the hill which, though not Saul's native place, was, through his long residence there, so identified with him as to retain his name to the latest existence of the Jewish nation (1Sa 11:4, etc.; and see Josephus, War, 5, 2, 1). The whole or part of this hill seems at the time of this occurrence to have been in some special manner dedicated to Jehovah, possibly the spot on which Ahiah the priest had deposited the ark when he took refuge in Gibeah during the Philistine war (1Sa 14:18). The victims were sacrificed at the beginning of barley harvest--the sacred and festal time of the Passover — and in the full blaze of the summer sun they hung till the fall of the periodical rain in October. During the whole of that time Rizpah remained at the foot of the crosses on which the bodies of her sons were exposed — the mater dolorosa, if the expression may be allowed, of the ancient dispensation. She had no tent to shelter her from the scorching sun which beats on that open spot all day, or from the drenching dews at night, but she spread on the rocky floor the thick mourning garment of black sackcloth which as a widow she wore, and crouching there she watched that neither vulture nor jackal should molest the bodies.

## Rladegunda, Saint[[@Headword:Rladegunda, Saint]]

             SEE BRADSOLE.

## Road[[@Headword:Road]]

             occurs but once in the A.V. of the Bible, viz. in 1Sa 27:10, where it is used in the sense of “raid” or “inroad,” the Hebrew word (פָּשִׁט) being elsewhere (e.g. ver. 8; 23:27; 30:1, 14, etc.) rendered “invade” and “invasion.” A road in the sense which we now attach to the term is expressed in the A.V. by “way” and “path,” for which the most general words in the original are דֶּרֶךְ, ὁδός.

In the East, where traveling is performed mostly on some beast of burden, certain tracks were at a very early period customarily pursued; and that the rather as from remote ages commerce and traveling went on by means of caravans, under a certain discipline, and affording mutual protection in their passage from city to city and from land to land. Now, wherever such a band of men and animals had once passed they would form a track, which, especially in countries where it is easy for the traveler to miss his way, subsequent caravans or individuals would naturally follow; and the rather inasmuch as the original route was not taken arbitrarily, but because it led to the first cities in each particular district of country. Thus at a very early period were there marked out on the surface of the globe lines of intercommunication running from land to land, and in some sort binding distant nations together. These, in the earliest times, lay in the direction of east and west, that being the line on which the trade and the civilization of the earth first ran. The purposes of war seem, however, to have furnished the first inducement to the formation of made, or artificial, roads. War, we know, afforded to the Romans the motive under which they formed their roads; and doubtless they formed them not only to facilitate conquest but also to insure the holding of the lands they had subdued; and the remains of their roads show us with what skill they laid out a country and formed lines of communication.

From the nature of the soil in the Holy Land, the roads must have been sometimes mountainous and rocky, sometimes level and sandy. The former were the most difficult, and in the rainy season the torrents made them dangerous (Schulz, Leitung, 5, 350). Yet they had a firmness which was important, since little was known of road making in the East. (The ancient Indians [Hindus] must be excepted, according to the accounts of trustworthy historians; see Strabo, 15, 689, and the remains of ancient artificial roads which are still extant [see Von Bohlen, Indien, 2, 199 sq.]. The Persians may have learned the art from India.) In Deu 19:3 (comp. Mishna, Maccoth, 2, 5) it seems that the minds of the Israelites were early familiarized with the idea, “Thou shalt prepare thee a way . . . that every slayer may flee thither;” and other passages, when taken in connection with it, seem to prove that to some extent artificial roads were known to the Hebrews in the commencement of their commonwealth. In Isa 40:3 are these words: “Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low; and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain.” Nor is the imagery unusual (comp. Isa 11:16; Isa 19:23; Isa 33:8; Isa 35:8; Isa 49:11; Isa 62:10). In 1Sa 6:12 we read: “The kine went along the highway, lowing as they went, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left.” In Numbers also (20, 17): “We will go by the king's highway,” etc. (21:22; Deu 2:27; Lev 26:22). Indeed, it is highly probable that the Hebrews had become acquainted with roads during their sojourn in Egypt, where, in the Delta especially, the nature of the country would require roads and highways to be thrown up and maintained. Josephus (Ant. 8, 7, 4) expressly says, “Solomon did not neglect the care of the ways, but he laid a causeway of black stone (basalt) along the roads that led to Jerusalem, both to render them easy for travelers and to manifest the grandeur of his riches.” (See the Mishna, Maccoth.) To the Romans, however, Palestine was greatly indebted for its roads. On this subject Reland (Paloestina) has supplied useful information. In the East generally, and in Palestine in particular, the Romans formed roads and set up milestones in imitation of what they had done in Italy. Eusebius, in his Onomasticon, frequently alludes to their existence in Palestine. To the present day traces of these roads and fragments of the milestones remain.

1. The first road in Palestine which we mention ran from Ptolemais, on the coast of the Mediterranean, to Damascus. This road remains to the present day. Beginning at Ptolemais (Acco), it ran eastward to Nazareth, and, continuing south and east, passed the plain of Esdraelon on the north; after which, turning north and east, it came to Tiberias, where, running along the Sea of Galilee, it reached Capernaum, and, having passed the Jordan somewhat above the last place, it went over a spur of the Anti-Libanus (Jebel Heish), and, keeping straight forward east by north, came to Damascus. This road was used for the purposes both of trade and war. In the history of the Crusades it bears the name of Via Maris. It connected Europe with the interior of Asia. Troops coming from Asia over the  Euphrates passed along this way into the heart of Palestine. Under the Romans it was a productive source of income. It was on this road, not far from Capernaum, that Jesus saw Matthew sitting “at the receipt of custom” and gave him his call to the apostleship. (See, in general, Ritter, Erdkunde, 2, 379 sq.)

2. Another road passed along the Mediterranean coast southward into Egypt. Beginning at Ptolemais, it ran first to Caesarea, thence to Diospolis, and so on through Ascalon and Gaza down into Egypt. (Comp. Josephus, War, 4, 11, 5; Ant. 14, 8, 1; Pliny, 6, 33; Arrian, Alex. 3, 1. See Appian, Cir. 5, 52. The stations are given as above, rather differently from Josephus, in Antonin. Itiner. p. 149.) This was also an important line of communication, passing as it did through cities of great importance, running along the coast and extending to Egypt. A glance at the map will show how important it was for trade by land and by sea as well as for the passage of troops. A branch of this road connected the sea with the metropolis, leading from the same Caesarea through Diospolis to Jerusalem. Down this branch Paul was sent on his way to Felix (Act 23:23; Act 23:26; comp. Josephus, War, 4, 8, 1; Jerome, Ep. 108). The band went through Antipatris, and thence on to Caesarea.

3. A third line of road connected Galilee with Judaea, running through the intervening Samaria (Luk 17:11; Joh 4:4; Josephus, Ant. 20, 6, 1; Life, § 52). The journey took three days. Passing along the plain of Esdraelon, the traveler entered Samaria at Ginaea (Jenin) and was thence conducted to Samaria (Sebaste), thence to Shechem (Nablus), whence a good day's travel brought him to Jerusalem. This last part of the journey (comp. Isaiah 10, 28 sq.) has been described by Maundrell (Journey, p. 85 sq.).

In the time of the Romans there was also a road from Jerusalem to the lake Gennesareth through Shechem and Scythopolis. The same road sent a branch off at Scythopolis in a westerly direction through Esdraelon to Cesarean; and another branch across the Jordan to Gadara, on to Damascus, along which line of country there still lies a road, southward of the Sea of Galilee, to the same celebrated city (see Reland, Palest. p. 416; Itin. Hieros. p. 585 sq.; also Antonin. Itiner. p. 198). This road was even traversed by armies (Josephus, Ant. 14, 3, 4).

4. There were three chief roads running from Jerusalem. One passed in a northeasterly direction over the Mount of Olives, by Bethany, through  openings in hills and winding ways on to Jericho (Mat 20:29; Mat 21:1; Luk 10:30 sq.; Luk 19:1; Luk 19:28 sq.; comp. Russegger, Reis. 3, 102 sq.), near which the Jordan was passed when travelers took their way to the north if they wished to pass through Peraea, which was the road the Galilean Jews, in coming to and returning from the festivals in the capital, were accustomed to take, thus avoiding the unfriendly territory of Samaria; or travelers turned their faces towards the south if they intended to go towards the Dead Sea. This road was followed by the Israelites when they directed their steps towards Canaan. Through Peraea the Syrian and Assyrian armies made their hostile advances on Israel (2Ki 8:28; 2Ki 9:14; 2Ki 10:32 sq.; 1Ch 5:26).

A second road led from Jerusalem southward to Hebron, between mountains, through pleasant valleys (Russegger, Reis. 3, 78), whence travelers went through the wilderness of Judaea to Aila, as the remains of a Roman road still show; or they might take a westerly direction on to Gaza, a way which is still pursued and is of two days' duration (Crome, Palest. 1, 97 sq.). The ordinary way from Jerusalem to Gaza appears, in the Roman period, to have lain through Eleutheropolis and Ascalon. From Gaza through Rhinocorura and Pelusium was the nearest road down into Egypt from Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. 14, 14, 2). Along this road many thousand prisoners, made by Vespasian in his capture of Jerusalem, were sent to Alexandria in order to be shipped for Rome. Of these two roads from Jerusalem to Gaza one went westward by Ramlah and Ascalon, the other southward by Hebron. This last road Raumer (Palest. p. 191; see also his Beiträge, published after Robinson's work on Palestine — namely, in 1843 correcting or confirming the views given in his Palestina, 1838) is of opinion was that which was taken by Philip (Act 8:26 sq.), partly because tradition states that the eunuch was baptized in the vicinity of Hebron, and this road from Jerusalem to Hebron runs through the “desert” Thekoa (Thecua) in the Onomasticon. And here he finds the reason of the angel's command to go “towards the south” — for Hebron lay south of Jerusalem — whereas but for this direction Philip might have gone westward by Ramlah. Robinson, admitting that there is a road from Jerusalem to Hebron, maintains (1, 320; 2, 640) that Philip went by a third road, which led down Wady Musurr to Betogabra (Eleutheropolis), and thinks that he has found at Tell el-Hasy the spot where the eunuch received baptism. But, says Raumer (Beiträge, p. 41), this road ran in a southwesterly direction, and Philip was commanded to go towards the  south, for which purpose he must have gone by Hebron. Raumer then proceeds to confirm his original position. Jerome, in his Life of Paula, testifies that a road from Jerusalem to Gaza went through Hebron. Paula travelled from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, which lay south of the city: “When she reached Bethlehem she quickened the pace of her horse and took the old road which leads to Gaza.” This road conducted to Bethsur (a little north of Hebron), “where,” says Jerome, “while he read the Scriptures, the eunuch found the Gospel fountain.” “This,” adds Raumer,' is the same Bethsur of which Jerome, in the Onomasticon, says, ‘As you go from AElia to Hebron, at the twentieth milestone, you meet Bethsoron, near which, at the foot of a mountain, is a fountain bubbling out of the soil. The Acts of the Apostles state that the chamberlain of queen Candace was baptized in it by Philip.' From Bethsur Paula proceeded to Hebron. The Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum (of the year 333) mentions Bethsur as the place where the baptism was performed.” Raumer concludes by remarking: “Robinson rightly rejects tradition when it contradicts the Sacred Scriptures, but he must also reject those pretended scientific theories which contradict Holy Writ. Such hypotheses may easily become the groundwork of scientific legends. To fix the baptismal place of the chamberlain at Tell el-Hasy contradicts the Scripture; but Bethsur, which has from the earliest ages been so accounted, agrees with the passage in the Acts of the Apostles.”

There only remains for us to mention what Winer reckons the third of the three great roads which ran from Jerusalem; this third road went to the Mediterranean at Joppa (Jaffa), a way which, from the time of the Crusades, has been taken by pilgrims proceeding to the holy city from Egypt and from Europe. Its principal station, Ramleh, seems to have been founded by the Saracens. See De Wette, Archeologie; Scholz, Archeologie; Heeren, Ideen, 1, 740; Ritter, Erdkunde; Crome, Paldstina, 1, 8; Burckhardt, Syria, 2, 547; Rosenmuller, AIterth. 2, 2, 338; Raumer, Beitrage, p. 30 sq.; also the articles SEE GEOGRAPHY; SEE PALESTINE.

## Roan, John[[@Headword:Roan, John]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland about 1716, and was brought up a weaver. He came to the United States in his youth, studied at the New College, and was licensed to preach by the “New Side” Presbytery of Newcastle. As early as 1741 he taught in a grammar school on the  Neshaminy, and in 1744 was sent by his presbytery on a missionary tour in Virginia. He inveighed so strongly against the clergy of the Established Church that charges were brought against him, before the grand jury, of proselytism and of blasphemy. Mr. Roan returned to Pennsylvania before the court met; but when the trial came on, Oct. 19, the indictment was dropped. In 1745 Mr. Roan was settled over the united congregations of Paxton, Derry, and Mountjoy, and continued to labor among them until his death, Oct. 3, 1775. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 129.

## Roast[[@Headword:Roast]]

             The oldest, and still the usual, form of dressing meat in the East is by roasting it (Jahn, 1, 2, 193 sq.); boiling is a process which marks some antecedent progress ip civilization, and many nations are ignorant of it at the present day. The culinary preparations of the patriarchs were the most simple that could well be imagined: the animal was killed at the moment that the flesh was required, and the joints, after some part had been selected for sacrifice, were then roasted or broiled over the glowing embers of a wood fire. Roasting is mentioned but casually in the Bible, and is called in Heb. tsalah', צָלָה(1 Samuel 2, 15; Isa 44:16). A roast is called tsali', צָלַי(Exo 12:8 sq.; Isaiah loc. cit. Comp. Arvieux, Voyage, 3, 233). SEE COOK.

## Rob[[@Headword:Rob]]

             I. The following are the Heb. and Gr. words rendered by this and its derivatives in the A.V.:

1. Rob:

(1) בָּזִז (Sept. διαρπάζω; Vulg. depopulor);

(2) גָּזִל (ἀφαιρέω; violenter aufero);

(3) עוּד, “return,” “repeat;” hence in Pi. to surround, circumvent (Psa 119:61; περιπλακῆναι; circumplecti),usually affirm,reiterate assertions (Gesen. Thesaur. p. 997);

(4) קָבִע, “cover,” “hide” (πτερνίζω; affigo [Gesen. Thesaur. p. 1190]);

(5) שָׁסָה (διαρπάζω; diripio);

(6) שָׁסִס, same as last (προνομεύω; depredor);

(7) גָּנִב (κλέπτω; furor; A.V. “steal”);

(8) συλάω, to strip. SEE STEALING.

2. Robber:

(1) בּוזֵז, part. from בָּזִז, “rob” (προνομεύων; vastans);

(2) פָּרַיוֹ, part. of פָּרִוֹ, “break” (λοιμός; latro); Mic 2:13, “breaker;”

(3) צִמַּים, Job 18:9 (διψῶντες; sitis. Targum, with A.V., has “robbers;” but it is most commonly rendered as Sept. Job 5:5, sitientes);

(4) שֹׁדֵד (ληστής; latro), from שָׁדִד, “waste;”

(5) שֹׁסֶה (ἐχθρός; deripiens; A.V. “spoiler”);

(6) גִּנָּב (κλέπτης; fur; A.V. “thief”);

(7) λῃσστής. SEE THIEF.

3. Robbery:

(1) גָּזֵל (ἁρπαγή, ἁρπάγματα; rapinoe);

(2) פֶּרֶק, from פָּרִק, ‘“break” (ἀδικία; dilaceratio);

(3) שֹׁד, from שָׁדִד, “waste” (ὄλεθρος; rapinoe);

(4) שָׁלָל (προνομή; proeda; A.V. “prey,” “spoil;”

(5) ἁρπαγμός. SEE THEFT.

II. Whether in the larger sense of plunder or the more limited sense of theft systematically organized, robbery has ever been one of the principal employments of the nomad tribes of the East. From the time of Ishmael to the present day, the Bedouin has been a “wild man” and a robber by trade; and to carry out his objects successfully, so far from being esteemed disgraceful, is regarded as in the highest degree creditable (Gen 16:12; Burckhardt, Notes on Bed. 1, 137, 17). An instance of an enterprise of a truly Bedouin character, but distinguished by the exceptional features belonging to its principal actor, is seen in the night foray of David (1Sa 26:6-12), with which, also, we may fairly compare Homer, Il. K. 204, etc. Predatory inroads on a large scale are seen in the incursions of the Sabaeans and Chaldaeans on the property of Job (Job 1:15; Job 1:17), the revenge coupled with plunder of Simeon and Levi (Gen 34:28-29), the reprisals of the Hebrews upon the Midianites (Num 31:32-54),  and the frequent and often prolonged invasions of “spoilers” upon the Israelites, together with their reprisals, during the period of the Judges and Kings (Jdg 2:14; Jdg 6:3-4; 1 Samuel 11; 1 Samuel 15; 2Sa 8:10; 2Ki 5:2; 1Ch 5:10; 1Ch 5:18-22). Individual instances, indicating an unsettled state of the country during the same period, are seen in the “liers- in-wait” of the men of Shechem (Jdg 9:25), and the mountain retreats of David in the cave of Adullam, the hill of Hachilah, and the wilderness of Maon, and his abode in Ziklag invaded and plundered in like manner by the Amalekites (1Sa 22:1-2; 1Sa 23:19-25; 1Sa 26:1; 1Sa 27:6-10; 1Sa 30:1). SEE WAIT, LIER-IN-.

Similar disorder in the country, complained of more than once by the prophets (Hos 4:2; Hos 6:9; Mic 2:8), continued more or less through Maccabaean down to Roman times, favored by the corrupt administration of some of the Roman governors in accepting money in redemption of punishment, produced those formidable bands of robbers so easily collected and with so much difficulty subdued who found shelter in the caves of Palestine and Syria, and who infested the country. even in the time of our Lord, almost to the very gates of Jerusalem (Luk 10:30; Act 5:36-37; Act 21:38). SEE BARABBAS; SEE CAVE; SEE JUDAS OF GALILEE. In the later history, also, of the country the robbers, or sicarii, together with their leader, John of Gischala, played a conspicuous part (Josephus, War, 4, 2, 1; 3, 4; 7, 2). In Asia Minor, likewise, the native tribes gave the Roman government much trouble, so that the roads were often unsafe for travelers (2Co 11:26). SEE SPOIL.

## Robber Council Of Ephesus[[@Headword:Robber Council Of Ephesus]]

             SEE EPHESUS, ROBBER COUNCIL OF.

## Robber Of Churches[[@Headword:Robber Of Churches]]

             (ἱερόσυλος, Act 19:37). Sacrilege took many forms in antiquity (1 Maccabees 6). The plundering of heathen temples was indirectly forbidden to the Jews (Deu 7:25; Josephus, Ant. 4, 8, 10). The Roman law held it as a sacrilege to be punished by forfeiture of goods, to steal the holy books of the Jews or their money out of places of worship (ibid. 16, 6, 2). SEE SACRILEGE.

## Robbia, Andrea della[[@Headword:Robbia, Andrea della]]

             an Italian sculptor and nephew of Luca, was born at Florence in 1444, and died in 1527. He worked both in marble and terracotta, and his productions may be found in many Italian cities. There are three in the Louvre, The Virgin Adoring the Infant Jesus, a head of St. Ann, and Christ Healing a Sick Man.

## Robbia, Luca della[[@Headword:Robbia, Luca della]]

             an Italian sculptor, was born at Florence in 1388. His first instructor was a goldsmith named Leonardo, from whom he learned to model in wax; but as soon as he had gained some proficiency, he gave himself wholly to sculpture. So great was his progress that at the age of fifteen he was employed to design the bas-reliefs for a tomb at Rimini. Similar work at Florence occupied him for several years, but he found that the compensation he received was in no way adequate, as the works required great skill and much time. He therefore turned his attention to working in terra cotta. He invented a peculiar enamel, composed of tin, antimony, and other minerals, by which, after baking, this material was rendered more durable.He afterwards found that his bas-reliefs could be colored, and this improvement rendered him famous throughout Europe. The demand for his work was universal, and to supply it, Luca employed his brothers to aid him. Their subjects in bas-reliefs, plaques, and other forms were principally religious, as, an Annunciation, in the Academy of Fine Arts at Florence, and a very beautiful medallion in the Louvre, The Virgin Adoring the Infant Jesus. He also decorated many churches and tombs. Robbia died at Florence in 1493. See Vasari, Baldinucci, and Barbet di Jouy [H.], Della Robbia, etc.

## Robbin, Alvin[[@Headword:Robbin, Alvin]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Coeyman's, N.Y., July 5, 1816. He was converted at a camp meeting in New Baltimore, N.Y., in 1832, and in 1841 was received on trial in the Black River Conference, within the bounds of which he labored for ten years. In 1851 he was transferred to the Troy Conference, received a supernumerary relation in 1870, and made his home in Osseo, Mich., where he died, April 10, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 66.

## Robbins, Ammi Ruhamah[[@Headword:Robbins, Ammi Ruhamah]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Branford, Conn., in September, 1740. He was fitted for college by his father, and was first entered at Nassau Hall, but was transferred to Yale at the beginning of his sophomore year. He graduated in 1760, and spent some time in teaching at Plymouth, Mass., and then engaged in the study of theology under Dr. Bellamy; was licensed by the Litchfield Association, and ordained at Norfolk, Oct. 28, 1761. When the Revolution came on, he enlisted as a chaplain, joining general Schuyler's brigade (March, 1776), and went to Canada; whence he returned in ill health after an absence of nearly half a year. He continued laboring in his Church with great fidelity, at the same time fitting young men for college, until May, 1813, when a cancer began to develop, which rapidly carried him to the grave. He published An Ordination Sermon (1772): --Election Sermono (1789): — A Half-Century Sermon (1811). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 369.

## Robbins, Chandler, D.D[[@Headword:Robbins, Chandler, D.D]]

             a Unitarian minister, was born at Lynn, Massachusetts, February 14, 1810. He graduated from Harvard College in 1829, and from the Cambridge Divinity School in 1833. He was ordained December 4 of that year pastor of the Second Church, Boston, as the successor of Ralph Waldo Emerson. This was his only pastorate, and; continued for forty-one years. He died at Weston, Massachusetts, September 11, 1882. Among his published writings are A History of the Second Church in Boston, with Lives of Increase and Cotton Mather, and several sermons. He edited the works of Henry Ware, Jr. (4 volumes), compiled The Social Hymn-book, and a Hymn-book for Christian Worship. See Boston Advertiser, September 12, 1882. (J.C.S.)

## Robbins, Chandler, D.D.[[@Headword:Robbins, Chandler, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Branford, Conn., Aug. 24, 1738. He graduated at Yale College in 1756, studied under Dr. Bellamy, and was ordained Jan. 30, 1760, pastor at Plymouth, Mass., where he continued until his death, June 30, 1799. He was made D.D. by the University of Edinburgh in 1793. His publications were, A Reply to John Cotton's Essays on Baptism (1773): — Some Brief Remarks on a Piece Published by John Cotton, Esq. (1774): --An Address at Plymouth to the Inhabitants Assembled to Celebrate the Victories of the French Republic over their Invaders (1793), and a few occasional Sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 573.

## Robbins, Elijah[[@Headword:Robbins, Elijah]]

             was born in. Thompson, Connecticut, March 12, 1828. He graduated from Yale College in 1856, and from East Windsor Theological Seminary in 1859, and in the latter year sailed for the Zulu Mission. Here he labored for nearly thirty years. For the first few years he was stationed at Umzumbe, but later in connection, with the mission training-school at Adams. He died June 30, 1889.

## Robbins, Onesiphorus[[@Headword:Robbins, Onesiphorus]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harvard, Mass., Aug. 19, 1792. He was converted in South Carolina at the age of twenty- six, was licensed to preach in 1825, and in 1826 was received into the New England Conference. In 1841 the Providence Conference was set off, and he became one of its members. He continued in active service until 1850, when he was returned superannuated, and so continued until his death, which took place in Woodstock, Conn., April 9, 1872. Mr. Robbins was a man of retiring habits and slow of speech — a clear and strong thinker, and excelling as a pastor. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, p. 39.

## Robbins, Philemon[[@Headword:Robbins, Philemon]]

             a Congregational minister, was a native of Charlestown, Mass. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1729, and settled in Branford, Conn., Feb. 7, 1732. About 1740 the Legislature of Connecticut, with a view to arrest the progress of NewLightism, passed a law forbidding any minister to preach within the limits of any other minister's parish. The people of Wallingford applied to Mr. Robbins to hold meetings for them. He consented, was arraigned by the Consociation, and formally deposed. The mass of his congregation adhered to him, and he continued to preach. There was some interference of the civil authority, but he pleaded his case so well before the Legislature that his penalty was remitted. He died Aug. 13, 1781. His publications are, A Plain Narrative of the Proceedings of the Rev. Association and Consociation of New Haven, etc. (1743): — Ordination Sermons (176061). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 367.

## Robbins, Royal[[@Headword:Robbins, Royal]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Wethersfield, Conn., in 1787, graduated at Yale College, and settled in the ministry at Kensington, a parish of Berlin, Conn., in 1816. He continued to hold this post until his death, in 1861. His works are, The World Displayed; Outlines of Ancient and Modern History (last ed. Hartford, 1851, 2 vols. in 1). He was also the author of History of American Contributions to the English Language, etc. (ibid. 1837, 12mo), besides several Sermons and articles for periodicals. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Robbins, Thomas, D.D.[[@Headword:Robbins, Thomas, D.D.]]

             secretary and librarian to, and benefactor of, the Connecticut Historical Society, was a native of Norfolk, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1796, was minister at East Windsor, 1809-27, of Stratford, 1830-31, and subsequently at Mattapoisett and Rochester, Mass. He died in 1856. He published, Historical View of the First Planters of New England (Hartford, 1815, 12mo), also a number of Sermons. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Robe[[@Headword:Robe]]

             (the rendering of several Heb. and Gr. words, but especially of מְעַיל, meil', στολή), a long garment with fringed or flowered borders, usually white, though sometimes purple, and worn by the great as a mark of distinction (Luk 15:22; Luk 20:46). The ancient Assyrians and Babylonians were celebrated for their manufactures of beautiful garments of divers colors (Jos 7:21; Eze 27:24). Their splendid robes appear to have been embroidered with figures of animals and flowers. According to Plutarch, Cato received as a legacy a Babylonian garment, and sold it because it was too costly for a citizen to wear. Some suppose that a sacred robe was preserved from early times, and handed down among the patriarchs as a badge of the birthright, and that “the goodly raiment” which Rebekah put upon Jacob was the birthright robe. This view is given in the Targum of Jonathan on Gen 27:15 : “And Rebekah took the desirable robes of her elder son Esau, which had belonged to Adam the first parent.” The coat of Joseph, the possession of which excited the envy of his brethren, is thus regarded, like the good raiment of Jacob, as a badge of the birthright, which, we are expressly taught, having been forfeited by Reuben, was transferred to Joseph (Gen 37:3; 1Ch 5:1). The robe appears also to have been, among the Hebrews, a species of vestment appropriated to the sacerdotal office, the holy garment. It was made entirely of blue, woven throughout, and on which neither knife nor needle was to be used; on the lower border was a row of artificial pomegranates and golden bells, alternating with each other (Exo 28:2; Exo 28:4; Exo 28:31-33). The robes of Aaron symbolized the dignity and glory of our great highpriest, “the heir of the whole creation” (Rev 3:4-5; Rev 6:9-11; Rev 7:9-14). SEE DRESS.

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

             SEE ROBES.

## Robert (1)[[@Headword:Robert (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was elected bishop of Ross in 1122, but was not consecrated until 1128. He died in 1159. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 8.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was an Englishman, and was brought, with five others, into Scotland by Alexander I, to instruct the people and to be good examples to them in the observance of the monastic rules prescribed by St. Augustine. He was made prior of Scone in 1115, and in 1122 became bishop of St. Andrews. He was consecrated in 1126 or 1127. He died in this see in 1159. This prelate founded the priory of Lochleven, to be annexed to his new foundation. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 8.

## Robert (3)[[@Headword:Robert (3)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the see of Ross in 1214. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 185.

## Robert (4)[[@Headword:Robert (4)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Brechin in 1456. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 163.

## Robert (5)[[@Headword:Robert (5)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop at Dunkeld in 1484, and was witness to a charter of appraisement by king James III of the lands of Bordland of Ketnes, from James, earl of Buchan, to Robert, lord Lisle, May 19, 1485. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 91.

## Robert (6)[[@Headword:Robert (6)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of the Isles in 1492, and received a charter from John, lord of the Isles, of the Church of Kilberry, which was united to the bishopric of a mensal Church. He was in this see in 1492. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 305.

## Robert (Abbe)[[@Headword:Robert (Abbe)]]

             a French historian, was born neat Rheims, about 1055. He was educated in the Abbey of St. Remi at Rheims, and in 1095 became its abbot; but on account of a dispute with the abbot of Mannoutiers retired to the Priory of St. Oricle de Senuc, where he remained till he joined the Crusaders in 1096. On his return from Palestine, the Council of Poitiers (Nov. 23, 1100)  declared his deposition from Rheims unjust and his life irreproachable; but he was not reinstated, and remained at Senluc. He was accused of maladministration, and Calixtus It deprived him of his office (April 16, 1121). He died at Senuc, Aug. 23, 1122. He left two works, entitled Historia Hierosolymitana Libris VIII Explicata (Cologne, 1470-74; Basle, 1533): — and In Chronique et Histoire faite par le R.P. en Dieu Turpin, etc. (Paris, 1527). See Rivet, Hist. Litter. de la France; Gallia Christiana.

## Robert (St.)[[@Headword:Robert (St.)]]

             founder of the Order of Citeaux, was born at Champagne in 1018. At the age of fifteen he entered the Convent of Moutier-la-Celle, near Troyes, of which he afterwards became prior. Later he was abbot of St. Michel de Tonnerre; and while prior of St. Ayrul de Provins, Alexander II ordered him to take charge of the hermits of Colan. Finding this solitude very unhealthful, Robert conducted the recluses to the desert of Molesne, where in 1075 he founded a convent in honor of the Virgin. The laxity of discipline and decline of piety, however, caused him to leave Molesne, with twenty companions, and establish himself at Citeaux, near Dijon. In 1098 he erected a monastery, and was its first abbot. He was recalled to Molesne, and succeeded in reviving the spirit of asceticism. He died March 21,1110. Sermons, Letters, and a Chronicle of Citeaux are attributed to Robert. His festival is celebrated April 29.

## Robert Le Poule, Or Robertus Pallus[[@Headword:Robert Le Poule, Or Robertus Pallus]]

             chancellor of the Church of Rome, flourished about 1150. He was perhaps archdeacon of Rochester, and certainly a distinguished lecturer on the Scriptures at Oxford. He was the author of Sententire, or Libri Sententiarum, or Sententioe de Trinitate (in MS. in the British Museum): twenty Sermons: — probably a treatise Super Doctorum Dictis: — and  two or three other works (late edition by Hugo Mathout, Paris, 1655, fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Robert Of Bavaria; Of Deutz[[@Headword:Robert Of Bavaria; Of Deutz]]

             SEE RUPERT.

## Robert Of Geneva[[@Headword:Robert Of Geneva]]

             antipope against Urban VI and Boniface IX, was the son of count Amadeus of Geneva. He was chosen by the French cardinals, who asserted that the election in Rome at which Urban VI was successful had not been free, and he reigned at Avignon under the title of CLEMENT VII from Sept. 21, 1378, to Sept. 26, 1394. He was recognized by France, Naples, Castile, Aragon, Navarre, Scotland, Lorraine, and Cyprus, while the other nations of Europe preferred the claims of Urban. This schism in the Church gave rise to serious complications in the intercourse of nations. The popes anathematized each other, and Urban especially caused a crusade against France and his rival to be preached in England, and had the death penalty inflicted on a number of the cardinals who had conspired to dethrone him.  The election of Boniface IX in 1389 protracted the schism in all its bitterness, until the Sorbonne decided that both popes ought to resign, and that a compromise should be effected by means of arbitrators or a council of the Church. Clement was so affected by this decision that he died of apoplexy (Sept. 26, 1394). The peace desired was not, however, finally reached until 1428.

## Robert Of Gloucester[[@Headword:Robert Of Gloucester]]

             an English chronicler, lived in the latter half of the 13th century. He was a monk in the Abbey of Gloucester, and does not appear to have lived long after 1265. He composed a rhymed chronicle of more than ten thousand verses, written in Anglo-Saxon, containing the history of England from the time of the Romans till Edward I. It is a philosophical curiosity, but is full of the most absurd fables. It was published entire by Hearne (Oxford, 1724, 2 vols.), and reprinted in 1810.

## Robert Of Lincoln[[@Headword:Robert Of Lincoln]]

             SEE GROSSETESTE.

## Robert Of Melun[[@Headword:Robert Of Melun]]

             an English theologian, was probably born in the latter part of the 11th century. But little is known of his life. Du Boulay supposes that he taught for some time in Paris, and then went to Melun to pursue the same vocation. At any rate, one of his pupils — John of Salisbury — reports that he taught physics in the former city, and afterwards devoted himself to theology. He died Feb. 28,1167. His principal treatise is entitled Summa Theologioe, fragments only of which have been published. It contains very valuable matter on the origin of scholastic theology. One other work is attributed to Robert, Quoestiones de Epistolis Pauli. See Hist. Litter. de la France; Du Boulay, Hist. Univers. Par.

## Robert, Carl Wilhelm[[@Headword:Robert, Carl Wilhelm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Cassel, March 21, 1740. He studied at Marburg and Gottingen. and was ordained in 1762. In 1764 he was second preacher and professor at Marburg, in 1768 doctor of theology, and in 1771 member of consistory. In 1778 Robert resigned his theological position and commenced his career in the faculty of law. In 1779 he took the degree of doctor of law, in 1797 he was called to Cassel, and died April 3, 1803. He published, De Nomine ὑιοῦ Θεοῦ non Regium Christi funus, etc. (Marburg, 1768): — Encyclopaediae et Methodi Theologici Brevis Ordinatio (1769): — Ethicae Christianae Compendium (1770): — Causa Belli a Israelitis Adversus Cananaeos, etc. (1778). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Robert, Champart[[@Headword:Robert, Champart]]

             archbishop of Canterbury, was by birth a Norman. He was abbot of Jumieges, a monastery on the Seine. He had formerly been monk, and was made bishop of London in 1044. In 1051 he was translated to the see of Canterbury. In 1052 he was deposed, and retired to his monastery at Jumieges, where he died. See Hook, Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury, 1:494 sq.

## Robert, Christopher R.[[@Headword:Robert, Christopher R.]]

             an eminent Presbyterian layman, was born in 1801, near Moriches, L.I. He was engaged for the greater part of his life in mercantile pursuits, but early took a warm and active interest in the religious and philanthropic enterprises which have marked the present century. He contributed largely in organizing and supporting several of the churches in New York city. He founded the German Presbyterian Church in Rivington Street, and sustained its pastoral work for many years at an annual expense of $2000. Taking a deep interest in the education of young men for the ministry, he assumed for many years the entire expense of a number of students at Auburn and other theological seminaries. While on a visit to Illinois in 1829, which at that time was one of the extreme Western states, he became deeply impressed with the importance of home missionary work in those regions, and became a large contributor to the funds of the Home Missionary Society, of which he was treasurer for a number of years, conducting all its financial business without fee or reward. Near the close of our late civil war he visited Tennessee, and with his own funds purchased a tract of land on Lookout Mountain, and established a college for the education of young men for the ministry in the South, having special reference to the wants of the colored race.

In 1864 Mr. Robert made an extensive tour in the East, and while at Constantinople was so deeply impressed with the educational wants of the Turkish empire that he resolved on founding a college at that place. To this end he took into his counsel that eminent missionary the Rev. Cyrus Hamlin, D.D., then a resident of Constantinople, whom he appointed president of the college, and to whom he intrusted the great work of laying its foundations. For years the Turkish government, true to its narrow minded and bigoted policy, placed every obstacle in the way of the enterprise, refusing to give its sanction to the purchase of a site for the buildings. Dr. Hamlin, not to be daunted, pressed his way through all the difficulties, finally purchased the ground, erected the buildings, and placed the enterprise on a firm foundation at a cost to Mr. Robert of $200,000. Contrary to his desire and expressed wishes, the college was called after his name. During the recent war in the empire, the revenue of the college having been diminished, Mr. Robert supplied the deficiency, amounting to $25,000 a year, from his own resources. Largely as Mr. Robert's efforts were put forth in building up the  cause of Christ, they did not consist merely of munificent contributions of money, but from the time of his conversion he was personally engaged in every good work, actively and earnestly seeking to promote the spirituality of the Church and the conversion of his fellow men., Being deeply affected with the worldliness and want of spirituality witnessed among professors of religion, he prepared with his own hand a letter to Christians on the subject, and had it published in pamphlet form and circulated by the thousand. Early in June, 1878, he left his home to seek the renewal of his health in one of the valleys of Switzerland, whose sanitary climate he had before enjoyed. He was returning much improved, but only lived to reach Paris, where he died Oct. 27 of the same year. The will of Mr. Robert provides that at the death of his wife a large part of his property shall inure to the benefit of the college at Constantinople. (W.P.S.)

## Robert, Claude[[@Headword:Robert, Claude]]

             a French ecclesiastical writer, was born at Chesley in 1564 or 1565. He studied at the College of Paris, and became preceptor of the son of Benigne Fremyot. After the education of his pupil was completed and he was made bishop of Bourges, Robert continued to aid him in the administration of his diocese. He filled the same office under the bishop of Chalons-sur-Saone. This prelate rewarded his preceptor by making him archdeacon and his grand vicar. He died at Chalons-sur-Saone, May 16, 1637. He left, besides three Latin treatises, the Gallia Christiana (Paris, 1626), with a geographical chart. This work, the result of thirty years' labor, is an ecclesiastical history of all the dioceses of France from their origin to the 17th century. The documents which he had collected for a second edition were given into the hands of Scevole and Louis de Sainte- Marthe, and the book was published with many additions in 1656. A third edition was undertaken by the Benedictines of Saint-Maur in 1715, and remained unfinished at the thirteenth volume. It was continued in 1856 by M.B. Haureau. See Gallia. Christiana; Perry, Hist. de Chalons-sur-Saone; Socard, Notice Hist. sur Claude Robert; Fouque, Du Gallia Christiana et de ses Auteurs.

## Robert, Joseph T., LL.D[[@Headword:Robert, Joseph T., LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister and educator, was born at Robertville, S.C., November 28, 1807. He was baptized in October, 1822, and graduated from Brown University in 1828 with the highest honors of his class. During 1829 and 1830 he was a resident graduate and medical student at Yale College, and in 1831 took his degree at the South Carolina Medical College. In 1832 he was licensed to preach by the Robertville Church, pursued his theological studies at the Furman (S.C.) Seminary, and was ordained pastor of the Robertville Church in 1834, where he remained until 1839, when he accepted a call to the pastorate of the Church at Covington, Kentucky. In 1841 he took charge of the Church at Lebanon. About 1848 he went to the First Church at Savannah, Georgia; in 1850 he became pastor of the Church at Portsmouth, Ohio; in 1858 professor of mathematics and natural sciences in Burlington University, Iowa; in 1864 professor of languages in the Iowa State University, and in 1869 president of Burlington University. He returned to Georgia in October, 1870, and in July, 1871, became principal of the Augusta Institute. Subsequently this institution, established  for the education of colored ministers, was removed to Atlanta, and in 1879 was incorporated with the Atlanta Baptist Seminary, under the presidency of Dr. Robert. He died March 5, 1884. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 992. (J.C.S.)

## Roberti, John[[@Headword:Roberti, John]]

             a learned and laborious Jesuit, was born at Hubert, in the Ardennes, in the year 1569. He studied at Liege and Cologne, and became professor of theology at Douay and other colleges, gaining a great reputation. He died  at Namur in the year 1651. His published work is entitled Mysticoe Ezechielis Quiadrigoe, id est, IV Evangelia Historiarum et Temporum serie Vinculata (Greek and Latin, Mogunt. 1615).

## Robertines[[@Headword:Robertines]]

             an English order of eremites, founded by Robert of Knaresborough about 1169.

## Roberts, Charles Dillard[[@Headword:Roberts, Charles Dillard]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Danville, Va., Feb. 15, 1838. He pursued his studies at Louisburg, Va., and subsequently, under the Rev. James H. Leps, at Parkersburg, Va., where, at the age of eighteen, he united with' the Church. Soon thereafter he entered Princeton College, and, after graduation, entered the Theological Seminary in 1862, whence he graduated after a three years' course. He was licensed by the Presbytery of Elizabethtown, N.J., Jan. 10, 1865, and in April following was ordained at Rahway by the same presbytery as an evangelist for Western Virginia. He labored about a year and a half at Grafton, in that state, in connection with the Board of Domestic Missions. After serving a Church at Ridley, near Philadelphia, Mr. Roberts went to Plattsmouth, Neb., where he joined the Presbytery of Missouri, and labored as a stated supply until 1869. Thence he went to Smartville, Yuba Co., Cal., and became a member of the Presbytery of Stockton, which, after the reunion, was merged in that of Sacramento. After preaching a year or two at Smartville, he became a stated supply at Elko, Nev., where he remained until his death, which occurred at the former place Oct. 12, 1875. He was held in high esteem by all who knew him as an earnest, laborious, self denying missionary in the frontier fields of the Church. (W.P.S.)

## Roberts, David[[@Headword:Roberts, David]]

             a British artist, was born at Stockbridge, near Edinburgh, Oct. 24, 1796. He was apprenticed as a house painter in his native place, but, going to London in 1822, he found employment as a scene painter for Drury Lane Theater. In 1832-33 he went to Spain, and in 1838-9 made a tour through Syria, Egypt, and other Eastern countries. In 1841 he was elected a member of the Royal Academy. Mr. Roberts died in London, Nov. 25, 1864. Among his paintings are, Ruins of the Great Temple of Karnak: — Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives: — Interior of the Cathedral at  Burgos: — Chancel of the Collegiate Church of St. Paul, Antwerp. Among his books, the following are the principal: Picturesque Views in Spain and Morocco (Lond. 1835-38): — The Holy Land, Egypt, Nubia, Arabic, etc. (1842-48, 4 vols. fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Appletons' Cyclop. s.v.

## Roberts, Francis[[@Headword:Roberts, Francis]]

             a Puritan divine, the son of Henry Roberts, of Aslake, Yorkshire, was born in that county in 1609. He entered a student of Trinity College, Oxford, in 1625, completing his studies and being ordained in 1632. On the breaking out of the Rebellion he went to London, took the covenant, and was appointed minister of St. Augustine's, Watling Street, in room of Ephraim Udal, ejected for his loyalty. In 1649 he was presented to the rectory of Wrington, Somersetshire, by lord Capel. At the Restoration he conformed, and in 1672 went to Ireland as chaplain to lord Capel, and while there received the degree of D.D. He died at Wrington in 1675. His principal work is Clavis Bibliorum (Lond. and Edinb. 1649, 2 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. 1675, fol.): — also, Synopsis of Theology (1644, fol.):--Believer's Evidence for Eternal Life (1649, 1655, 8vo): Communicant Instructed (1651, 8vo). See Chalmers, Biog. Dict.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Roberts, John L.[[@Headword:Roberts, John L.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Strafford, Vt., March 18, 1818. He was converted and united with the Church in 1845, joining the Vermont Conference in 1849. In this conference he continued to labor until October, 1862, when he became chaplain of the Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers. In 1866 he took a supernumerary relation to the Troy Conference, and took up his residence in Washington, D. C., filling several important government offices. He died at Ocean Grove, N.J., June 24, 1873. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 70.

## Roberts, John Wright[[@Headword:Roberts, John Wright]]

             missionary bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church for Africa, was born of colored parents at Petersburg, Va., and was converted and joined the Church while in the United States. He early emigrated to Liberia, where he was admitted among the missionaries. The Liberia Conference elected him to elder's orders in 1841, and in the same year he came to the United  States and was ordained. In 1866 he was elected to the office of missionary bishop, and was ordained in St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, New York, June 20, 1866. He left for Liberia June 25. From that time on he labored faithfully for the edification and enlargement of the Church in the republic of Liberia and the adjacent territory. He died Jan. 30, 1875. Bishop Roberts was endowed with excellent mental gifts, which, under the circumstances of his early condition, were exceedingly well trained. He was a gentleman by nature and culture, a Christian in faith and life. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Roberts, Joseph[[@Headword:Roberts, Joseph]]

             a missionary to India, who went out to that country in 1818, under the patronage of the Wesleyan Missionary Society. After nearly fourteen years' residence among the Hindufs, he returned to England, and gave to the public Oriental Illustrations of the Sacred Scriptures, collected from the Customs, Manners, Rites, Superstitions, etc., of the Hindus, and noted on the spot by himself (Lond. 1835, 1844, 8vo). The work was published under the patronage of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, of which the author was a corresponding member. His Illustrations are arranged in the order of the books, chapters, and verses of the Bible, and contain satisfactory explanations of many doubtful or obscure passages. See most of these in Bush's Scripture Illustrations.

## Roberts, Palmer[[@Headword:Roberts, Palmer]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born March 15, 1780, and was converted in September, 1804. He commenced travelling under the presiding elder in 1810, and joined the East Genesee Conference in 1811. He located in 1834, but was readmitted to conference in 1837. In 1839 he was supernumerary, and since about that time was superannuated until his death, at Seneca Falls, N.Y., April 19, 1858. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1858, p. 207.

## Roberts, Peter[[@Headword:Roberts, Peter]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was a native of North Wales, and was educated at Trinity College, Dublin. On entering into orders he became rector of Halkin, Flintshire, where he died in 1819. Among his works are. Observations sin Christian Morality (Lond. 1796, 8vo): — Christianity Vindicated against Volney (ibid. 1800, 8vo): — Harmony of  the Epistles (ibid. 1800, 4to): — Manual of Prophecy (ibid. 1818, 8vo): — Review of the Policy, etc., of the Church of Rome (ibid. 1809, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Roberts, Robert[[@Headword:Roberts, Robert]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Lincolnshire, England, in 1832. He experienced religion at the age of fifteen years, and at eighteen became a local preacher, and four months after a travelling preacher, among the Primitive Methodists. He travelled four years until received into full connection, and then came to the United States. He was received into the New York East Conference as a probationer in 1856. His last appointment was Cook Street, Brooklyn, in which he died, January, 1865, after an illness of two weeks. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1865, p. 82.

## Roberts, Robert Richford[[@Headword:Roberts, Robert Richford]]

             bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Frederick County, Md., Aug. 2, 1778. He removed while a child to Ligonier Valley, Pa., and was converted when he was about fifteen years old. He was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference in 1802, and was ordained deacon in 1804. He was soon placed in charge of important stations in Baltimore, Alexandria, Georgetown, and Philadelphia. In 1815 he was appointed presiding elder of Schuylkill district, embracing the city of Philadelphia; and owing to the death of bishop Asbury, he was elected to preside over the Philadelphia Conference in the spring of 1816. At the following session of the General Conference (May 1816) he was elected to the office of bishop, being the first married man in America who filled that position. He made his first residence in Chenango (now Mercer) County, Pa., but in 1819 settled in Lawrence County, Ind. The record of his last year's service will serve to give an idea of the extent of his labors while bishop. In that year he preached in six different states and among four Indian tribes in the West, presided at four annual conferences, and travelled nearly 5500 miles. In the spring of 1843 his disease, the asthma, greatly increased upon him, and he died March 26. His body was buried on his own farm, but in January, 1844, in pursuance of a resolution of the Indiana Conference, it was removed to Green Castle. Bishop Morris writes of him: “He possessed by nature the elements of an orator — an imposing person, a clear and  logical mind, a ready utterance, a full — toned, melodious voice.... He was always patient and pleasant; above all, unpretending.” See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 387.

## Roberts, Thomas W.[[@Headword:Roberts, Thomas W.]]

             a Presbyterian minister. was born in Montgomeryshire, North Wales, Oct. 10, 1830. His early education was good, and his parents emigrating to the United States, he graduated at the Theological Seminary at Auburn, N.Y., and was licensed and ordained at New York Mills Nov. 14, 1856. He exercised his gifts as a minister among the Welsh Congregationalists until 1860, when he joined the Cayuga Presbytery, with a view of laboring within the bounds of that presbytery; and it was while travelling in behalf of his mission that he was injured on the New York and Erie Railroad, and died soon after (Sept. 26, 1860). Mr. Roberts was a humble, unassuming man, and a devoted, energetic minister of the Gospel. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 191. (J.L.S.)

## Roberts, William Hayward, D.D.[[@Headword:Roberts, William Hayward, D.D.]]

             a clergyman of the Church of England, was born in 1745, and educated at Eton and King's College, Cambridge. He was for some time undermnaster at Eton, became provost of King's College in 1781, chaplain to the king, and rector of Farnham Royal, Bucks, and died in 1791. His works are, Poetical Essay ( Lond. 1771, 4to): — Judah Restored, a poem in six books (ibid. 1774, 2 vols. 8vo): --besides other Poems, Sermons, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Robertson, Frederick William[[@Headword:Robertson, Frederick William]]

             an English clergyman, was born in London, Feb. 3, 1816. At the age of nine he was sent to a grammar school in Beverley, Yorkshire, where he remained a few years, and then accompanied his parents to the Continent. In 1832 he entered the Edinburgh Academy, and the next year proceeded to the Edinburgh University. He was originally designed for the bar, but the study of law did not please him, and he would gladly have been a soldier. Certain difficulties intervening in the way of obtaining a commission, Mr. Robertson entered Brasenose College, Oxford (1836), to study for the Church. The purity of his life and the depth of his religious feeling prepared him to enter upon this new career without regret. His first appointment was to the curacy of St. Maurice and St. Mary Calendar; but his health failed in  the course of a year, and he was compelled to visit the Continent. On his return to England, he was for a time curate to the incumbent of Christ Church, Cheltenham. In the beginning of 1847 he removed to St. Ebbes, Oxford, and was just attracting the notice of the undergraduates, when he was offered the incumbency of Trinity Chapel, Brighton. Here his eloquence and originality always attracted large and intellectual audiences. He was accused of not being very orthodox in his belief and teaching. This is supposed to have hastened his death, which took place Aug. 15, 1853. He was the author of Lectures and Addresses on Literary and Social Topics (Lond. 1858, 1861): — Expository Lectures on Corinthians (ibid. 1859): — Sermons, four series ( 1855- 63; new ed., with Memoir, Boston, 1870, 2 vols.). His Life and Letters have been edited by S. A. Brooke (1865, 2 vols.). See Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Appletons' Cyclop. s.v.; Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1866; Boston Rev. July, 1866.

## Robertson, James (Of Ellon), D.D.[[@Headword:Robertson, James (Of Ellon), D.D.]]

             a minister of the Established Church, Scotland, was born in Pitsligo, a parish in the north of Aberdeenshire, in 1803. He graduated in due time at Marischal College, Aberdeen, and afterwards served as private tutor, as parish schoolmaster in his own parish, and eventually as head master of a hospital in Aberdeen for the education of boys. In 1832 he was appointed minister of the parish of Ellon, where he remained until 1843, caring for his parish with assiduity and thoroughness. In the great controversy in the Scottish Kirk he was an earnest and indefatigable “Moderate,” opposed to the Veto Act and to Drs. Chalmers, Candlish, Cunningham, and the other Non-intrusionists. When these withdrew in the great secession of the Free Church, it was natural that Mr. Robertson should be designated to occupy some one of the posts they left empty. In 1843 --the year of the disruption --Dr. Robertson became professor of divinity and Church history in the University of Edinburgh. He was one of the central minds of the Established Church, and toiled indefatigably in a great endowment scheme — a kind of adaptation or revival of the Church — extension scheme of Dr. Chalmers. He died in Edinburgh, Dec. 2, 1860. He published pamphlets on The Moderate Side of the Scotch Church Controversy. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Charteris, Life of Robertson (Edinb. 1863, 8vo); The Reader, May 9, 1863.

## Robertson, John Jay[[@Headword:Robertson, John Jay]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Washington, Ga., in 1822. He graduated at the University of East Tennessee in 1845, entered the Union Theological Seminary in 1846, and graduated in 1848. He was ordained in 1850, and filled the pulpit of the Presbyterian Church at Maryville, Tenn., as a stated supply. In the years 1851-52 he was professor in the Maryville College, and from the last date until 1862 he was chaplain in the Confederate army. From 1862 to 1865 he was a stated supply of the church in Rogersville, Tenn. He died in August 1866, while in that relation. (W.P.S.)

## Robertson, Joseph[[@Headword:Robertson, Joseph]]

             a learned English divine, was born at Knipe, Westmoreland Co. Aug. 28, 1726. He entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1746, where he took his degree of arts. Receiving orders, he was for some time curate to Dr. Sykes at Rayleigh, and in 1758 received the living of Herriard, Hampshire. In 1770 he became rector of Sutton, in Essex, and in 1779 he was presented to the living of Horncastle, in Lincolnshire. He died Jan. 19, 1802. Among his principal publications are, a tract on Culinary Poisons (Lond. 1781): — Introduction to Study of Polite Literature (ibid. 1782): — Education of Young Ladies (ibid. 1798, 8vo). Besides other miscellaneous works, he contributed to The Critical Review from August, 1764, to September, 1785, over 2620 criticisms on theological, classical, poetical, and miscellaneous publications. See Chalmers, Biogq. Dict. s.v.; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.

## Robertson, Wesley[[@Headword:Robertson, Wesley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in New Providence, N.J. He was converted in 1828, and united with the Church. In 1834 he received license as a local preacher, and in 1836 was received on probation in the Philadelphia Conference. He labored with great acceptability, being instrumental in the conversion of large numbers and successful in the building of churches. In the spring of 1857 he took a supernumerary relation, and made Newark his residence, where he remained until August 1864. He then went to Jacksonville, Fla., to labor under the direction of the Christian Commission, where he died Nov. 2,1864. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1865, p. 49.

## Robertson, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Robertson, William, D.D.]]

             often called Principal Robertson, a celebrated Scottish historian, was born at Borthwick, county of Mid-Lothian, Scotland, Sept. 19, 1721. His father, the Rev. William Robertson, was minister at Borthwick when his son was born, and afterwards at the Grey Friars' Church, Edinburgh. After a preparatory course at the school of Dalkeith, and when only twelve years of age, young Robertson obtained admission into the University of Edinburgh, where his subsequent progress in learning was rapid, in proportion to the astonishing acquirements of his childhood. In 1741, before he was twenty years old, he was licensed by the Presbytery of Edinburgh to preach; in 1743 he was appointed minister of Gladsmuir, in Haddingtonshire, where he acquired a high reputation as an eloquent pulpit orator; in 1751 he married, and soon after became leader of the Moderate party in the Church of Scotland, in which capacity he is said to have evinced in the General Assembly a readiness and eloquence in debate which his friend Gibbon might have envied in the House of Commons.

In 1759 he first became known as a historian by the publication of his History of Scotland, which benefited his fortune to the extent of £600, and his fame was by one effort placed on an imperishable basis. No first work was ever more successful. It was extolled by Hume, Burke, and other eminent critics. About the same time he removed to Edinburgh, and became chaplain of Stirling Castle; in 1761 he was nominated one of the king's chaplains-in-ordinary for Scotland; in 1762 he was elected principal of the University of Edinburgh, and in 1764 was made historiographer for Scotland, with a salary of £200 per annum. Stimulated by such success, as well as by an ardent devotion to literature, he continued his studies, and in 1769 produced his History of the Reign of Charles V, which raised his then increasing reputation still higher, and which is considered his capital work. The introductory part consists of an able sketch of the political and social state of Europe at the time of the accession of Charles V, a most important period, which forms the connection between the Middle Ages and the history of modern European society and politics. In 1777 he published his History of America, which was followed in 1788 by Additions and Corrections to the former Editions; and in 1791 he published his Historical Disquisition concerning the Knowledge which the Ancients had of India, a slight work, to which he had been led by major Rennel's Memoir of a Map of Hindostan. After spending a life of equal piety, usefulness, and honor, he died, June 11, 1793.

His remains were followed  to their resting place in Grey Friars' Church yard by a large concourse of the most illustrious magnates of the kingdom, the famous professors of the ancient university, the chiefs of the learned professions, and by many private citizens — all anxious to testify their respect to the memory of one whose intellectual productions cast so bright a lustre on the record of Scottish letters. “A month or two previous to his decease he was removed to Grange House, near Edinburgh, where his friend Dugald Stewart enjoyed those visits which, fortunately for the world, led to the composition of that charming memoir of the principal which has been so often praised and so seldom equalled.” Dr. Robertson was a man of dignified and pure personal habits. His conduct as a Christian minister, as a member of society, as a relation, and as a friend was wholly without a stain. Lord Brougham, a relative of his, in his Lives of the Men of Letters of the Time of George III, says, “His affections were warm; they were ever under control, and therefore equal and steady. His conversation was cheerful, and it was varied. Vast information, copious anecdote, perfect appositeness of illustration--narration or description wholly free from pedantry or stiffness, but as felicitous and as striking as might be expected from such a master — great liveliness, and often wit, and often humor, with a full disposition to enjoy the merriment of the hour, but in the most scrupulous absence of everything like coarseness of any description — these formed the staples of his talk.” Most of the works of Dr. Robertson relate to that important period when the countries of Europe were beginning to form constitutions and act upon the political systems which were for centuries preserved. His style is elegant, clear, and vigorous, with occasional passages of great beauty. It seems to have completely surprised his contemporaries; and Horace Walpole, in a letter to the author, expresses the feeling with his usual point and vivacity: “But could I suspect that a man I believe much younger, and whose dialect I scarce understood, and who came to me with all the diffidence and modesty of a very middling author, and who, I was told, had passed his life in a small living near Edinburgh — could I then suspect that he had not only written what all the world now allows to be the best modern history, but that he had written it in the purest English, and with as much seeming knowledge of men and courts as if he had passed all his life in important embassies?”

Gibbon also has borne ample testimony to his style. In his Memoirs (ch. 5), he says: “The perfect composition, the nervous language, the well turned periods, of Dr. Robertson inflamed me to the ambitious hope that I might one day tread in his footsteps; the calm philosophy, the careless, inimitable beauties,  of his friend and rival Hume often forced me to close the volume with a mixed sensation of delight and despair.” Robertson is more uniform and measured than Hume. He has few salient points, and no careless beauties. Of grandeur or dignity there is no deficiency; and when the subject awakens a train of lofty or philosophical ideas, the manner of the historian is in fine accordance with his matter. When he sums up the character of a sovereign, or traces the progress of society and the influence of laws and government, we recognize the mind and language of a master of historical composition. There have been, however, various criticisms as to his accuracy in details of fact — the research and import of his histories. We quote from a single critic: “In plain terms, Dr. Robertson appears to have studied grace and dignity more than usefulness. He has chosen those features of every figure which he could best paint, rather than those which were most worthy of the pencil. The charms of Robertson's style, and the full flow of his narration, which is always sufficiently minute for ordinary readers, will render his works immortal in the hands of the bulk of mankind. But the scientific reader requires something more than periods which fill his ear, and general statements which gratify by amusing; he even requires more than a general textbook — a happy arrangement of intricate subjects, which may enable him to pursue them in their details. When we repair to the works of Robertson for the purpose of finding facts, we are instantly carried away by the stream of his narrative, and forget the purpose of our errand to the fountain. As soon as we can stop ourselves, we discover that our search has been vain, and that we must apply to those sources from which he drew and culled his supplies” (Dr. Thomas Brown, in the Edinb. Rev. April, 1803, p. 240, 241). See Brougham, Lives of Men of Letters, etc. (ed. 1855), p. 206, 280-283; Dugald Stewart, Account of the Life and Writings of Robertson (1801 and 1802); Cockburn, Memorials of his Time; Suard, Notice sur la Vie et les Ecrits de Dr. Robertson; Memoirs of Adam Smith, W. Robertson, and Thomas Reid (1811); Chambers, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors; Mackintosh, Journal, July 13 and 16, 1811; id. Life, vol. 1, ch. 2; vol. 5; Chalmers, Biog. Dict.; Macaulay, Life of Johnson, in the Encyc. Britan. (8th ed.); Europe dursing the Middle Ages; Lardner's Cyclop. 1, 278, 280; Gentleman's Mag. 1836, 2, 19; 1846, 1, 227, n.; 1847, 2, 3, 4, n.; Maitland, Dark Ages, p. 10, 13, 25, 52; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, ch. 13, n.; ch. 31, 49, 58, 61; also Miscell. Works (ed. 1837), p. 373; Green, Diary of a Lover of Literature (1810, 4to), p. 18, 19; Alison, Blackwood's Mag. Dec. 1844; Smyth, Lectures on Modern  History, lect. 1-4, 7-9, 11; Humboldt, Researches in America, 2, 248; Southey, Hist. of Brazil, 1, 639; For. Quar. Rev. No. 17, p. 108-110; Irving, Life and Voyages of Columbus (ed. 1850), 3, 364, 419; Prescott, Conquest of Mexico, vol. 1, pref. 6, p. 37, 103, 320, 333, 335, 348, 365, 376; 2, 64, 95, 112, 203, 204, 222; 3, 304, n., 379; id. Conquest of Peru, vol. 1, pref. 12, p. 17, 338, 423; id. Feridinand and Isabella, 3, 409; Lond. Quar. Rev. Dec. 1843, p. 187, 188; Sept. 1847, p. 317, 318; 12, 369, 370; 76, 91-97; Lond. Athenoeum, 1843, p. 973, 1005; English Cyclop. s.v.; North Amer. Rev. Oct. 1847, p. 370, 371; 61, 405-410; 86, 347; Walpole, Letter to the Countess of Ossory, Nov. 23, 1791; id. Letters (ed. 1861), 9:361; Schlegel, Lectures on the Hist. of Literature (Engl. transl.), lect. 14; Schlosser, Hist. of the 18th Century, p. 664, 917, supra; Shaw, Outlines of English Literature, ch. 15; Edinb. Rev. 2, 245; 56, 220; Menselius, Bibliotheca Historica; Beauties of Dr. Robertson (N.Y. 1810, 8vo); De Chastellux, Essays (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo); Illustrious Biog. (Edinb. 1808, 12mo); Croker, Boswell's Life of Johnson, years 1756, 1767, 1768, 1772-74, 1777-79, 1781, 1784; Disraeli, Miscell. of Literature (ed. 1855), p. 466. (J.L.S.)

## Robes[[@Headword:Robes]]

             a term denoting, in general, the ecclesiastical garments worn by the clergy when performing the offices of the Church. More strictly it applies to the black gown and the dress worn by a bishop. In early times this badge was so essential that writers often use the robe to denote both the person and the office of the bishop. It was at first worn by all bishops, but afterwards became the distinctive badge of archbishops, metropolitans, and patriarchs. Tradition narrates that Mark the evangelist, as bishop of Alexandria, first assumed the robe and left it for his followers. Nothing is known of the form and quality of the robe in the first centuries, save that it was a seamless garment made of white linen, and hung loosely from the shoulders. It was made afterwards of woollen. In the 12th century it was made of white woollen, having a circular gathering on the shoulders and two scarfs hanging over it behind and before. On the left side it was double, and single on the right. Previous to the 8th century it had also four purple crosses upon it, one before and behind, and one on either side. It was fastened by three golden pins. The robe itself was styled πολυσταύριον. See Coleman, Christ. Antiq. p. 83.

## Robigus[[@Headword:Robigus]]

             in Roman mythology, was a deity who averted mildew from growing harvests, and was venerated by the rustic population.

## Robing room[[@Headword:Robing room]]

             a room attached to a church for the keeping of the vestments and sacred vessels, called also VESTRY SEE VESTRY (q.v.).

## Robins, Sanderson[[@Headword:Robins, Sanderson]]

             an English clergyman, was rector of St. James's Church, Dover, afterwards vicar of St. Peter's, in the isle of Thanet, and rural dean. He died in 1862. His principal works are, The Church Schoolmaster (Lond. 1850, 12mo): — Agument for the Royal Supremacy (ibid. 1851, 8vo): — Evidence of Scripture against the Claims of the Romish Church (ibid. 1853, 1854, 8vo): — The Whole Evidence against the Devices of the Romish Church (ibid. 1858, 8vo): — A Defense of the Faith (ibid. 1861, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Robinson, Benjamin[[@Headword:Robinson, Benjamin]]

             a learned Presbyterian minister, was born at Derby, England, in 1666. He became pastor at Findern. Derbyshire, in 1688, from which place he removed to Hungerford, Berkshire. He was settled at Little St. Helen's, London, in 1700, and died in 1724. He wrote, A Review of the Causes of Liturgies, etc. (Lond. 1710, 8vo): — Letter to Thomas Bennet in Defense of the Review (ibid. 1710, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Robinson, Charles G.[[@Headword:Robinson, Charles G.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Newville, N.Y., in 1822, and when nineteen years of age was converted. Although early impressed that it was his duty to preach, he endeavored by diligent attention to other duties to pacify his conscience. At length he yielded, and was received on trial in the Oneida Conference in 1852. He was ordained deacon in 1854, and elder in 1856; but the condition of his health forbade active service, and, taking a supernumerary relation, he went in October, 1856, to Mansfield, O., where his parents resided, and failing rapidly, died  on the 24th of the same month. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1857, p. 293.

## Robinson, David[[@Headword:Robinson, David]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Croppuck Township, Washington Co., Pa., about the year 1808. He graduated at Washington College, studied theology in the Western Seminary, Allegheny City, was licensed by Washington Presbytery in 1841, and ordained and installed as pastor of Mill Creek Church, Hookstown, April 19, 1842. This relation existed until 1854, when it was dissolved, and in 1856 he joined New Lisbon Presbytery and was installed pastor of Madison Church, at Calcutta, O., where he remained until 1858, when he returned to Hookstown, Pa., where he died, March 17, 1861. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 117. (J.L.S.)

## Robinson, Edward, D.D., LL.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, Edward, D.D., LL.D.]]

             the most German among English-speaking scholars, whose classical and invaluable work on Palestine has made his name as well known in Germany and England as in his native laud, was of Puritan descent, and inherited the piety, energy, love of liberty, and high moral principle of the settlers of New England. He was the son of a Congregational minister, was born at Southington, Conn., April 10, 1794, and from 1812 to 1816 attended Hamilton College at Clinton, N.Y., where he distinguished himself chiefly in mathematics and the ancient languages, and was at the head of his class. In the fall of 1817, after studying law for some time at Hudson, N.Y., he was called to a tutorship at Hamilton College and accepted. A year later he married Eliza Kirkland, daughter of the Rev.

Samuel Kirkland, known as missionary to the Oneidas. Though somewhat older than her husband, she was a woman of uncommon intellect and cultivation, and very attractive in appearance. She died, however, within a year after her marriage. Mr. Robinson remained at Clinton until 1821, when he went to Andover, Mass., to publish an edition of eleven books of the Iliad, with notes and a Latin introduction, which appeared in 1822. This stay at Andover, however, destined him to the service of theology and the Church. He entered into intimate relations with Prof. Moses Stuart, the patriarch of Biblical scholarship in America, and became assistant professor of the Hebrew language and literature at the Andover Theological Seminary (1823-26). He assisted Prof. Stuart in preparing the second edition of his Hebrew Grammar (which was founded on that of Gesenius), and in the  translation of Winer's Grammar of the New Testament Greek (1825). At the same time he prepared alone a translation of Wahl's Claris Philologica Novi Testamenti (Andover, 1825), which, in later editions, grew to be a much more important, independent work. These labors determined his future career, as well as the whole character of modern exegetical theology in America, of which Stuart and Robinson must be considered the founders and representatives. Stuart was brilliant and enthusiastic; Robinson. calm, sober, and critical; the former fresher and more animating, the latter more thorough and scholarly. The school of exegesis originated by them consists in an independent elaborating of the results of modern German investigation on the basis of AngloAmerican orthodoxy and practical piety. By this process many excrescences and extravagances of German research were done away with, but at the same time the old Puritan severity was largely modified. Since then it has become a necessity for every American theologian who would keep up with the times to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the German language and literature; and this necessity will long continue to exist, even after most of the classical works of German theology have been made accessible to the Anglo-American literary world by translations.

In the year 1826, Robinson, then thirty-two years of age, undertook a voyage to Europe in order there to complete his theological education at the fountainheads of German learning and research. He spent his time chiefly at the universities of Göttingen, Halle, and Berlin, and became, in point of persevering industry, a German among Germans. He was particularly intimate with Gesenius, Tholuck, and Rodiger in Halle, and with Neander and Ritter in Berlin. To the celebrated Berlin geographer, who elevated geography to the dignity of a science, constituting it the indispensable companion of ethnography and history, and who united with depth of learning sincere piety and a childlike faith, he was allied during his whole life by the closest bonds of esteem and affection, which were fully reciprocated by Ritter. He considered Ritter, as he assured the writer of this article on presenting, in 1844, a letter of introduction from him, the greatest man of his time. In 1828 he was married in Halle to Therese Albertine Luise, youngest daughter of L.A. von Jacob, professor of philosophy and political science at the University of Halle, a highly gifted lady of thorough culture, who has acquired, under the nom de plume of Talvj, a well merited reputation as a writer, and who, with German love  and fidelity, was a true helpmeet to her American husband, in his literary labors, until he died.

After his return to America in 1830, Robinson was appointed professor extraordinary of Biblical literature and librarian at the Theological Seminary in Andover. Soon after, in 1831, he founded and edited a learned theological quarterly, the Biblical Repository, which subsequently (in 1851) was united with the Bibliotheca Sacra, founded in 1844, and edited by himself in conjunction with the Andover professors Edwards and Park, and as such still exists. This flourishing periodical contained in its first volumes, besides valuable independent articles, particularly by Robinson and Stuart, many translations and reviews of German works, and was thus a means of transferring the best results of foreign biblical and theological research to American soil. In the year 1832 Robinson published an improved and enlarged edition of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible, which proved very successful. A year later he issued a smaller Dictionary of the Bible, for popular use, of which thousands of copies were spread abroad through the American Tract Society. At the same time he published in Halle a translation, by himself, of Buttmann's Greek Grammar, which has since then repeatedly reappeared in new and improved editions, and was, and is still, largely used as a text book in American colleges.

These severe labors, in connection with his daily duties as instructor, undermined his health, and forced him, in 1833, to resign his position. He removed to Boston, and there devoted himself to his studies. In 1834 he published a revised edition of Newcome's Greek Harmony of the Gospels, which was far superior to the earlier editions, and a valuable contribution to the literature on Gospel harmony. It was based on Knapp's text of the New Test., and did not possess the advantages of the later researches of Lachmann, Tischendorf, Alford, and Tregelles in the field of textual criticism. At the same time Robinson completed an English translation of Gesenius's Hebrew-Latin Lexicon, which first appeared in 1836, met a great want, and contributed much to the advancement of the study of Hebrew in America. The second and later editions were enriched by many additions from the Thesaurus of Gesenius. The most important fruit, however, of this season of leisure in Boston was the preparation of an independent Greek and English Lexicon of the New Test., which at once took the place of the author's translation of Wahl's Clavis. He made frequent use of his predecessors — Bruder, Schleussner, Wahl, Bretschneider, and all exegetic sources of importance; and. in the later  editions particularly, of the commentaries of De Wette and Meyer, which he preferred on account of their great philological advantages and concise brevity, without, however, allowing them to disturb his American orthodoxy in any important point. This extremely valuable and sterling work first appeared in 1836, and was at once welcomed as the best English lexicon of the New Test., and reprinted in three different editions in England. A new edition, greatly improved and, in part, entirely altered, appeared in 1850, and made it the first work of its kind to the present time. It is likewise an almost complete concordance, and enables the student to nearly dispense with Bruder. This work is a monument of labor and industry. Its motto is, “Dies diem docet,” and “Nulla dies sine linea.” The exegetical point of view of the author belongs to the historico-grammatical school founded by Winer, so far as it agrees with a stricter conception of inspiration and a decidedly Protestant orthodox acceptation of all important doctrines. He kept equally aloof from rationalism and from mysticism, and was a progressive supernaturalist.

In the year 1837, Prof. Robinson received a call as professor of Biblical literature to the Union Theological Seminary of New York, a Presbyterian institution recently founded, which since then, and chiefly through Prof. Robinson, has risen to the first rank of theological seminaries in America, and stands side by side with Andover and Princeton; and which, by his efforts, was enriched, at an early day, by the Van Ess library and other literary treasures. He accepted the call on condition of his being permitted to devote some years (at his own expense) to the investigation of the Holy Land on the spot itself before entering upon his duties. On July 17, 1837, he sailed for Europe with his family, left the latter in Germany, and travelled by way of Athens and Egypt to Palestine. In conjunction with the Rev. Eli Smith, a highly esteemed missionary of the American Board, who was an accomplished Arabic scholar, he explored, with the acute judgment of a critical scholar and the devout heart of a believer in the Bible, all the important places of the Holy Land. In October, 1838, he returned to Berlin, after having been detained at Vienna by a severe illness, contracted during his travels, which nearly proved fatal. The two following years, spent in the metropolis of German science in the preparation of his Biblical Researches in Palestine, were among the happiest of his life. This pioneer work, which since then has been consulted and quoted on all questions of Biblical geography and topography by all the scholars of America, England, and Germany, appeared simultaneously in America and England  in the original, and in Germany in a translation revised by Mrs. Robinson, in 1841. and secured the immortality of the author's name, placing him, in Biblical geography, in the same rank with Bochart, Reland, Ritter, Raumer, and Burckhardt; as in Biblical philology he stands side by side with Wahl, Gesenius, and Winer. The Biblical Researches are based throughout on personal inspection and investigation by the aid of the telescope, compass, and measuring tape; on keen observation, strict regard to truth, and sound and wholly independent judgment, which allowed itself to be dazzled by no mediaeval traditions or venerable monkish legends, but was guided by the principle, “Prima historiae lex est, ne quid falsi dicere audeat, ne quid veri non audeat.” Though necessarily dry in many details, his simple and massive style rises at times to true eloquence. The work was immediately received with great favor in Germany, England, and America, and still continues to be quoted as the first authority in its department. We give as examples three criticisms upon it.

Ritter says of it (Die Erdkunde von Asien, 8, div. 2, 73):

“The union of the acutest observation of topographic and local conditions, like that of Burckhardt, with much preparatory study, particularly the erudite study of the Bible, and of philological and historical criticism as well as that of the language of the country by the author's travelling companion, the Rev. Eli Smith (whom a residence of many years in Syria as a missionary had made practically at home there), distinguish this work, which is carried through in the most conscientious manner and with great vigor of body and of mind, from all former ones of its kind, whereby the scientific treatment of the subject has only now gained firm ground upon which the future will be able to build up with more success than the past. The competent Olshausen remarks that no previous work has brought to light a richer funud of new tfad Important researches on Palestine. The admirable principles of investigation developed and acted up to therein will remain a guiding star for all future travelers who would undertake to contribute to the investigation of Biblical antiquity in the Holy Land itself, wherefore the work marks a new era in Biblical geography.”

The committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, in its publication Our Work in Palestine (Lond. 1873), p. 7, expresses itself as follows:  “The first real impulse, because the first successful impulse, towards scientific examination of the Holy Land, is due to the American traveller Dr. Robinson. He it was who first conceived the idea of making a work on Biblical geography to be based not on the accounts of others, but on his own observations and discoveries. He fitted himself for his ambitions undertaking by the special studies of fifteen years, mastering the whole literature of the subject, and, above all. clearing the way for his own researches by noticing the deficiencies and weak points of his predecessors .... We shall not go into the question here of his theories and his reconstruction of the old city, on which he has had both followers and opponents. Let it, however, be distinctly remembered that Dr. Robinson is the first of scientific travelers. His travels took him over a very large extent of ground, covering a large part of the whole country from Sinai north; and his books are still, after thirty years, the most valuable works which we possess on the geography of Palestine.”

Dean Stanley (Addresses and Sermons delivered in the United States, October, 1878, p. 26) says:

“Dr. Robinson, I believe it is not too much to say, was the first person who ever saw Palestine with his eyes open as to what he ought to see. Hundreds and thousands of travelers had visited Palestine before — pilgrims, seekers after pleasure, even scientific travelers — but there was no person before his time who had come to visit that sacred country with all the appliances ready beforehand which were necessary to enable him to understand what he saw; and he also was the first person who came there with an eye capable of observing, and a hand capable of recording, all that with these appliances he brought before his vision.”

The Royal Geographical Society of London awarded to the author, in 1842, their Patron's Gold Medal; in the same year the University of Halle conferred upon him the degree of D.D.; and Yale College, in 1841, that of LL.D.

On his return to America, in 1840, Dr. Robinson devoted himself to his labors in the Union Theological Seminary, at the same time not neglecting his literary work. He wrote numerous articles and essays, revised his former works for new editions, and in 1845 published a new and  independent Greek Harmony of the Gospels, with notes of his own, which, with other important changes, made it far superior to any former work of the kind and won it general acknowledgment. This was followed in 1846 by an English Harmony, with the notes adapted for popular use.

In 1851 Dr. Robinson made a second visit to Germany and Palestine, in which he included Damascus. The valuable results of his new investigations were laid down in an improved and enlarged edition of his Biblical Researches, in 1856, which was at the same time published in Germany with a translation of the additional matter by Mrs. Robinson. Nevertheless, this invaluable work was, in the eyes of Dr. Robinson, merely a preparation for a complete physical, historical, and topographical geography of the Holy Land, which he considered the chief labor of his life. Unfortunately, he was not permitted to finish it; only the first part, the Physical Geography of Palestine, was fully prepared in manuscript, and his faithful helpmeet translated it into German after his death, and published it in both languages in 1865. Repeated attacks of illness undermined his constitution, and an incurable disease of the eyes obliged him, in the year 1861, to lay down his pen. In May, 1862, he set out on his fifth and last voyage to Europe, in order to consult the celebrated oculist Dr. von Grafe, in Berlin, who, however, could promise him no permanent cure. Nevertheless, he greatly enjoyed the intercourse with his learned friends in Halle and Berlin, and refreshed his soul once more by a clouded view of the Swiss Alps. On his return in November of the same year, he resumed his usual duties at the Union Theological Seminary, but was forced to cease with the Christmas vacation. After a short illness, he died in the bosom of his family, Jan. 27, 1863, universally esteemed and lamented, most so by his wife, son, and daughter, his colleagues, and a large number of students in the seminary, the learned ornament and crown of which he had been for a quarter of a century.

Dr. Robinson was a man of athletic form and imposing figure, though somewhat bent in later years; of strong, sound good sense; reserved and dry, though, when in the society of his learned brethren, often very entertaining and with a strong sense of humor. He was thorough and indefatigable in his investigations, somewhat sceptical by nature, but bowing in reverence to God's revelation; outwardly cold, but warm inwardly; of great kindness of heart and tender sympathy; a plain, serious, solid, thoroughly honorable character; and a pious, orthodox, evangelical Christian. Though a dangerous opponent when attacked, he was a lover of  peace, avoided theological controversy, and adhered strictly to his task in life, which he accomplished faithfully. He is the most distinguished Biblical theologian whom America has brought forth, and one of the most distinguished of the 19th century. His Harmony of the Gospels, his popular Dictionary of the Bible (published by the Amer. Tract Society), his Greek and English Lexicon of the New Test., his Hebrew and English Lexicon based on Gesenius, and, above all, his Biblical Researches in Palestine, belong to the most useful works of modern Protestant theology, and will long continue to exert their influence, under the blessing of God, particularly in America.

Sources. — Next to the works quoted above in chronological order, particular reference is had to two excellent addresses by his two colleagues in the Union Theological Seminary — Profs. Henry B. Smith and Roswell D. Hitchcock — which appeared soon after his death under the title The Life, Writings, and Character of Edward Robinson, D.D., LL.D., read before the N.Y. Historical Society, published by request of the Society (N.Y. 1863). Dr. Hitchcock's address gives, at the same time, a thoroughly trustworthy biographical sketch, partly founded on the communications of the family. See also the noble tribute which dean Stanley of Westminster paid to Dr. Robinson in an address before the students of the Union Theological Seminary, New York, Oct. 29, 1878, published in his Addresses and Sermons delivered during a Visit to the United States and Canada (Lond. and N.Y. 1879, pp. 23-34). He holds him up as the noblest specimen of an American scholar. The original MS. of Robinson's Biblical Researches and a part of his library are in possession of the Union Theological Seminary in New York. (P.S.)

## Robinson, George C.[[@Headword:Robinson, George C.]]

             a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hartwick, near Cooperstown, N.Y., Aug. 9, 1833, and was educated first at the village academy in Wellsboro, Pa.; next at Lima, N.Y.; and finally graduated with distinction at Yale College in 1856. He then studied at the Union Theological Seminary, New York, till the spring of 1857, when he entered the New York East Conference and took charge of the First Place M.E. Church, Brooklyn, N.Y. He was transferred in 1859 to the Cincinnati Conference, and served the Union Chapel in Cincinnati; but his declining health induced his generous society to send him to Europe in 1860. In Germany he studied thoroughly the latest results of theological inquiry and became master of  the best learning of its evangelical teachers, enjoying the personal friendship and admiration of professors Tholuck, Jacobi, etc. He extended his travels through France and Italy, and returned to the United States in June, 1862, with rich acquisitions of knowledge and improved health. But his frail constitution soon yielded again to our precarious climate, and, after a persistent conflict with pulmonary disease, he fell at last, greatly lamented, Sept. 21, 1863. Although so young, he had laid the broadest and deepest foundation for the future. To the Latin, Greek, German, French, and Italian languages he had added a knowledge of the Hebrew, Syriac, and Chaldee. He was familiar even with much of the literature of these languages — especially of the German. Several erudite and critical articles on the present state of opinion and criticism in Germany respecting the Pentateuch were given by him in the periodical journals. To great geniality of disposition he added remarkable strength of intellect. Originality marked the whole structure of his mind, and it amounted to genius. A brief conversation could not fail to convince the hearer that he was not only capable of original and precious thought on almost any subject susceptible of it, but that this power was spontaneous to his affluent mind. His preaching was characterized by it remarkably; and thus presented a singular fascination, especially to thoughtful hearers. His congregation at Union Chapel in Cincinnati established “The Robinson Mission” in his memory. See Record of the Yale Class of 1856, p. 60 sq.; The (N.Y.) Methodist, Oct. 3, 1863.

## Robinson, George Marshall[[@Headword:Robinson, George Marshall]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Buckfield, Me., July 13, 1821. He was a graduate of Waterville College in the class of 1850. He studied theology at Newton, and was ordained pastor of the Church in Sidney, Me., in the summer of 1853. On leaving Sidney in 1854, he preached in several churches, chiefly as a temporary supply, the state of his health not allowing him to take a regular pastorate. For several years before his death he gave sup preaching entirely, and was engaged in business. He died at Livermore, Me., April 29, 1873. (J.C.S.)

## Robinson, Hastings, D.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, Hastings, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1793, graduated at Cambridge as sixteenth wrangler in 1815, and Was fellow of St. John's College from 1816 to 1827. He then took the college living of Great Warley, Essex. In  1821 he was appointed assistant tutor of his college, in 1823 Whitehall preacher, and in 1836 select preacher before the university, honorary canon of Rochester, and rural dean. His death took place May 18, 1866. He published Euripidis Electra, Gr. emendavit et Annotationibus (Lond. royal 8vo): — Πράξεις τῶν Α᾿ποστόλων, Acta Apostolorums (Cambridge, 1824, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Robinson, Hugh, D.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, Hugh, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was born in St. Mary's parish, in the county of Anglesea. He was educated at Winchester School, was admitted a probationer fellow of New College, Oxford, in 1603, and perpetual fellow in 1605. He completed his master's degree in 1611, and about three years after became chief master of Winchester School. He was afterwards archdeacon of Winchester, canon of Wells, and archdeacon of Gloucester. Having sided with the party that was reducing the Church to the Presbyterian form, he lost the advantages of his canonry and archdeaconry, but obtained the rectory of Hinton, near Winchester. He (died March 30, 1655, and was buried in St. Giles-in-the-Fields, London. He wrote for the use of Winchester School, Preces; Grammaticalis quoedam; Antiquoe Historioe Synopsis (Oxford, 1816, 8vo). printed together: — Scholoe Wintoniensis Phrases Latinoe (Lond. 1654 and 1664): — Annales Mundi Universales, etc. (ibid. 1677, fol.).

## Robinson, Isaac, D.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, Isaac, D.D.]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Hudson, N.H., in August 1779. Having studied under his own minister, he commenced a course of classical and theological study with Rev. Reed Paige, of Hancock. He received a call to become pastor of the Church in Stoddard, Aug. 30, 1802, and, having accepted it, was ordained Jan. 5, 1803. Here he remained until the close of his ministry and life. Mr. Robinson continued to labor with vigor until within a few weeks of his death, which occurred July 9, 1854. He published, about 1809, a pamphlet in opposition to Universalism, a sermon on the Supreme Divinity of Jesus Christ, and others. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 463.

## Robinson, John (1)[[@Headword:Robinson, John (1)]]

             pastor of the “Pilgrim Fathers” of New England, was born in 1575. The Independents, as they were called, had their origin in a protest, not against  popish intolerance and persecution, but against Protestant usurpation and bigotry connected with a persecution equal in atrocity to the darkest period of papal domination; not in the dark ages, but in the bright and golden age of Henry VIII and good queen Bess. While renouncing the supremacy of the pope and his title to headship in the Church of Christ, the king assumed ecclesiastical supremacy, and the change was from priestcraft to kingeraft, both eternally incompatible with the teachings of Christ. A little band whose consciences no chains could bind, and whose judgments no sophisms could pervert, rose up and mildly, but firmly, protested against such infringement of the rights of conscience and private judgment, and, rather than submit to the same, suffered imprisonment, torture, and death. An attempt was made in 1602 to seek refuge in Holland, but the vile treachery on the part of the captain of the ship on which they were embarked prevented. The next year, Robinson, the pastor of the little flock, made another effort; but they were again thwarted by untoward providences. Finally, a company arrived at Leyden in 1608. The Church was enlarged by additions mostly from English exiles, and numbered more than three hundred. Robinson was greatly respected by the clergy of Leyden, and also by the professors in the university. He gave proof not only of his piety, but of his scholarship. The Church was not allowed to rest in quiet in this asylum of conscience, but was pursued by the prelatic rage of the bigoted Laud. Holland was not allowed by Providence to be their rest, and they turned their thoughts across the ocean to the New World, where they might enjoy freedom to worship God in a heathen land. An appeal was made to king James as to whether they would be granted liberty of conscience in America. They made a full statement of their religious principles, keeping nothing back. The king promised to connive as to their religious principles and practices, but could not grant them toleration under the great seal.

In the beginning of the year 1620 they kept a day of solemn fasting and prayer; Robinson delivered a discourse from 1Sa 23:3-4. It was decided that part of the Church should emigrate and prepare the way, and the remainder follow when their pastor could go with them; but many could not get ready, and had to remain. Mr. Brewster, a ruling elder, was appointed to go as a leader. They were constituted as much an absolute Church as the portion that remained. In July they held another season of prayer, and the pastor preached from Ezr 8:21. On June 21 they left Leyden to embark at Delftshaven, and went on board ship the day after  they arrived. All having assembled on deck, their beloved founder knelt and poured out his soul to God in prayer for the divine protection. They believed thoroughly not only in a general, but a special, providence, extending to the minutest events. The proceeds of their estates were put into a common stock, and, with the assistance of the merchants to whom they mortgaged their labor and trade for seven years, two vessels were provided — the Speedwell, of sixty tons, and the Mayflower, of one hundred and eighty tons. They expended seven thousand pounds in provisions and stores. The ships, carrying one hundred and twenty passengers, sailed from Southampton on Aug. 5, 1620. The Speedwell, proving leaky, had to put into port at Dartmouth for repairs. On Aug. 21 they put to sea again, and by still another providential interference, both ships proving unseaworthy, they were obliged to put back to Plymouth. About twenty left the Speedwell, and, taking with them their provisions, went on shore; the remainder, one hundred and one in number, went on board the Mayflower, and the shores of England were lost sight of forever. The company had entered into a solemn covenant to be faithful to God and each other. But little remarkable occurred during the voyage. There was one death, and one birth — a son of Stephen Hopkins, who was named Oceanus. On Nov. 9 they caught sight of the sandy cliffs of Cape Cod, and the next day entered the harbor. Before going ashore, they founded a democratic government, and elected John Carver to serve one year as governor of the colony. They named the place Plymouth. The first religious service held on land was on Dec. 31. Robinson had charged them to “follow him only so far as he followed Christ.” They were faithful to the charge — a noble band of God fearing and God loving men; and they left unchanged to posterity

“What here they found-- freedom to worship God.”

The only book of Robinson's writing was entitled Justification of Separation from the Church of England, published in 1851. He died March 11, 1625. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 1. (W.P.S.)

## Robinson, John (2)[[@Headword:Robinson, John (2)]]

             bishop of London, was born at Cleasby,Yorkshire, in 1650, and was educated at Oriel College, Oxford. He was chaplain to the English  ambassador to Sweden in 1683, and subsequently ambassador there himself. He returned to England in 1708, in 1710 became bishop of Bristol, and in 1714 was transferred to London. He was minister plenipotentiary at the Treaty of Utrecht, and one of the commissioners for finishing St. Paul's Cathedral. He died in 1723. He published, An Account of Sweden (3d ed. 1717, 8vo): — Sermon on Benefits, etc., of Christ's Kingdom (Lond. 1714, 8vo), and others. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Auth. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Robinson, John (3), D.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, John (3), D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Mecklenburg County, N.C., Jan. 8, 1768. His college course was pursued at Winnsborough, S.C. He studied under the care of the Orange Presbytery, was licensed to preach April 4, 1793, and was by the presbytery directed to visit Dupin County, where he remained seven years. In 1800 he became minister of the Church in Fayetteville, but removed in 1801 to Poplar Tent. In 1806 he was induced to return to Fayetteville, where he resumed pastoral labors and his classical school. In December, 1818, he returned to Poplar Tent, where he passed the rest of his life, dying Dec. 14, 1843. Dr. Robinson was a man of consistent and elevated piety, large benevolence, firmness of purpose, courage, and punctuality. He published a Eulogy on Washington. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 113.

## Robinson, John (4), D.D.[[@Headword:Robinson, John (4), D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was graduated at Christ College, Cambridge, and was minister of Ravenstondale, Westmoreland, and master of the free grammar school there. He published, a Theological, Biblical, and Ecclesiastical Dictionary (Lond. 1815, 8vo): — The Proper Names of the Bible (ibid. 1804, 12mo): — besides a number of works for schools. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Robinson, John (5)[[@Headword:Robinson, John (5)]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in County Wicklow, Ireland, Aug. 14, 1801. He was converted in his fourteenth year, and came to the United States in 1818, uniting soon after with the Church in Fishkill, N.Y. In 1823 he moved with his parents to South Sodus, Wayne Co., where he labored, with a great revival as a result. After  working under the presiding elder for two years, he was in 1832 received on trial as an ordained deacon in the Genesee Conference. In this and in the East Genesee Conference he labored a short time previous to his death, in Starkey, Yates Co., Jan. 9, 1868. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1868, p. 155.

## Robinson, Jonathan N.[[@Headword:Robinson, Jonathan N.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Suffolk County, Long Island, N.Y., Sept. 27, 1816. He joined the Church April 10, 1838, was licensed to preach March 14, 1840, and after a course of preparatory study was received on trial in the New York Conference, June 16, 1844. He went to his last charge in 1853, was attacked with hemorrhage of the lungs, which became so aggravated that he died, Nov. 6, 1858. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1859, p. 153.

## Robinson, Moses[[@Headword:Robinson, Moses]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Burlington, Vt., April 26, 1815. His parents were poor, and he was dependent upon his own exertions to gain an education. He graduated at Middlebury College in 1839, studied theology in Union Seminary, New York city, was licensed by New York Third Presbytery in 1842, and was ordained by Salem Presbytery in 1843 as pastor of the church at Washington, Ind. He labored subsequently at Wadsworth, O., then at Enosburg, Vt., and for the last ten years of his life at Steamboat Rock, Ia. He died Aug. 31, 1865. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1866, p. 223. (J.L.S.)

## Robinson, Ralph[[@Headword:Robinson, Ralph]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Scotland, Windham Co., Conn., March 12, 1780. His father and family removed to Dorset, Vt., where Ralph spent the earlier part of his life at agriculture. He pursued his preparatory studies under the care of Rev. William Jackson, of Dorset, paying his board and tuition by his labor; graduated at Middlebury College in 1808; studied theology with Rev. Holland Weeks, of Pittsford; was licensed to preach by the Rutland Association in 1809, and for about a year acted as home missionary, preaching in Malone, N.Y., and in two or three towns in Vermont. In 1810 he was ordained and installed as pastor of two churches, viz. the Congregational Church in Granville, Vt., and the First Congregational Church in Hartford, N.Y. In 1822 he was settled as pastor  of the Congregational Church, Marshal, Oneida Co.; in 1828 of the Church in New Haven; in 1830 of the Church in Pulaski, where he remained sixteen years; in 1846 he returned to the New Haven Church and remained seven years; in 1854 he went to the Church in East Mexico, and in 1858 to the Presbyterian Church in Constantia. Thus we have fifty years of uninterrupted ministerial labor — a life itself, which, from its nature, must have made a mark for eternity on hundreds of souls. He died May 14, 1863. Mr. Robinson was an intelligent and earnest preacher and defender of the New England or Edwardian theology, a pioneer in temperance and anti-slavery reform, and an earnest promoter of all the benevolent causes of the Church. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1864, p. 317; also The Congregational Quarterly, Boston, July, 1863; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v. (J.L.S.)

## Robinson, Richard[[@Headword:Robinson, Richard]]

             archbishop of Armagh and lord Rokeby, was born in the North Riding of Yorkshire, England, in 1709. He was educated at Westminster School and Christ Church, Oxford, where he took his master's degree in 1733. Dr. Blackburn, archbishop of York, appointed him his chaplain, and collated him first to Elton, Yorkshire, and next to prebend of Grindal, Cathedral of York. In 1751 he went to Ireland, and was promoted to the bishopric of Killala in the same year. In 1759 he was translated to the united sees of Leighlin and Ferns, and in 1761 to Kildare. In 1765 he was advanced to the primacy of Armagh, and made lord-almoner and vice-chancellor of the University of Dublin. He was created baron Rokeby of Armagh in February 1777, and in 1783 he was appointed prelate to the Order of St. Patrick. He succeeded to the title of baronet upon the death of Sir William, his brother, in 1785. Bishop Robinson died at Clifton, near Bristol, in October, 1794. He was very watchful over the legal rights of the Church in Ireland. The acts of the 11th and 12th of the then reigning sovereign, securing to bishops and ecclesiastical persons repayment for expenditures in purchasing and building glebes and houses, originated with him.

## Robinson, Robert[[@Headword:Robinson, Robert]]

             a distinguished minister of the Baptist denomination in England, was born at Swaffham, Norfolk, Jan. 8, 1735. In 1749 he was apprenticed to a hair dresser in London. Becoming a hopeful Christian under the preaching of Whitefield, his master released him from his indentures, and he returned to  his native county and began to preach as a Calvinistic Methodist. He soon joined the Baptists, and in 1759 became pastor of the Baptist Church in Cambridge, where he was very popular with all classes of people. Enjoying peculiar facilities for study at Cambridge, he improved every opportunity to add to his store of knowledge. He was a fine linguist, and easily learned both the ancient and modern languages. Between the years 1770 and 1782 he prepared and published a translation of Saurin's Sermons, He also published in 1776 A Plea for the Divinity of Our Lord Jesus Christ, in a Pastoral Letter Addressed to a Congregation of Protestant Dissenters at Cambridge. It is said that this “Plea excited the most singular attention, and the highest dignitaries of the Church of England pronounced that it was the best defense of the divinity of Christ that had ever been published. He was invited to become a clergyman of the Establishment, to which, however, he refused to listen.” Robinson was the author of several other works which, in their day, enjoyed a good degree of popularity. Among them was a translation of the celebrated essay of Claude, On the Composition of a Sermon, and an elaborate work on which he spent years of labor--History of Baptism. Close and long continued application to study at length produced its effect on his constitution, and he died June 8, 1790. Although he was thought at one time to lean somewhat towards Socinianism, he never lost the affection and confidence of his Church in Cambridge. See Dyer, Robinson's Life and Writings (Lond. 1796, 4to); Flower, Robinsons Miscellaneous Works, etc.; also the Annual Review, 1805, p. 464; Eclectic Review, September, 1861; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v. (J.C.S.)

## Robinson, Stuart, D.D[[@Headword:Robinson, Stuart, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, Was born at Strabane, Ireland, November 26, 1816. He received his preparatory education under Rev. James M. Brown, D.D., in Berkeley County, Virginia, and Reverend William H. Foote, D.D., at Romney; graduated from Amherst College, Massachusetts, in 1836; went thence to Union Theological Seminary in Virginia, and spent one year; then taught from 1837 to 1839; from 1839 to 1841 studied at Princeton Seminary was licensed by Greenbrier Presbytery, Virginia, April 10, 1841; and was ordained by the same presbytery, Oct. 8. 1842, at Lewisburg (now in West Virginia), pastor of the Church at Kanawha Saline, from which he was released May 8, 1847; was installed pastor of the Church at Frankfort, Kentucky, by the Presbytery of West Lexington, June 18 following, and labored there until September 2, 1852; removed to Baltimore, Maryland, and supplied the Fayette Street Church in 1852 and 1853; then organized the Central Presbyterian Church in the same city, and was installed its pastor May 10 of the latter year, and released October 27, 1856; was professor of pastoral theology and Church government in Danville Theological Seminary, Kentucky, in 1856 and 1857; pastor of the Second Church of Louisville from 1858 to 1881, at which time he was released on account of the failure of his health. He died in Louisville, October 5, 1881. Dr. Robinson was a man of rare learning, and one of the finest expository preachers in the country. He wrote much and published much, but his principal productions are the two volumes, The Church of God. and Discourses on Redemption. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 882, page 42.

## Robinson, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Robinson, Thomas (1)]]

             an English clergyman, was born at Wakefield, in the county of York, Aug. 29, 1749. He was educated at the grammar school of his native place, the governors of which, when it was determined to send him to the university, unanimously agreed to allow him a double exhibition (pension). He was admitted a sizar into Trinity College, Cambridge, in October, 1768. In 1772 he was elected fellow of the college, and soon after presented to the curacies of Witcham and Witchford. About two years afterwards he accepted the curacy of St. Martin's in Leicester, was chosen afternoon lecturer of All-Saints', and in 1774 chaplain to the Infirmary. In 1778 he was appointed weekly lecturer of St. Mary's, Leicester, and in the same year was presented to the living of this church. Mr. Robinson died of apoplexy, March 24, 1813, after preaching thirty-nine years in Leicester.  Among his works are, Scripture Characters (Lond. 1789, 12mo; last ed. 1860, 8vo): The Christian System Unfolded (ibid. 1805, 3 vols. 8vo; last ed. 1848, 8vo): — Prophecies of the Messiah (ibid. 1812-25, 8vo): — besides Addresses, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Robinson, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Robinson, Thomas (2)]]

             an English clergyman, was born about the middle of the last century, and became rector of Ruan Minor and vicar of St. Hilary, Cornwall. He died in 1814. He was the author of, A Few Plain Reasons for the Belief of a Christian (1800, 8vo): — Inquiry into the Nature, Necessity, and Evidences of Revealed Religion (1803, 8vo).

## Robinson, William (1)[[@Headword:Robinson, William (1)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born near Carlisle, England, in the beginning of the 18th century. Having plunged into the dissipations of London, he was ashamed to return to his father, and resolved to seek his fortune in America. On his arrival, he began to teach school in Hopewell, N.J., living the life of a correct and sober man. Soon after his conversion, he determined to enter the ministry, and pursued his studies at the Log College. He was received under the care of the New Brunswick Presbytery on April 1, 1740, and was licensed to preach May 27 following. On Aug. 14, 1741, he was ordained in New Brunswick sine titulo. Until 1746 he labored as missionary in Virginia, and on March 19 was dismissed from the Presbytery of New Brunswick to that of New Castle, with a view of his becoming pastor of the congregation at St. George's, Del. But in April following, before he had been installed, his death occurred. There remains little documentary testimony concerning him; but there is a uniform tradition that he was an eminently devout and benevolent man, and one of the most vigorous and effective preachers of his day. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 92.

## Robinson, William (2)[[@Headword:Robinson, William (2)]]

             a Congregational minister, and father of Dr. E. Robinson, was born at Lebanon, Conn., Aug. 15, 1754. He was fitted for college in the school of Mr. Tisdale in Lebanon, entered the sophomore class in Yale College in 1770, and graduated in 1773. In 1775 he returned to New Haven to study theology, united with the Church in Yale College, May 5, 1776, and was licensed to preach May 29. In the summer of 1778, Mr. Robinson was  chosen to a tutorship in Yale College, and held that office one year, preaching in the towns adjacent. He was invited in December, 1778, to settle in Southington, which call he accepted, but was not ordained until June 13, 1780. So limited was his income that he was obliged to devote considerable of his time to agricultural pursuits. He was retired from active duties in September, 1820, after a ministry of forty-one years and two months, and died in 1825 on the anniversary of his birth. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 131.

## Robinson, William S.[[@Headword:Robinson, William S.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Harrison County, Ky., in 1825. He joined the Church in his eighteenth year, was licensed to preach in August 1851, and was received on trial in the North Indiana Conference in 1852. In 1854 he was admitted into full membership, but was obliged to give up his work in May, and on July 11, 1855, he died. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1855, p. 619.

## Roboam[[@Headword:Roboam]]

             ( ῾Ροβοάμ), the Greek form (Ecclesiastes 47:23; Mat 1:7) of the name of king Rehoboam (q.v.).

## Roc[[@Headword:Roc]]

             SEE ROK.

## Rocaberti, Juan Tomas De[[@Headword:Rocaberti, Juan Tomas De]]

             a Spanish prelate, was born at Perelada, Catalonia, March 4, 1627. While very young, he took the habit of St. Dominic at the Convent of Gerona, but later removed to that of Valencia. In 1666 he was provincial of Aragon, was elected general of the order in 1670, and in 1676 was nominated archbishop of Valencia by Charles II. This prince twice made him viceroy of that province, and in 1695 gave him the title of “grand inquisitor of the faith.” He died at Madrid June 13, 1699. The following are his principal works: Alimento Espiritual, Cotidiano Exercicio de Meditaciones (Barcelona, 1668) Teologia Mistica (ibid. 1699): — De Romani Pontifcis Auctoritate (Valencia, 1691-94). The last named work, though held in great esteem in Spain and Italy, was not so regarded in France, where it was considered contrary to the doctrines of the fathers, and the Parliament of Paris forbade its sale in 1695. Rocaberti also collected and printed at his  own expense all the works which upheld the pontifical authority and infallibility. This collection is entitled Bibliothecea Pontificia Maxima (Rome, 1695-99). As general of his order, he edited the works of several Dominicans which had never before appeared. See Antonio, Bibl. Hispana Nova.

## Rocca, Angiolo[[@Headword:Rocca, Angiolo]]

             a learned Italian prelate, was born in Rocca Contrada, Naples, in 1545. In 1552 he took the habit among the Hermits of St. Augustine, and afterwards continued his studies at Rome, Venice, Perugia, and Padua, receiving the title of doctor of divinity at the University of Padua in September 1577. In 1579, Fivizani, vicargeneral of the Augustinians, invited him to become his secretary. Pope Sixtus V placed him in the Vatican in 1585, and confided to his superintendence those editions of the Bible, the councils, and the fathers issued from the apostolical press during his pontificate. In 1595 Clement VIII made him apostolical sacristan and titular bishop of Tagaste, in Numidia. He presented his large and excellent library to the Augustinian monastery at Rome (Oct. 23, 1614), on condition that it should always be open to the public. He died April 8, 1620. Among his works are, Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana: — Bibliotheca Theologica et Scripturalis: — Notes in Novum Testamentum: — De Patientia: — De Cometis: — Observationes in VI Libros Elegantiarum, etc.: and Observationes de Lingua Latina, etc. (1719, printed together, 2 vols. fol.).

## Roch, St.[[@Headword:Roch, St.]]

             a wonder worker of the Romish Church, respecting whom there is evidence to show that he was born at Montpellier, about A.D. 1295; that he visited the towns of Italy during an epidemic to nurse the sick, and effected cures by the might of his prayers; that he subsequently returned to his native city, and was there imprisoned during several years on the charge of being a spy; and that he died in 1327. It is said that while himself sick of the plague, and lying in a hovel in the neighborhood of Piacenza, he was saved from starvation by a hound, who brought him bread from time to time. The stories of his descent from a royal stock and of his having attained the cardinalate are wholly fabulous. Various miracles are said to have been wrought by him after his death. A plague which broke out at Costnitz during the sessions of a council was stilled by invoking the aid of  “the blessed confessor and physician Rochus.” It is said that his body was stolen in 1485 and brought to Venice; but Montpellier, Turin, Antwerp, and other towns boast that they possess genuine relics of St. Roch, and churches and chapels bearing his name are found in all the important towns of Roman Catholic Europe. A Confraternitas S. Rochi, a Morbo Epidemioe Liberatoris, has existed in Rome since the close of the 15th century, and was endowed with rich privileges and exemptions by popes Alexander VI, Leo X, and Pius IV; and associations bearing similar names were formed at Bologna, Venice, Turin, Aries, and Antwerp — one having been founded in the place last named so late as 1685. St. Roch is commemorated Aug. 16. See Acta Sanctorum, Aug. 3, 380-414,

## Rochat, Auguste Louis Philippe[[@Headword:Rochat, Auguste Louis Philippe]]

             a Protestant theologian of Switzerland, was born July 17, 1789, at Crassier, Vaud. In 1812 he was ordained, and acted as preacher at different places. In 1825 he founded an independent Church at Rolles, in which he labored till his death, March 7, 1847. Rochat wrote, Meditations (1832): — La Nature, la Constitution et le But de l'Eglise du Christ (1837): — Meditations sur Diverses Portions de la Parole de Dieu (1838): —  Oeuvres Posthumes (1848). See Burnier, Notice sur Auguste Rochat (Lausanne, eod.); A. de Montet, Dictionnaire des Genev. et des Vaud, 2:383, 384; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rochechouart (Mortemart), Marie Madelaine Gabrielle De[[@Headword:Rochechouart (Mortemart), Marie Madelaine Gabrielle De]]

             abbess of Fontevrault, was born in 1645. The daughter of the duke of Mortemart, she was possessed of a great degree of the beauty which rendered her sister, Madame de Montespan, so famous. At the age of twenty she took the veil at Bois, and in 1670 became abbess and superior of the Order of Fontevrault. She was well read, and conversant with the literature of the Italian, Spanish, Greek, and Latin languages, as well as of her own. After her death, which occurred Aug. 15, 1704, there were found among her papers several dissertations on piety, morals, and criticism. One is entitled Question sur la Politesse, which may be found in the Recueil de Divers Ecrits, by Saint-Hyacilthe (Brussels, 1736). See Gallia Christiana.

## Rochemore, Pierre Joseph[[@Headword:Rochemore, Pierre Joseph]]

             was bishop of Montpellier in 1802. He refused to exercise his ecclesiastical functions in order to avoid leaving Nismes, where he was vicar-general. He died in 1811.

## Rochet[[@Headword:Rochet]]

             a linen garment worn by bishops under the chimere (q.v.). The word appears first about the 13th century, being called sarcos at Cambrai and saroht by John of Liege. The Council of Buda (1279) mentions it as the white camisia, or rosettta, worn under the cappa, or mantle when walking or riding. Between 1305 and 1377 the popes introduced it at Avignon, but it was of far earlier date, having been in common use in the 7th century, and identified with the linea prescribed by the Ordo Romanus. In the following ages the bishops were obliged by the canon law to wear their  rochet whenever they appeared in public; and this practice was long kept up in England, but has been abandoned since the Reformation, except in Parliament and in Convocation, over the scarlet habit. Secular prelatic prothonotaries, and canons who had the right to use it, put it on over the vestis talaris before robing for mass. The rubric of the First Common Prayer Book of Edward VI prescribes that the bishop shall wear the rochet at communion. The rochet, according to Lyndwood, was sleeveless, and worn by the server to the priest, and by the latter in baptizing. The chief difference between this garment and the surplice was that its sleeves were nary rower than those of the latter. The modern full sleeve is not earlier than the time of bishop Overall. Before and after the Reformation, till Elizabeth's time, the rochet was always of scarlet silk, but bishop Hooper changed it for a chimere of black satin. Bale describes the clergy wearing white rochets of raines (linen of Rennes or Rheims), or fine linen cloth. See Walcott, Sac. Archoeol.; Hook, (Ch. Dict.; Eden, Theol. Dict.; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v. SEE ORNAMENTS.

## Rochus[[@Headword:Rochus]]

             a carver of San Lucar, Spain, whose principal business was to make images of saints and other popish idols. Convinced of the errors of Romanism, he embraced the Protestant faith, and followed the business of seal engraver only. An image of the Virgin had been retained as a sign, and a papal inquisitor passing asked him if he would sell it, and the price. Rochus gave the price, and the inquisitor offered him half the money; upon which Rochus replied, “I had rather break it in pieces than take such a trifle.” “Break it in pieces if you dare,” said the inquisitor. Rochus took a chisel and cut off the nose of the image, for which offense he was burned.

## Rock[[@Headword:Rock]]

             (properly סֶלִע, or צוּר, πέτρα). Palestine is a mountainous and stony country, abounding in caves and fastnesses where the inhabitants sought shelter from sudden invasions of enemies, and where bands of robbers frequently formed their dens. Thus when the Benjamites were overcome, they secured themselves in the rock Rimmon, and David hid himself from Saul in the caves of Adullam, Engedi, and Maon. These ravines furnish a great number of defensible positions, which have been the scene of many deadly struggles, from the days of the Canaanites down to the present hour. The prevailing rock is a dark-gray limestone, which, though it has a  most saddening aspect of barrenness and desolation, is very susceptible of cultivation, being easily worked into terraces, which give support to the soil, and facilitate the fertilizing process of irrigation. Travelers who now visit the land are disposed, at the first view, to doubt the ancient accounts of its fertility; they can scarcely bring themselves to believe that these barren wastes were the promised land “flowing with milk and honey;” but a more attentive examination of the country affords abundant evidence that its present sterility is owing to the nature of its government, which, affording no security either for life or property, prevents the husbandman from tilling the soil when he is uncertain whether he shall reap its fruits. Indeed, it may be generally said that a country of limestone rock will be found one of the best in rewarding the labor of cultivation, and one of the worst in spontaneous produce. SEE CAVE; SEE HILL.

Rock is frequently used in Scripture in a figurative sense of the ancestor of a nation, the quarry whence it was derived (Isa 51:1). It is also used in a metaphorical sense of God, as the “Rock,” i.e. the strength and refuge of his people (Deu 32:4; 2Sa 23:3; Psa 18:2). The rock from which the Hebrews were supplied with water in the desert was a figure or type of Christ (1Co 10:4). So the term rock is used of the grand doctrine of Christ's eternal supremacy, which is the foundation of the Christian system (Mat 16:18). SEE STONE.

## Rock, Daniel[[@Headword:Rock, Daniel]]

             a learned Roman Catholic, was born at Liverpool, England, in 1799, and educated at Old Hall, Herts, and in the English College, Rome. After serving the mission in London for two years, he became domestic chaplain to the earl of Shrewsbury, and in 1840 took charge of the Church at Buckland, Berks, which he resigned in 1854. On the reintroduction into England of the Roman hierarchy (1852), he was one among those first made canons of Southwark. He died Nov. 28, 1871. Rock published, Hierurgia, or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass (Lond. 1833, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d ed. 1850, 8vo): — The Church of our Fathers, etc. (vol. 1, 2, ibid. 1849, 8vo; vol 3, 1853-54): — Transubstantiation Vindicated: The Mystic Crown of Mary; also minor publications, See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rockwell, Joel Edson, D.D[[@Headword:Rockwell, Joel Edson, D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Salisbury, Vermont, May 4, 1816. In 1837 he graduated from Amherst College, and in 1841 from Union Theological Seminary, N.Y. The same Year he became pastor of the Presbyterian Church at Valatie; in 1847 of the Hanover Street Church, Wilmington, Delaware; in 1851 of the Central Presbyterian Church, Brooklyn, N.Y. After laboring constantly for eighteen years, he spent five months in Europe for the benefit of his health. During the war of the rebellion he served as a member of the Christian Commission. In 1878 he became pastor of the Edgewater Presbyterian Church, on Staten Island, where he remained until his death, July 29, 1882. Besides fulfilling the duties of an active pastor during all these years, he was a prolific writer, and contributed to a number of religious periodicals. See (N.Y.) Observer, August 3, 1882; Evangelist, same date. (W.P.S.)

## Rockwood, Elisha, D.D[[@Headword:Rockwood, Elisha, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Chesterfield, N.H., May 9, 1778. He graduated from Dartmouth College in 1802; taught an academy in Plymouth, Massachusetts, two years; was tutor in Dartmouth College; while there studied theology, and in 1806 was approbated by the Londonderry Presbytery. After preaching as an occasional supply in several places in Vermont and Massachusetts, he was ordained in Westboro', October 28, 1808; was dismissed March 11, 1835; and finally was pastor in Swansey, N.H., from November 16,1836, until his death, June 19, 1858. See Hist: of Mendon Association, page 164. (J.C.S.)

## Rockwood, Lubim Burton[[@Headword:Rockwood, Lubim Burton]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Wilton, N.H., April 8, 1816. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1839, and entered the Andover Theological Seminary, where he remained two years, and then entered the Union Theological Seminary, where he also remained two years, graduating in 1843. He was ordained to the Gospel ministry in 1845, and became the financial agent of Union Theological Seminary. He was called to the pastorate of the Congregational Church at Rocky Hill, Conn., in 1850, and continued in charge of the same until 1858, when he accepted the position of district secretary of the American Tract Society of New York, and subsequently of that of Boston, Mass. He died while engaged in this work, May 7, 1872. (W.P.S.)

## Rococo[[@Headword:Rococo]]

             a name given to the very debased style of architecture and decoration which succeeded the first revival of Italian architecture. It is ornamental design run mad, without principle or taste. This style prevailed in Germany and Belgium during last century, and in France during the time of Henry IV. The following figure is an example from an altar in the Church of St. James, Antwerp.

## Rod[[@Headword:Rod]]

             stands in the A.V. as the representative of several different Hebrew words, and consequently has various significations in the Scriptures (חֹטֶר, choter, a shoot, Pro 14:3; Isa 11:1; מִקֵּל, makkel, a twig, Gen 30:37-39; Gen 30:41; Gen 32:10; Exo 12:11; Num 22:27; 1Sa 17:40; 1Sa 17:43; Jer 1:11; Jer 48:17; Eze 39:9; Hos 4:12; Zec 11:7; Zec 11:10; Zec 11:14; elsewhere מִטֶּה, matteh, a stick, especially for walking or smiting, or שֶׁבֶט, shebet, the baton of office; ῥαβδός). It signifies a wand or walking staff: as Moses' rod (Exo 4:2; Exo 4:4), Aaron's rod (7:9), Jonathan's rod (1Sa 14:27). The rods of Moses and Aaron were the visible means chosen by the Almighty for the instrument of his wonders in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness. The rod of Moses is sometimes called “the rod of God” (Exo 4:20; Exo 7:9; Exo 7:12; Exo 7:19-20; Exo 8:5; Exo 8:17; Exo 9:23; Exo 10:13). Aaron's rods, which miraculously  blossomed and brought forth almonds, was laid up as a memorial in the holy place (Num 17:8; Num 17:10; Heb 9:4). As the wonders wrought by the instrumentality of Moses' and Aaron's rods attracted the attention of neighboring nations, it is not extraordinary if, in course of time, these personages were interwoven with mythology (see Willemer, De Baculo Mosis [Viteb. 1680]). It has been plausibly conjectured that Aaron's rod, which in its serpent state devoured the serpent rods of the Egyptian magicians, was the prototype of the caduceus, or wonder working rod of Mercury, which was figured as entwined with two serpents. Aaron's rod was caused to blossom miraculously and bring forth almonds (Num 17:8) to show God's election for the priesthood. Parkhurst thinks that the rods of the chiefs among the Israelites were of the almond tree, to denote vigilance, that being an early tree, flowering before all others. The shepherd's staff is called “a rod;” and the tithe of the herd, or of the flock, was to be taken from “whatsoever passed under the rod,” i.e. from whatsoever required the shepherd's care (27:32; Jer 33:13; Eze 20:37; Mic 7:14). The term “rod” also means a shoot or branch of a tree, and in this sense is applied figuratively to Christ as a descendant of Jesse (Isa 11:1). “Rod” is used to designate the tribes of Israel as springing from one root (Psa 74:2; Jer 10:16). It is used as the symbol of power and authority (Psa 2:9; Psa 120:2; Psa 125:3; Jer 48:17; Eze 19:11; Rev 2:27); of that which supports and strengthens, a stay or staff (Psa 23:4; Isa 3:1; Eze 29:6); and of the afflictions with which God disciplines his people (Job 9:34; Heb 12:6-7). (See Cooper, Hist. of the Rod in all Countries and Ages [2d ed. Lond. 1877].) SEE SCEPTRE; SEE STAFF.

A peculiar use of rods is afforded in the instance of those of poplar and hazel (more properly the wild almond) which Jacob partially peeled, and set in the water where Laban's cattle drank, and by looking at which they brought forth speckled and ring-streaked young. Commentators are not agreed as to the effect thus produced: whether it was natural or miraculous; whether the sight of the rods had naturally such an effect on the animals' perceptions as to influence the markings of their offspring, in the manner that children often receive marks before birth, from some object that has impressed itself on the mother's mind, or whether it was a special operation of God in Jacob's favor, which, in fact, seems clearly intimated in Gen 31:10; Gen 31:12. where Jacob declares himself to have  been guided on this subject by God in a dream. The Latin fathers considered the case as natural, the Greek as miraculous, which is also the prevailing opinion of modern commentators, who consider it very doubtful whether the same cause (the use of variegated rods) would now certainly produce the same effects. SEE POPLAR.

Rhabdomancy, or divining by rods, became a common superstition or idolatrous custom among the Jews, arising, doubtlessly, from the ideas of supernatural agency attached to the rods of Moses and Aaron. It is alluded to in Hos 4:12 “My people ask counsel at their stocks, and their staff declareth unto them.” It was performed, first, by inscribing certain characters on small rods, and then drawing them, like lots, out of a vessel; secondly, by measuring the rod in spans, and saying, alternately, words expressing a negative and an affirmative, and then determining, according to the last span, whether negative or affirmative, to do the intended action or not; thirdly, by erecting two sticks, repeating a charm, and then determining by certain rules, according as the sticks fell backward or forward, to the right or to the left. SEE DIVINATION.

## Rodanim[[@Headword:Rodanim]]

             SEE DODANIM.

## Rodburne[[@Headword:Rodburne]]

             SEE RUDBORNE.

## Rodgers, Ebenezer[[@Headword:Rodgers, Ebenezer]]

             a Baptist minister, was born March 16, 1788, in the Blaina valley, Monmouthshire, England. He studied with the Rev. Samuel Kilpin of Leominster, Herefordshire, for two years, and was then admitted into the Baptist College at Stepney, London, where he spent four years. Soon after the completion of his studies, he came to America on secular business, intending to return in a few months. He was persuaded by some of his friends to visit the State (then Territory) of Missouri, and for a time relinquished his purpose of returning to his native land. A Baptist church was soon formed at Chariton, about 175 miles west of St. Louis, and Mr. Rodgers was ordained its pastor, though he did not confine his labors to this one locality. He engaged in teaching in order to defray expenses of living. This itinerant life continued for about sixteen years, during which he assisted in the organization of about fifty churches. In 1832 he visited  Wales, and in 1834 became pastor of the churches in Alton and Upper Alton, Ill., but after a year gave his undivided service to the latter. He then resigned, but immediately became pastor of two or three other churches. He continued preaching and acting as trustee of Shurtleff College until his death, May 25, 1854. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 681.

## Rodgers, James[[@Headword:Rodgers, James]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Roxburghshire, in the South of Scotland, in 1785. His parents were in humble circumstances, and his education was limited to that which could be acquired in the common school. He owed much to his early religious training, and in childhood he had been so thoroughly drilled in the doctrines of the Shorter Catechism that in later years, planted on this foundation, he stood unmoved amid hosts of heresies. He dated his conversion from his fourteenth year. In 1819 he emigrated to this country, and settled in the then new colony of Hammond, St. Lawrence Co., N.Y. He was licensed March 23, 1823, and ordained as an evangelist June 9, 1824. For a number of years he continued to labor in Hammond and some of the adjoining churches. He also gave a partial supply to a church in the township of Oswegatchie, where he finally settled as stated supply in 1827, and was installed as the regular pastor May 13, 1839. In 1848 failing health rendered regular labor impossible, and he resigned this charge, although he continued to labor for short periods in other fields. He died Aug. 20, 1863. Mr. Rodgers was a remarkable man, and he proved himself an efficient and successful workman. His pulpit services were characterized by rich scriptural knowledge, great earnestness, and deep spirituality. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 114. (J.L.S.)

## Rodgers, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Rodgers, John, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Boston, Aug. 5, 1727. After studying theology, he was licensed by the Presbytery of Newcastle in October, 1747. After this he went to Virginia, but not being permitted to preach there, he went to Maryland, and early in 1748 returned to Pennsylvania, where on March 16, 1749, he was installed pastor of the congregation of St. George, where his ministrations proved very acceptable. In 1754 he spent some months in Virginia as substitute of Rev. Samuel Davies during the latter's absence in England. In 1762 he was himself appointed by the Synod of New York and Philadelphia to visit England to solicit  subscriptions to a fund for the benefit of the Presbyterian ministry, but family reasons obliged him to decline. In 1765 he was elected one of the trustees of the College of New Jersey, which office he resigned in 1807. In 1765 he dissolved his relation with the Church of St. George, and became pastor of a congregation in New York. In 1768 he was made doctor of divinity by the University of Edinburgh. During the Revolutionary war he showed himself devoted to the cause of his country, and was several times consulted by Washington. In May, 1776, he removed with his family to Greenfield, Conn., but being appointed chaplain to general Heath's brigade on York Island, he at once entered upon his duties. He was obliged to resign in November of the same year, however, business calling him to Georgia. On his return, in April, 1777, he was appointed chaplain of the New York State Convention in session at Esopus, and afterwards served the Council of Safety in the same capacity, as well as the first Legislature of the State under the new constitution. In 1780 he removed to Danbury, Conn., and in 1782 accepted a call from the church of Lamington, N.J., when, in 1783, the close of the war permitted him to return to New York, where he resumed his former connection, with the aid of an assistant after April, 1785. Shortly after, he was appointed vice-chancellor of the Board of Regents of the University of New York, and in 1789 he was chosen moderator of the General Assembly at Philadelphia. In 1809 his health became greatly impaired, and he died May 7, 1811. Besides some miscellaneous articles in connection with the Episcopal controversy, and several Sermons in the American Preacher, Dr. Rodgers published A Sermon before a Masonic Lodge, at Stockbridge, Mass. (1779): — A National Thanksgiving Sermon (1783): — A Sermon on the Death of Dr. Witherspoon (1794): — and A Sermon at the Opening of the Cedar Street Church (1808). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, -154.

## Rodgers. Ravaud Kearney, D.D.[[@Headword:Rodgers. Ravaud Kearney, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in N.Y. city, Nov. 3,1796. He was the son of John R.B. Rodgers, M.D., surgeon in the Revolutionary army, practicing physician, and professor in the medical department of Columbia College, New York city. His grandfather, John Rodgers, D.D., was minister of the First Church, in New York, founder of the Brick Church, and the first moderator of the General Assembly in 1789. In the year 1815 Ravaud K. graduated at Princeton College. and in 1818 he graduated at the Princeton Theological Seminary. In 1820 he was ordained and installed pastor of the Sandy Hill and Glenn's Falls Presbyterian churches, N.Y. He  remained ten years in that field. He was an ardent, noble, earnest young preacher, and associated with Drs. Bullions, Proudfit, Prime, and others in the Bible cause, education, and all great works of social improvement and philanthropy. With a voice of trumpet power and glowing eloquence, he was a favorite at all great public meetings and anniversaries, and a leader in every good work. Genial, warm hearted, and generous, he was a general favorite. In the year 1830 he received a call from the Presbyterian Church at Bound Brook, N.J., and, accepting the same, was installed pastor; and at that place, and in the Synod and the State of New Jersey, he left the impress of a pure and useful life. No minister of that State was more generally known or more universally respected. On all social occasions his presence was indispensable as the most agreeable and entertaining of men. As a member and officer of ecclesiastical bodies — whether General Assembly, Synod, or Presbytery — his great excellence of character and peculiar executive ability were illustrated. For a long time he was stated clerk of the New Jersey Synod, and a more faithful, popular, and accomplished servant never filled that office. His assiduity in the discharge of official duty, his punctuality in attendance, his perfect knowledge of the law and practice of the Church, and his clear, incisive, and able exposition of the constitution, which was always at his command, rendered him an authority in the courts of the Church. He was a model pastor, knowing all his people and their families. He called his own sheep by name; he carried them in his heart, and went about among them to do them good, for he was their trusted counsellor and confidential friend. He entered his pulpit with sermons thoroughly prepared, which he delivered with energy, life, and power. Even down to old age he was strong in the work of the ministry, and at seventy-five could outwork many of his younger brethren. As he drew near to fourscore, he resigned his pastoral charge, which he had held unbroken for forty-five years. In 1874 he removed to Athens, Ga., where in the home of his daughter he spent the calm and beautiful evening of a long, laborious, and honored life. He was a philosopher as well as a Christian, the divine presence being as real to him as the light of the sun; and living in that light, he was as ready to die as to live; for, “whether living or dying, he was the Lord's.” He died at Athens, Ga., Jan. 12, 1879. (W.P.S.)

## Rodigast, Samuel[[@Headword:Rodigast, Samuel]]

             rector of the gymnasium of the Gray Convent in Berlin from 1698 to 1708, and previously adjunct professor in the University of Jena. He was intimately acquainted with Philip J. Spener to the time of his death, in  1705. His claim to recognition in this place lies in his having composed the hymn Was Gott thut, das ist wohlgethan (1675), which has become a classic, and is used wherever the German tongue is known. It was a favorite with Frederick William III of Prussia, and was rendered on the occasion of his funeral, June 11, 1840.

## Rodiger, Emil[[@Headword:Rodiger, Emil]]

             doctor and professor of the Oriental languages at the Uniyersity of Berlin, was born Oct. 13, 1801, at Sangerhausen. In 1821 he left the gymnasium at Halle, and entered the university for the study of theology and philology. In 1828 he commenced his lectures; in 1830 he was made extraordinary, and in 1835 ordinary, professor of Oriental languages. In 1860 he was called to Berlin, where he died, June 15, 1874. He was one of the first editors of the Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, which review also contains a great many of his articles pertaining to Oriental literature. He wrote, Commentatio, quo Vulgata Opinio de interpretibus Arab. Libr. V. T. Histor. Refut. (Halle, 1828): — Chrestom. Syr. c. Gloss. (ibid. 1838): — De Origine et Indole Arabicoe Librorum V. T. Historicorum Interpretationis Libri Duo (ibid. 1829). But his main work is his continuation of Gesenius's great Novus Thesaurus Philolog.-criticus Linsguce Hebr. et Chald. V. T. (Lips. 1853). He also edited several editions of his Teacher's Hebrew Gramnmar. See Literarischer Handweiser, 1874, p. 236; Schneider, Theologisches Jahrbuch, 1875, p. 375 sq.; Winer, Theologisches Handbuch, 1, 58; 2, 737; Fiirst, Bibliotheca Judaica, 3, 162; Steinschneider, Bibliographisches 1andbuch, p. 52 sq.; and Index to vol. 1-30 of the Zeitschrijf der deutschen morgenl. Gesellschaft. (B. P.)

## Rodiger, Moritz[[@Headword:Rodiger, Moritz]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Sangerhausen, April 29, 1804, and died at Halle, October 13, 1837, doctor of philosophy. He is the author of Synopsis Evangeliorum Pericopis Parallelis (2d ed. Halle, 1839). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:245. (B.P.)

## Rodon[[@Headword:Rodon]]

             SEE DERODON.

## Rodriguez, Girao[[@Headword:Rodriguez, Girao]]

             called Father Joao, a Portuguese missionary, was born near Lisbon in 1559. He entered the Jesuit order in 1576, and in 1583 went to Japan, where he gave himself to the study of the language. He soon spoke the dialect of Nagasaki with fluency, received the protection of the government, and consequently escaped the persecutions to which the other missionaries were subjected. He returned to Europe late in life, and died in  1o33. His principal work was printed at Nagasaki, and was entitled Arte da Lingua do Japao (1604). It was translated into French by Laludresse and annotated by Remusat (1825). Rodriguez also wrote letters on the persecutions to which Christians were subjected in Japan, entitled Cartas Annuas de Nangazachi dos Annos 1604 e 1605, transl. into Latin (Antw. 1611-12) and into Italian (1808-10): — Annuas de 1609 e 1610 (Rome, 1615). Some smaller works of Rodriguez appeared at Rome in 1615 and 1632. See Antonio, Bibl. Hispana; Pages, Bibliogr. Japonaise.

## Roe[[@Headword:Roe]]

             is properly the rendering in the A.V. of צְבַיָּה, tsebiyah (Son 4:5; Son 7:3), which is the fem. of צְבַי, tsebi, the ROE-buck (so called from its beauty, Deu 12:15; Deu 12:22; Deu 14:5; Deu 15:22; 1Ki 4:23; elsewhere improperly “roe,” 2Sa 2:18; 1Ch 12:8; Pro 6:5; Son 2:7; Son 2:9; Son 2:17; Son 3:5; Son 8:14; Isa 13:14; “beauty,” 2Sa 1:19). These are the masculine and feminine appellations of an antelope, which was considered the very impersonation of beauty; and so, in the later Hebrew Scriptures, i.e. from Isaiah downward; it is always used in an abstract sense, and is rendered by such terms as “glory,” “beauty,” “ornament,” “delight,” etc. The word was not only found in the various Aramaean dialects of Western Asia, but has spread to nations where we should have little expected to find it, as those of the extreme south of Africa. Thus the elegant springbok of the Cape Colony (Antilope euchore), an animal nearly allied to the gazelles of Asia, is named tsebi by the Bechuanas, and tesbe by the Caffres. The Sept. generally renders the word by δορκάς; and this is given in the New Test. as the Greek equivalent of the Syriac tabitha (Act 9:36), which is but the feminine form with the ts softened to t by the dropping of the sibilant.

The animal in question is the dorcas gazelle of the modern Orientals (Antilope dorcas), the most abundant of all the ruminants inhabiting Palestine and its vicinity in a state of freedom. It appears to be replaced in the surrounding regions by what some naturalists consider as distinct, though closely allied, species, and others are disposed to view as only local varieties of the same. Thus in Asia Minor, extending southward into Syria  and eastward into Central Asia, there is the ahu (Antilope subgutturosa), with rather stouter horns than the gazelle; in Western India the kalsepi (A. Bennettii, Sykes; A. cora, H. Smith), closely like the gazelle, but higher on the limbs, with the tail entirely black, and scarcely gregarious; all along the eastern shore of the Red Sea lives the ariel gazelle (A. Arabica), scarcely to be distinguished from A. dorcas except by being somewhat darker in color, and usually a little slighter in form. On the continent of Africa we have, in the north of Abyssinia, the A. Soemmeringii of Rüppel, an animal considerably larger than the gazelle, with boldly lyrate horns, and associating in pairs; on the western side of the desert, the kevel (A. kevella), nearer the gazelle, but with the horns compressed, more annulated, and lyrate; and, finally, in the southern half of the continent, the springbok (A. euchore) and the blessbok (A. pygarga), large species with lyrate horns, and the sides and flanks marked with conspicuous dark bands, which enclose a white patch on the buttocks. These merge into another group, chiefly inhabiting North Africa, containing the mhorr and the addra. SEE PYGARG. Of all these species the tsebi properly includes only the A. dorcas and A. Arabica; and in all probability these were not distinguished, but supposed. Stanley (Syr. and Palest. p. 207) says that the signification of the word Ajalon, the valley “of stags,” is still justified by “the gazelles which the peasants hunt on its mountain slopes.” Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 252) says that the mountains of Naphtali “abound in gazelles to this day.” SEE ANTELOPE.

So elegant is the form, so light and slender the limbs, so graceful the movements, so shy and timid the disposition, of the gazelle that the Oriental genius has ever delighted to make it the representative of female loveliness. The eye in particular is large, soft, liquid, languishing, and of the deepest black--qualities which are so admired in the eyes of an Oriental woman that to say “she has the eyes of a gazelle” is the most flattering compliment that can be paid to beauty. The poetry of the Arabs and Persians is full of such allusions, while the lightness and fleetness of the creature afford similes by which to illustrate the activity and grace of the youthful man. David, in his exquisite elegy on the death of Saul and Jonathan, calls his friend “the gazelle of Israel” (2Sa 1:19); and in the Song of Songs the comparison is frequently interchanged between the bridegroom and the bride. What can be more exquisite than the compound simile in ch. 4:5? Ashael, the brother of Joab, was “as light of foot as one of the gazelles in the field” (2Sa 2:18); and the Gadites who  gathered to David in the wilderness were “men of might, . . . whose faces were like the faces of lions, and who were as swift as gazelles upon the mountains” (1Ch 12:8). The gentle Tabitha of Joppa, the loving and beloved (Act 9:36), was doubtless so named because of her beauty, real or fancied. The gazelle was permitted to be eaten by the law of Moses, as it is a typical ruminant. It seems to have even been a standard of lawful and proper food — “Thou mayest eat flesh,... even as the gazelle ... is eaten” (Deu 12:15; Deu 12:22). Whereas hitherto they had eaten the flesh of their flocks and herds only on occasions of these being offered in sacrifice, now that they were about to become a settled and an agricultural people, they might kill and eat their domestic animals without any such restriction, as freely as they had been accustomed to eat the gazelles which they took in hunting. It is probable that this animal formed a considerable portion of the animal food of the Hebrews, not only in their desert wanderings, but before and after their captivity in Egypt. The venison which Isaac loved, and which Esau took with his quiver and his bow, and which could not be distinguished from kid when this latter was suitably dressed (Genesis 27), was doubtless the flesh of the gazelle. To this day the valley of Gerar and the plains of Beersheba are the haunts of vast flocks of these agile creatures, and still the pastoral Arabs hunt them there and make savory meat. SEE GAZELLE.

The paintings of ancient Egypt present us with numerous examples of gazelle hunting. Sometimes a battue is depicted, in which all the game of the country is driven before, the hounds. In such scenes the great predominance given to the gazelle shows how large a proportion this animal bore to other quarry. Sometimes the capture of the wild animal alive was the object desired; in this case it was either trapped or snared in some way, or shot with blunt-headed arrows, and the hunter is seen leading home the gentle gazelle by the horns. Occasionally, too, this was accomplished by throwing the lasso, as wild horses are now taken on the South American pampas. Large herds of gazelles were kept by the Egyptian land holders in their parks and preserves, like deer with us. Frequently, however, the hounds, which were held two or three in leash, were loosed after the fleet-footed antelope, and pulled it down by sheer running, the hunter running on foot, which implies that the course could not have been long. At present, however, though large herds of gazelles are common enough, and the sport of chasing them is as keenly relished as ever, no breed of dogs cultivated in the East has a chance of bringing one  down in a fair open run. They are hunted by the Arabs with a falcon and a greyhound. The repeated attacks of the bird upon the head of the animal so bewilder it that it falls an easy prey to the greyhound, which is trained to watch the flight of the falcon. Many of these antelopes are also taken in pitfalls, into which they are driven by the shouts of the hunters. (See Addison, Damascus and Palmyra, 2, 340; Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 392; and Burckhardt, Notes, p. 220.) The group of antelopes to which this article is devoted, generically named Gazella by some naturalists, is thus characterized: the horns, which are permanent, and present in both sexes, are lyrate, with solid bony cores. The lachrymal sinuses are distinct and movable, the interdigital pits and inguinal pores are large. The knees are generally furnished with tufts of hair. A dark streak runs through the eye. The inside of the ear is marked with lines, occasioned by the alternation of bands of white hair; the color of the sides and flanks, some hue of warm brown, is separated from the white of the belly by a dark line. The nose is sheep like. See Tristram. Nat Hist. of the Bible, p. 127 sq.; Bible Educator, 2, 135 SEE DEER.

In Pro 5:19, the word Roe represents the Heb. yaalah', יִעֲלָה, properly the female ibex or young she-goat; here used as an epithet for a lovely woman (Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 899; Gesen. Thesaur. s.v. יָעִל). SEE GOAT.

YOUNG ROE in the Song of Solomon (4:5) stands for the Heb. o'pher, עֹפֶר(from the root aphar', עָפִר, to be whitish), the Arabic algophro, which denotes the calf or fawn of a stag (ail). It occurs in no other book of Scripture, is unknown in the Syriac and Chaldee, and appears to be only a poetical application of a term more strictly belonging to fawn-like animals; for in the above passage it is applied to couples feeding in a bed of lilies — indications not descriptive of young goats or stags, but quite applicable to the Antilopine groups which are characterized in Griffith's Cuvier, in subgenus X Cephalophus, and in XI Neotragus, both furnishing species of exceeding delicacy and graceful diminutive structures, several of which habitually feed in pairs among shrubs and geraniums on the hilly plains of Africa. And as they have always been, and still are, in request among the wealthy in warm climates for domestication, we may conjecture that a species designated by the name of Opher (עפר, perhaps alluding to איפיר, Ophir, or even Africa) was to be found in the parks or royal gardens of a sovereign so interested in natural history as Solomon was, and  from the sovereign's own observation became alluded to in the truly apposite imagery of his poetical diction (Son 4:12). Among the species in question, in which both male and female are exceedingly similar, and which might have reached him by sea or by caravan, we may reckon Cephalophus Grimmia, C. perpusilla, C. philantomba, all marked by a small black tuft of hair between their very short horns; as also the Neotragus pygmea, or guevei, the smallest of cloven-footed animals; and the madolka, with speckled legs; all these species being natives of Central Africa, and from time immemorial brought by caravans from the interior for sale or presents. SEE HIND.

## Roe, Azel, D.D.[[@Headword:Roe, Azel, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Setauket, Long Island, N.Y., Feb. 20, 1738. He was graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1756, and studied theology under Rev. Caleb Smith, of Newark Mountains (now Orange), N.J. He was licensed to preach by the New York Presbytery in 1759 (or 1760), and was ordained sine titulo by the same presbytery about two years after. In the autumn of 1763 he was installed pastor at Woodbridge, N.J. During the Revolution he proved himself an earnest friend of the colonies. Mr. Roe was trustee of the College of New Jersey for twenty- nine years (1778-1807), a member of the first General Assembly in 1789, and moderator of that body in 1802. He was made doctor of divinity by Yale College in 1800. He died of an affection of the throat, Dec. 2, 1815. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit 3, 232.

## Roe, Charles A.[[@Headword:Roe, Charles A.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was converted at an early age, and received his license to preach when about twenty-three years old. In 1853 he was received on probation in the Rock River Conference, in which he labored until the conference of 1857 granted him a superannuated relation, which he sustained until his death by consumption, Sept. 27, 1859. See Minutes of Annual Conf. 1860, p. 330.

## Roe, Charles Hill, D.D[[@Headword:Roe, Charles Hill, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Kings County, Ireland, January 6, 1800, his father being a clergyman of the Established Church. Having become a Baptist, he entered, in 1822, Horton College, England, and on the completion of his studies became pastor of the Church in Middleton, Lancashire, not confining his labors to his own church, but preaching extensively in all the neighboring region. He acted as secretary of the Home Mission Society from 1834 to 1842, and then became pastor of the Church in Birmingham, where his labors were greatly blessed. He came to the United States in 1851, accepted a call to Belvidere, Illinois, and during a part of the time of the civil war was chaplain of a regiment. He visited England in behalf of the freedmen, and raised funds for educational purposes among them. After a two years' pastorate at Waukesha, Wisconsin, and two years' service for the University of Chicago, he died at Belvidere, June 20, 1872. See Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1008. (J.C.S.)

## Roebuck[[@Headword:Roebuck]]

             SEE ROE.

## Roebuck, J.H.[[@Headword:Roebuck, J.H.]]

             a minister of the Wesleyan Methodist Association, was born in Leeds, England, Feb. 14, 1816. He was awakened at about the age of fifteen years, and when nineteen years of age he was appointed to the Sheffield circuit. While laboring in Manchester he had a public debate with Robert Owen, the founder of socialism, in which he showed great skill. Removing to Glasgow, he still continued his services against Owenism, and was very successful in his ministerial labors. He died Dec. 20, 1840, of disease of the throat. He conducted for a time The Temperance Journal. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Roeh[[@Headword:Roeh]]

             SEE HAROEH.

## Roell, Herman Alexander[[@Headword:Roell, Herman Alexander]]

             a celebrated Protestant divine, was born in 1653 at Doelberg, Westphalia. He studied first at Unna and then at Utrecht, but upon the breaking out of the war he was obliged to go to Göttingen. This place becoming unsafe,he returned to Germany, studied at Marburg, and afterwards at Heidelberg. He then went to Basel and Zurich, and in 1676 he again visited the United Provinces, spending two years at the universities of Utrecht and Leyden. He became chaplain to Elizabeth, abbess of Hervorden, and held that position until her death in 1680, when he was appointed preacher to Albertine, princess of Orange. In 1686 he was elected professor of divinity at the University of Franeker, and in June 1704, was appointed to the divinity chair of Utrecht, which he retained with great reputation until his death, July 12, 1718. Among his publications are, Commentarius in Principium Epistoloe Pauli ad Ephesos (Utrecht, 1715, 4to): — a Continuation, with An Exegesis on Colossians (ibid. 1731, 4to): — Explicatio Catecheseos Heidelbergensis (ibid. 1728): — Exegesis in Psalmum lxxxix (Duisburg, 1728, 8vo): — Gulichii Analysis et Compendium Librorum Propheticorum, etc. (Amherst, 1683,4to): — Oratio Inauguralis de Religione Rationali. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Eccles. Biog. s.v.

## Roeska[[@Headword:Roeska]]

             in Norse mythology, was the sister of Thialfe and servant of Thor.

## Rogatiani[[@Headword:Rogatiani]]

             one of the numerous sects into which Donatism subdivided itself. They took their name from their leader, Rogatus, and flourished in Mauritania Caesariensis (A.D. 372-373).

## Rogation Days[[@Headword:Rogation Days]]

             (Lat. rogare, to beseech) are the three days immediately before the festival of Ascension. About the middle of the 5th century, Mamertus, bishop of Vienna, upon the prospect of some particular calamities that threatened his diocese, appointed that extraordinary prayers and supplications should be offered up with fasting to God for averting those impending evils upon the above mentioned days; from which supplications (called by the Greeks litanies, by the Latins rogations) these days have ever since been called Rogation days. The calamity referred to was a terrible fire which raged in the city of Vienne, Dauphiny, and which suddenly went out in answer to the prayers of the bishop. The same result followed his supplications on the occurrence of a second great fire. Such is the assumed miracle (Thompson, Philos. of Magic, 2, 291). At the time of the Reformation these days were continued for the purpose of retaining the perambulation (q.v.) of the circuits of parishes. In the Church of England it has been thought fit to continue the observance of these days as private fasts. There is no office, or order of prayer, or even a single collect, appointed for the Rogation days in the Prayer book; but there is a homily appointed for Rogation week, which is divided into four parts, the first three to be used on the three Rogation days, and the fourth on the day when the parish make their procession. The days were called in Anglo-Saxon gang daegas; the old form of the name, “gang days,” still lingering in the north of England. There was considerable opposition to the observance of rogations during the fifty days between Easter and Pentecost--a time which was one continued festival in the early Church. The Eastern Church does not keep Rogationtide, and even drops the fasts of Wednesday and Friday during the fifty days. See Bingham, Christian Antiq. 21, 2, 8; Blunt, Dict. of Theol. s.v.; Eden, Theol. Dict. s.v.; Hook, Church Dict. s.v.

## Rogation Sunday[[@Headword:Rogation Sunday]]

             the Sunday immediately preceding Rogation days (q.v.).

## Rogation Week[[@Headword:Rogation Week]]

             the next week but one before Whit-Sunday. SEE ROGATION DAYS.

## Rogda[[@Headword:Rogda]]

             in Slavic mythology, was a Russian hero who slew the serpent's son Tugarin of Bulgaria, invincible to any person born of a woman. Tugarin intended to challenge the prince Vladimir to mortal combat because he had married Lepa, daughter of the king of the Bulgarians, against her father's will, and Lepa made known the secret of Tugarin's invulnerability to her husband. Rogda, who had been taken from his mother's womb by means of an incision made after her death., went forth and successfully encountered the giant.

## Rogel[[@Headword:Rogel]]

             SEE EN-ROGEL.

## Rogelim[[@Headword:Rogelim]]

             (Heb. Rogelim', רֹגְלַים, treaders, i.e. fullers; Sept. ῾Ρωγελλίμ), a place in Gilead, the residence of Barzillai (2Sa 17:27; 2Sa 19:31). It is possibly the present Ajlun, the principal village of Jebel Ajlun, on a wady of the same name, between Jerash and ed-Deir (Jabesh-Gilead).

## Roger (1)[[@Headword:Roger (1)]]

             a Scotch prelate, was lord high chancellor in Scotland in 1178, and was made bishop of the see of St. Andrews in 1188. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 13.

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

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Ross in 1340, and is witness to a grant which Duncan, earl of Fife, made to Robert Lauder about that period. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 188.

## Roger Of Hexham[[@Headword:Roger Of Hexham]]

             SEE RICHARD.

## Roger Of Hoveden[[@Headword:Roger Of Hoveden]]

             an English historian and professor of theology, was born in Yorkshire, and lived beyond 1204, but the exact periods of his birth and death are not known. He is said to have been employed by Henry II in confidential services, such as visiting monasteries. He was by profession a lawyer, but was in the Church, and also a professor of theology at Oxford. After Henryrs death he applied himself diligently to the writing of history, and composed annals from 731, where Bede left off, to 1202, the third year of king John. These annals were first published by Saville among the Historici Anglici (1595; reprinted, Frankfort, 1601, fol.). Vossius says that he wrote also a history of the Northumbrian kings and a life of Thomas a Becket.

## Roger Of Wendover[[@Headword:Roger Of Wendover]]

             an ancient English historian, of whom little is known, embraced the monastic life in the Abbey of St. Alban's, and died May 6, 1237. He published Rogeri de Wendover Chronica, sive Flores Historiarum (formerly ascribed to Matthew Paris), translated from the Latin by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1849, 2 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Roger, Abraham[[@Headword:Roger, Abraham]]

             a Protestant minister, who embarked for the East Indies about 1640, and was pastor at the Dutch factory, Palicat, on the Coromandel coast, for ten years. He died about 1670. From the intercourse he had with the Brahmins he has given a valuable account of their religion and customs — La Vraye Representation de la Religion des Bramines (Amherst, 1670, 4to).

## Rogereens[[@Headword:Rogereens]]

             so called from John Rogers, their chief leader. They appeared in New England about 1677. The principal distinguishing tenet of this denomination was, that worship performed the first day of the week was a species of idolatry which they ought to oppose. In consequence of this they used a variety of measures to disturb those who were assembled for public worship on the Lord's day.

## Rogers, Daniel[[@Headword:Rogers, Daniel]]

             a Puritan divine, was born in 1573, and was educated at Christ's College, Cambridge, of which he was chosen fellow. He became minister of Haversham, Buckinghamshire, and afterwards of Weathersfield, Essex. His death took place in 1652. His publications are: David's Cost (Lond. 1619, 8vo):--Practical Catechism (ibid. 1633, 4to; 1640): — Baptism and the Lord's Supper (3d ed. ibid. 1635, 4to; again, 1636): — Matrimonial Honor (ibid. 1642, 4to): — Naaman the Syrian (lectures on 2Ki 5:9-15) (ibid. 1642-50, fol.): — Prediction concerning King Charles I and Archbishop Laud (ibid. 1692). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rogers, Ebenezer Platt, D.D[[@Headword:Rogers, Ebenezer Platt, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, wag born in New York city, Dec. 18, 1817. He graduated from Yale College in 1837; studied at Princeton Theological Seminary nearly one year; then, because of weakness of the eyes, two years in private with Reverend L.H. Atwater, D.D., at Fairfield, Connecticut; was licensed by the South Association of Litchfield County, June 30, 1840, and ordained by the Hampden Association at Chicopee Falls, Massachusetts, November 4 following. His successive fields of labor were, Chicopee Falls, 1840-43; Northampton, 1843-46; Augusta, Georgia, 1847- 54; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1854-56; Albany, N.Y., 1856-62 New  York city, 1862-81. Part of these labors were in the Congregational Church, part in the Presbyterian, and part in the Reformed Dutch Church. He died at Montclair, N.J., October 22, 1881. He published several volumes on religious subjects, besides many sermons. See Necrol. Report of Princeton Theol. Sem. 1882, page 38.

## Rogers, Elymas P.[[@Headword:Rogers, Elymas P.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Madison, Conn., Feb. 10, 1815. Though reared in humble life, he had devoted Christian parents; they being poor, however, and unable to support their large family, when nine years of age he was sent to live with strangers, and, being the only colored boy in the neighborhood, was looked down upon by those who were prejudiced against his race. His meagre advantages for gaining an education were thereby lessened and his difficulties increased. He returned home in his fifteenth year, and labored with his father until he accepted a situation in the family of major Caldwell, of Hartford, Conn., who wanted a person who would work for his board and have an opportunity of going to school. In 1833 he became a communicant of the Talcott Street congregation in Hartford, Conn. Now he determined to study for the ministry, and in 1836 entered the Oneida Institute in Whitesborough, N.Y., where he remained five years, teaching for his support during the winter, and studying for the ministry during the other portions of the year, until he graduated in 1841. He immediately removed to Trenton, N.J., as principal of the public school for colored children, and there he continued the study of theology under the care of the late Rev. Dr. Eli F. Cooley and the Rev. Dr. John Hall. He was licensed by New Brunswick Presbytery Feb. 7, 1844, and in 1845 was ordained and installed as pastor of the Witherspoon Street Church, Princeton, N.J. In 1846 he became pastor of the Plane Street Church, Newark, N.J., where he continued to preach until Nov. 5, 1860, when he went to Africa, with the object of travelling in the interests of the African Civilization Society, and while engaged in this work, died at Cape Palmas, Jan. 20, 1861. Mr. Rogers was a man of fine gifts, and remarkable poetic talent. Dr. Maclean, ex-president of the College of New Jersey, says of him, “This truly good man ought to be held in respect by all who have any regard for simple and unaffected piety. My estimate of his character was a high one.” He wrote a large number of temperance hymns and two poems, one, The Repeal of the Missouri Compromise Considered; the other, on The Fugitive Slave Law. He published a Thanksgiving Sermon, and Dangers and Duties of Men of Business (Phila. 1835, 8vo). See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 191. (J.L.S.)

## Rogers, Ezekiel[[@Headword:Rogers, Ezekiel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Weathersfield, Essex, England, in 1590. He took the degree of B.A. at Benet College in 1604, and that of  M.A. at Christ's College in 1608, becoming the chaplain of Sir Francis Barrington at Hatfield, Essex. After five or six years, Sir Francis bestowed upon him the benefice of Rowley, Yorkshire, where he exercised his ministry for about twenty years, when he was silenced for nonconformity, though he was allowed the profits of his living for two years longer, and the privilege of nominating his successor. Restless under the restraints upon his liberty, Mr. Rogers came to America in 1638, where he commenced a new settlement in April, 1639, and was ordained in the following December. He continued to labor in this parish until his death, Jan. 23, 1660. Mr. Rogers gave his library to Harvard College, and his house and lands to the town of Rowley for the support of the Gospel. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 120.

## Rogers, Ferdinand, D.D[[@Headword:Rogers, Ferdinand, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in New York state in 1816. He was ordained to the ministry in 1837, and took. charge of his first parish at Brownsville, where he remained till 1846, when he accepted a rectorship in Greene, and continued there till his death, January 17, 1876. See Appleton's Annual Cyclop. 1876, page 623.

## Rogers, George[[@Headword:Rogers, George]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1741, and was for more than fifty years rector of Sproughton, near Ipswich. He published a Sermon (1790, 8vo): — Five Sermons (1818, 12mo); and edited, with a memoir, the Sermons of Rev. Edward Evanson (1806, 2 vols. 8vo). See Gentleman's Mag. 1836, 1, 555; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rogers, George W. T.[[@Headword:Rogers, George W. T.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Holderness, N.H., Feb. 2, 1812, and was converted March, 1830, joining the Church in 1832. He preached his first sermon as local preacher in 1838, and, after preparation, entered the regular work in 1843. In 1864 he became supernumerary, in 1865 effective, in 1867 superannuated, and died at the house of his son in Salem the next year. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 104.

## Rogers, Hester Ann[[@Headword:Rogers, Hester Ann]]

             an eminent saint in the early annals of Methodism, was born in Macclesfield, England, in 1756. Her father, a pious man, died when she was but nine years old, and his peaceful end made an indelible impression upon her mind. She was at first greatly prejudiced against the Methodists; but her interest in them was aroused by hearing one of their preachers, and, although her mother threatened to turn her out of doors in consequence, deepened, until, on a visit of Mr. Wesley to her native place in her twentieth year, she fully joined them. Her maiden name was Roe, and in  1784 Wesley promoted her marriage with James Rogers, one of his most effective preachers, with whom she lived happily, occupied in all evangelical labors, until her death, Oct. 10, 1794, soon after the birth of her fifth child. She was a model of Christian purity and zeal, filling the office of female class leader, and often addressing public congregations with remarkable pathos and power. For twenty years she had been a witness of the experience of perfect love. Her Journal has been published, also her Life, as a part of Methodist literature. See also Stevens, Women of Methodism, p. 98 sq.; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Rogers, Isaiah P.[[@Headword:Rogers, Isaiah P.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was converted in the autumn of 1840, and soon after joined the Church. In July 1846, he was received on trial in the Maine Conference; and when the conference was divided, August 1848, he became a member of the East Maine Conference. He was superannuated June 20, 1849, and held that relation until his death, at Benton, Me., June 20, 1852. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1852, p. 80.

## Rogers, John (1)[[@Headword:Rogers, John (1)]]

             an English divine and martyr, was born about 1500. He was educated at Cambridge, where he entered holy orders, and was appointed chaplain to the English factory at Antwerp, where he remained several years. There he met Tyndale and Coverdale, through whom he was led to renounce popery. He married at Antwerp, and became pastor of a congregation at Wittenberg, which office he retained until the accession of Edward VI. In 1548 he returned to England, invited by bishop Ridley, and was presented with the rectory of St. Margaret Moyses and the vicarage of St. Sepulchre's, both in London, May 10, 1550. Bishop Ridley made him a prebendary of St. Paul's, St. Paneras, and rector of Chigwell, Aug. 24, 1551, and, later, divinity reader. On the Sunday after the entry of queen Mary into London (Thursday, Aug. 3, 1553), he denounced Romanism at St. Paul's Cross, urging the people to continue steadfast in the doctrines taught in king Edward's day. For this he was summoned before the privy council, but defended himself so ably that he was released. On Aug. 18 he was ordered to remain a prisoner in his own house at St. Paul's, from which he refused to make his escape, though frequently urged. After six months he was removed to Newgate, where his confinement was  aggravated by every species of severity. In January, 1555, he was tried before Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and condemned to be burned at Smithfield. Feb. 4, which sentence he bore with great constancy and patience. He translated from Melancthon, A Weighing and Considering of the Interim (Lond. 1548, 16mo); and was compiler of the first authorized English Bible prepared from Tyndale's MSS., Coverdale's translation, published under the assumed name of Thomas Matthew: The Byble, in which is contained the Olde and Newe Testameents, etc., by Thomas Matthew (1537, fol.). It was printed by Grafton and Whitchurch, and copies are in the British Museum, Lambeth, Bodleian, St. Paul's, and other libraries. During his imprisonment, he wrote an account of his examinations, and also other papers, which were providentially preserved, and have been transmitted to the present time. They may be found in Fox's Martyrology, p. 415. See Chester, Life of Rogers (Lond. 1861, 8vo); Strype, Cranmer; British Reformers, vol. 9; also Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rogers, John (2)[[@Headword:Rogers, John (2)]]

             an English divine, was born probably in 1565, and is supposed to have been a grandson of the preceding. He was minister of Chacomb, Northamptonshire, from 1587 to 1620, the year of his death. His published work is a Discourse on Christian Watchfulness, etc. (Lond. 1620, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rogers, John (3)[[@Headword:Rogers, John (3)]]

             an English Puritan divine, was educated at Cambridge. He became vicar of Hemmingham in 1592, minister of Haverhill in 1603, and was afterwards minister of Dedham, Essex, where he died in 1630. His works are: Sixty Memorials of a Godly Life: — Treatise of Love: — Doctrine of Faith (Lond. 2d ed. 1627; 6th ed. 1634, 12mo): — Exposition of First Epistle of Peter (ibid. 1650, fol.). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclopoedia Bibliographica, s.v.

## Rogers, John (4)[[@Headword:Rogers, John (4)]]

             a Congregational preacher, was born probably at Assington, England, and came with his father to New England in 1636. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1649, having studied medicine and theology. He was invited to preach at Ipswich in 1656, where he remained until he became  president of Harvard College, August, 1683. He died July 2, 1684. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 147.

## Rogers, John (5)[[@Headword:Rogers, John (5)]]

             a Congregational minister, and son of the preceding, was born July 7, 1666, was graduated at Harvard College in 1684, was ordained at Ipswich, Oct. 12, 1692, and died Dec. 12, 1745. His works are: Death the Wages of Sin (1701): — Election Sermon (1706): — Sermon on the Death of J. Appleton (1739). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 147.

## Rogers, John (6), D.D.[[@Headword:Rogers, John (6), D.D.]]

             an English divine, was born at Ensham, Oxfordshire, in 1679, was educated at New College school, Oxford, and in 1693 was elected scholar of Corpus Christi College. After taking his degree in arts and entering orders, he waited for a fellowship, which he secured in 1706, but in the meantime had become vicar of Buckland, Berkshire. He took the degree of B.D. in 1710, was made lecturer of St. Clement's Danes in 1712, afterwards becoming lecturer of the united parishes of Christ Church and St. Leonard's, Foster Lane. In 1716 he became rector of Wrington. Somersetshire; prebend of Wells in 1718; subdean of the same in 1721; chaplain to George II, then prince of Wales; and vicar of St. Giles's, Cripplegate, London, October, 1728. He died May 1, 1729. He wrote, The Visible and Invisible Church of Christ (2d ed. Lond. 1719, 8vo): — Necessity of Divine Revelation (1727, 8vo): — Sermons (4 vols. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rogers, Joseph[[@Headword:Rogers, Joseph]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Wiveliscombe, Somersetshire, England, June 11, 1815. He emigrated to the United States at an early age, and settled in New York city. He was converted when about twenty-two years old, pursued his preparatory studies under Dr. Owen, of New York city, graduated at Princeton College in 1845, and at the Theological Seminary at Princeton in 1848, and was licensed to preach the same year by the Presbytery of New York. After leaving the seminary, he labored at May's Landing and Pleasant Mills, Atlantic Co., N.J., in the employment of the Board of Domestic Missions, until 1850, when he received an  appointment to the Church of Round Prairie, Ia., over which he was installed pastor in 1851. In 1853, because of failing health, he returned East, and spent the succeeding four years in preaching and teaching in Attleboro, Pa.; Bridgeton, N.J.; the vicinity of Fredericksburg, Va.; and at Newtown, Pa. In 1857 he received a call to, and was installed pastor of, the churches of Kingwood and Frenchtown, N.J., where he continued to labor till his death, Aug. 20, 1863. Mr. Rogers was a diligent student, a ripe scholar, and of fine attainments in the different branches of a liberal education, especially in the Greek language and English literature. As a preacher he was naturally eloquent. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almnanac, 1864, p. 192. (J.L.S.)

## Rogers, Lorenzo[[@Headword:Rogers, Lorenzo]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Orange County, Vt., March 12, 1804, and was converted in 1828. He entered the ministry in 1834, was superannuated by the Erie Conference in 1854, and died in Cleveland, O., Feb. 17, 1865. He was greatly influential in winning men to Christ. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1865, p. 131.

## Rogers, Nathaniel[[@Headword:Rogers, Nathaniel]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Haverhill, Suffolk, England, in 1598. He was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and, after serving for two years as a domestic chaplain, became Dr. Barkham's assistant at Bocking, Essex, where he remained for five years; and obtaining the living of Assington, Suffolk, he continued there until June 1, 1636, when he sailed for New England, and arrived Nov.16. He was ordained, Feb. 20, 1638, pastor at Ipswich; and died July 3, 1655. He published, A Letter to the Hon. House of Commons at Westminster on the Subject of Reformation (1643). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 1, 87.

## Rogers, Nehemiah[[@Headword:Rogers, Nehemiah]]

             an English divine (said by some to have been a great-grandson of John Rogers the martyr), was born in 1594. He was minister of Doddinghurst, Essex, and died in 1660. He published, Expositions of the Parables (1620- 62): — Exposition of St. Luk 10:5-11 (1658, 4to), and other works.

## Rogers, Richard[[@Headword:Rogers, Richard]]

             an English Puritan minister, was born about 1550, and entered the ministry in 1575. He preached through the eastern counties of England forty-three years, suffering molestation from the officers, but acquiring considerable prominence among the dissenting divines. He died at Weathersfield, Essex, April 21, 1618. His publications include Seven Treatises (Lond. 1605, fol. and several other editions), a kind of theological manual, much used by the early divines of New England: — Certain Sermons (1612): — Commentary on the Whole Booke of Judges (1615). Mr. Chester, in his John Rogers (1861), pages 238-244, disputes Calamy's oft-repeated assertion that this divine was a descendant of the martyr. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rogers, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Rogers, Thomas (1)]]

             an English divine, was a native of Chelsea, and entered Christ Church in 1568. He was A.M. in 1576; chaplain to Bancroft, bishop of London, and in 1581 rector of Horinger, Suffolk, where he was held in great esteem. He died Feb. 22, 1616. Among his many works are, The Anatomie of the Minde (Lond. 1576, 8vo): — Of the End of the World (ibid. 1577, 4to; 1582, 1583, 8vo): — The English Creede (ibid. 1579, fol.): — A Golden Chain Taken out of the Rich Treasure-house of the Psalms of David (ibid. 1579, 1587, 12mo): — Historical Dialogue touching Antichrist and Popery, etc. (ibid. 1589, 8vo): — besides Sermons, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rogers, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Rogers, Thomas (2)]]

             an English clergyman, was born in Warwickshire, Dec. 27, 1660, and was educated at the free school there. In Lent term, 1675, he entered Trinity College, Oxford, but soon after removed to Hart Hall, where he took the degree of A.M. and entered holy orders. In July, 1689, he became rector of Slapton, near Towcester, Northamptonshire. He died of smallpox, while on a visit to London, June 8, 1694, and was buried at St. Savior's, Southwark. His writings were mostly poetical and published anonymously, and were not at all becoming his character as a clergyman. We mention only, Lux Occidentalis, or Providence Displayed in the Coronation of King William, etc. (Lond. 1689): — The Loyal and Impartial Satyrist (ibid. 1693, 4to): — A True Protestant Bridle (ibid. 1694, 4to): — Commonwealth Unmasked. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Rogers, Timothy (1)[[@Headword:Rogers, Timothy (1)]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1589, became preacher of Essex, and died in 1650. He wrote, Righteous Man's Evidences (Lond. 1619, 8vo; 12th ed. 1637): — Roman Eucharist (ibid. 1621, 4to; 1631, 24mo): — Good News from Heaven: — A Faithful Friend True to the Soul: — Christian's Jewel of Faith. See Chester, John Rogers (1861), p. 275; also Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rogers, Timothy (2)[[@Headword:Rogers, Timothy (2)]]

             a Dissenting minister, was born at Barnard Castle, Durham, England, about 1660. He was educated at one of the Scotch universities, became evening lecturer at a chapel in Crosby Square, London, and afterwards one of the ministers of a Dissenting congregation in Old Jewry, which office he resigned in 1707. He died in 1729. Among his works we notice, Practical Discourses (Lond. 1690, 8vo): — Discourse concerning Trouble of Mind and the Disease of Melancholy (ibid. 1691). See Allibone, Dict. of Birit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rogers, William Matticks[[@Headword:Rogers, William Matticks]]

             a Congregational minister, was born on the island of Alderney. Sept. 10, 1806. His name was Samuel M. Ellen Kittle, which was changed to Rogers after he became a preacher. When ten years of age he was brought to the United States, and lived with his uncle, Capt. W. M. Rogers, at Dorchester. He graduated at Harvard College in 1827, studied theology at the Andover Seminary, became pastor of the Evangelical Congregational Church, Townsend, Mass., where he remained five years, and was  installed, Aug. 6, 1835, pastor of the Franklin Street Church, Boston, and died Aug. 11, 1851. He published An Address at the Dedication of the New Hall of Bradford Academy (1841), and a couple of occasional sermons. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 2, 730.

## Rogers, William, D.D.[[@Headword:Rogers, William, D.D.]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Newport, R.I., July 22, 1751. He entered the Rhode Island College in 1765, and was licensed to preach in August, 1771. In May following he was ordained pastor of the Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In 1776 he became chaplain of the army of Pennsylvania, and from 1778 to 1781 he served as brigade chaplain in the Continental army. In March, 1789, he was appointed professor of English and oratory in the College and Academy of Philadelphia, and in April, 1792, was elected to the same office in the University of Pennsylvania. He was made D.D. by the latter institution in 1790, having previously received the degree of A.M. from Yale College in 1780, and from the College of New Jersey in 1786. From April, 1803, to February, 1805, he also acted as pastor of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia. In January, 1812, he resigned his professorship and received a call from the Church in Newark, N.J., but finally declined it. In 1816 and 1817 he became a member of the General Assembly of the State of Pennsylvania. The latter years of his life were spent in retirement. He died April 7, 1824. Dr. Rogers published a number of sermons, letters, essays, etc. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 6, 145.

## Rogerus[[@Headword:Rogerus]]

             a Scotch prelate, was witness to a charter dated March 4, 1328, at Ross. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 187.

## Rognon, Louis[[@Headword:Rognon, Louis]]

             a Protestant theologian of France, was born at Lyons, February 4, 1826. Having completed his studies, he was successive pastor at Vals (1850), Montpellier (1852), and Paris (1861). He died April 15, 1869, leaving Melanges Philosophiques, Religieux et Litteraires, and Sermons (Paris, 1870). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Roh, Peter[[@Headword:Roh, Peter]]

             a famous Roman Catholic missionary, was born in 1811 at Aven, in the canton Valais, in Switzerland. When eighteen years of age, he entered the Society of Jesus, and after completing his philosophical and theological studies at Fribourg he was appointed professor of dogmatics at the Seminary of Lucerne. Having received holy orders in 1840, he went to France, where he remained one year, at Notre Dame d'Ay. He returned to Fribourg, where he lectured on dogmatics; and in 1847 he was appointed to a professorship at Lucerne, which he held only for a short time, being obliged to leave the country. He now went from place to place as a missionary preacher, finding everywhere a large congregation eager to listen to his powerful oratory. In 1856 he occupied the theological chair at Paderborn and Maria-Laach, and in 1860 he represented the bishop of Paderborn at the provincial council at Cologne. In 1866 he again resumed preaching, and in 1869 he accompanied the bishop of Paderborn to the Vatican council at Rome. He died May 17, 1872. He wrote, Die Grundirrthumer unserer Zeit (Fribourg, 1865): — Das alte Lied: der Zweck heiligt die Mittel (ibid. 1869, etc.). See Regensburger Conversations-Lexikon, s.v.; Literarischer Handweiser, 1872, p. 212. (B.P.)

## Rohan, Armand Jules de[[@Headword:Rohan, Armand Jules de]]

             archbishop of Rheims, was born at Paris, Feb. 10, 1695. At an early age he entered the chapter of Strasburg, received in 1715 the abbey of Gard, and in 1730 that of Gorze. As the colnclavist of cardinal Rohan, he assisted in the election of Innocent XIII, and was afterwards made bishop of Rheims (May 22, 1722). He was very active in favor of the bull Uneigenitus. After consecrating Louis XV, he took a seat in Parliament as the first ecclesiastical peer, and gradually gave over the care of his diocese to vicars under the title of bishops in partibus. He died at Saverne Aug. 28, 1762. He published Breviarium Remense (Charleville, 1759).

## Rohan, Armand de[[@Headword:Rohan, Armand de]]

             called the Cardinal de Soubise, grand-nephew of Gastonl, was born at Paris, Dec. 1, 1717. In 1736 he became abbe of St. Epore, and in 1737 abbe of Lure and Murback. March 21, 1739, he was elected rector of the faculty of arts at Paris, and in 1741 he was made doctor of the Sorbonne and member of the French Academy. Cardinal Rohan procured his appointment as his own coadjutor, with the title of bishop of Ptolemais. Benedict XIV created him cardinal April 10, 1747, when he took the title of Cardinal de Soubise, to distinguish himself from his grand-uncle; but he never went to Rome to receive the cardinal's hat. At the death of cardinal Rohan, he succeeded him in the see of Strasburg and in the office of grand  almoner. He died at Saverne June 28, 1756. This prelate was distinguished for his charity zeal, and sweet and simple maller.

## Rohan, Armand-Gaston-Maximilien de[[@Headword:Rohan, Armand-Gaston-Maximilien de]]

             Cardinal, was born at Paris, June 26, 1674. In 1690 he was canon of Strasburg, and in 1701 was chosen coadjutor of the prince-bishop Egon of Furstenberg, with the title of bishop of Tiberias in partibus. After the death of his superior he was titulary of the diocese, in 1712 became cardinal, and grand almoner in 1713. He held several rich abbeys, and, without any literary qualifications whatever, was elected member of the French Academy. He was also master of the Sorbonne. By virtue of his birth, fortune, and high office, he took an important part in the negotiations for peace in the Church of France which occupied the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV; and his connection with father Tellier, confessor to the king, and with the cardinal de Bissy, bishop of Meaux, made him one of the chiefs of the Molinist party. In the assembly of the clergy of 1713 he used all possible means to gain their acceptance of the papal bull Unigenitus, and gained his cause during the next year. During the regency he endeavored to bring about a reconciliation among the bishops, and persuaded forty to sign an accommodation, which ended their quarrels. His library was one of the greatest in France, and was under the charge of the learned abbe Oliva. Cardinal Rohan died at Paris July 19, 1749. The only work of any account which he left is Rituale Argentinense (Strasburg, 1742). See Gallia Christitiua.

## Rohan, Ferdinand-Maximilien-Meriadec[[@Headword:Rohan, Ferdinand-Maximilien-Meriadec]]

             Prince of Guemene, brother of Louis, was born at Paris, Nov. 7, 1738. He studied at the Sorbonne. was prior of the faculty of theology, and received the degree of doctor. He was grand provost of the chapter of Strasburg and abbe of Mouzon, when in 1759 Louis XV gave him the archbishopric of Bordeaux. In 1781 he was transferred to the diocese of Cambrai, in 1790 was made regent of the principality of Liege, and took the civil oath. He returned to Cambrai in 1791, where he remained until 1801, when he resigned the archbishopric and became grand almoner to the empress Josephine. He died at Paris Oct. 30, 1813.

## Rohan, Louis-Rene-Edouard[[@Headword:Rohan, Louis-Rene-Edouard]]

             Prince of Guemene, a French prelate, was born at Paris, Sept. 25, 1734. His education was carried on at the College of Plessis and the Seminary of Saint-Magloire. In 1760 he was elected coadjutor to his uncle, the bishop of Strasburg. with the title of bishop of Canopus in partibus, in which position he showed more love for pleasure than zeal in religious exercises. Made member of the French Academy in 1761, he was in 1772 sent as ambassador to Vienna. Here he was at first received with great favor, but by his extravagant mode of life and interference in political affairs he fell under the displeasure of Maria Theresa, and at her request was recalled to France in 1774. After his return he was appointed grand almoner, in 1778 was made cardinal, and later master of the Sorbonne and bishop of Strasburg. In addition to these honors, he held several rich abbeys, but his large fortune was not in any way adequate to his scandalous luxury. In 1785 he was arrested and imprisoned in the Bastile for the part he had taken in the affair of the diamond necklace, which so gravely compromised Marie Antoinette. The friends of Rohan were indignant at the government, the clergy protested against his imprisonment, and at his trial he was finally acquitted, without even an expression of blame for his evident misconduct. But he could not recover from the disgrace of his dismissal from court, and retired to his diocese of Strasburg, where he lived in comparative quiet for a few years. In 1789 he was deputy of the clergy of Hagenau to the States- general, but, being accused of disloyal conduct, resigned his seat. In order to be out of the jurisdiction of the French government, he retired to a part of his diocese beyond the Rhine, and finally, in 1801, in consequence of the concordat, resigned the bishopric of Strasburg entirely. He died at Ettenheim, Feb. 17, 1803. The cardinal de Rohan was a man of fine  appearance and agreeable manners. It is not to be denied that he had a fine mind and great amiability, but he possessed no judgment, put no check upon his passions or conduct, and was weak and easily led by favorites. See Memoire de l'Abbe Georgel; Levis, Souvenirs.

## Rohgah[[@Headword:Rohgah]]

             (Heb. Rohgah', רָהְגָה, also written רוֹהְגָה, clamor; Sept. ῾Ροογά v.r. Οὐραογά), the second named of the four sons of Shamer, of the tribe of Asher (1Ch 7:34), and fifth in descent from that patriarch. B.C. perhaps cir. 1658.

## Rohini[[@Headword:Rohini]]

             in Hindu mythology, is the name of one of the daughters of Daksha, said to be the favorite wife of Chandra (or the Moon, which in Sanscrit, as in German, is masculine). She is the bright star of the Bull's eye, called in Arabic Aldebaran (or Al Dabarhn). Other stars regarded as the sisters of Rohini are also numbered among the wives of Chandra.

## Rohr, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Rohr, Johann Friedrich]]

             a prominent rationalist, was born July 30, 1777, at Rossbach, on the Saale, of humble parents, and early displayed mental qualities which induced his friends to provide him with opportunities for study. He was thus enabled to enter Leipsic University as a student of theology, and while there attended the lectures of Platner and Keil, and employed his mind in the examination of Kant's philosophy. Reinhard examined him for ministerial license, and recommended him as assistant preacher to the University Church. Transferred in 1802 to Pforta, he engaged in the study of modern languages, particularly English, and published a tabular view of English pronunciation (1803). Unpleasant relations with his colleagues led to his removal in the following year (1804). He next became pastor at Ostrau, near Zeitz, and remained in that station during sixteen years, at the end of which period he was called to be chief minister at Weimar; and to that position the government added the dignities of court preacher, ecclesiastical councillor, and general superintendent for the principality of Weimar, his duties, in addition to those connected with his relation to his parisl, including general visitations, examinations, inspection of the Weimar Gymnasium, and the filling of appointments.

He held these positions from 1820 to 1848, when he died.  Rohr's historical significance grows out of the energy with which he asserted the theological position of vulgar rationalism. His views were for the first time presented in a connected scheme in Briefe uber den Rationalismus, etc. (Zeitz, 1813), whose train of ideas may be summarized as follows: Religious truth may be ascertained from revelation or from reason, the latter term denoting the natural, not cultured, judgment of the mind. If such truth is grounded on reason, the system of rationalism or naturalism will result, which is the only tenable system. This rationalism rejects all religious teachings which have not universal authority and a strict adaptation to moral ends; for the ultimate end of religion is a pure morality. There is in Christianity a theology or doctrine respecting God, and an anthropology or doctrine respecting man in his intelligent and moral nature, and also in his sensuality and consequent depravity; but it does not properly include a Christology, since opinions respecting the first expounder of a universal religion can form no part of that religion. Stripped of all additions to his personality made by the evangelists, Christ is simply a man, though the greatest, and even a unique, man. A subsequent work, entitled Grund- und Glaubenssatze d. evang.-prot. Kirche (1832), was intended to unite the Church for its protection against its Roman Catholic, and still more against its pietistic, adversaries, and to that end was sent to a number of theological faculties for their approval. The effort failed, however, even Rohr's fellow rationalists refusing to endorse his purpose. In the second and third editions (1834, 1844), he gave a summary of the essential teachings of the Gospel in specifically Christian language. There is a true God, who is proclaimed to us by Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son, and who deserves our profound veneration because of his perfections. This veneration can be truly rendered only by the cultivation of a sincerely virtuous character and life, and for this work we may hope for the aid of the Divine Spirit. As God's children, we may confidently look for his help in earthly troubles, and in the consciousness of moral weakness and unworthiness we may look for grace and mercy through Christ; while in death we may be assured of undying continuance and a better, retributive life.

It is needless to add that throughout his official life Rohr was engaged in controversy with the orthodox theologians of his time, e.g. Reinhard, Harms, Hahn, Hengstenberg, Sartorius, etc., whom he accused of literalism, want of progressiveness, and similar offenses. He was utterly incapable of appreciating the aims of such spirits as Schleiermacher,  Twesten, etc., in the direction of a higher development within the limits of Protestant freedom; and in consequence of this incapacity, he blundered into a dispute with Hase on the occasion of the appearance of the Hutterus Redivivus written by the latter, which Hase ended by clearly demonstrating that the “rationalism of sound reason” is utterly unscientific and has no regard for the facts of history. His peculiar views and tempers are reflected also in his sermons. The moral element predominates, of course, and tne sunernatural is reduced to natural proportions. His Christologische Predigten (Weimar, 1831, 1837) are not Christological in character, exhibiting Jesus simply as “the pattern and example of true culture,” etc. His casual sermons, however, sometimes present all the characteristics of truly religious discourse. His published homiletical works are very numerous.

In addition to the works already mentioned, we notice the Kritische prediger-Bibliothek, wihicih under various names he edited from 1810 to 1848: — Palastina zur Zeit Jesu (Zeitz, 1816; 8th ed. 184.): — Luther's Leben u. Wirken (ibid. 1817; 2d ed. 1828): — Die gute Sache d. Protestantismus (Leips. 1842), and others.

## Rohrbacher, Rene Francois[[@Headword:Rohrbacher, Rene Francois]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of France, was born at Langatte in 1789. For some time professor of theology in the clerical seminary at Nancy, he. went in 1849 to Paris, and died in 1856. Rohrbacher is the author of, Histoire Universelle de l'Eglise Catholique (Nancy, 1842-49, 29 volumes; 2d ed. Paris, 1849-53), afterwards translated into German:Catechisme du Sens Communn (2d ed. 1858): — La Religion Meiditee (2d ed. 1852, 2 volumes): — Des Rapports Naturels entre les deux Puissances (Besan(on, 1838, 2 volumes): — De la Grace et de la Nature (eod.): — Motifis qui ont Ramene a l'Eglise Catholique un Grand Numbre de Protestants et d'Autres Religionnaires (Paris, 1841, 2 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rohrer, Franz[[@Headword:Rohrer, Franz]]

             one of the best historical scholars of Switzerland, was born at Stanz in 1832, and studied theology at the universities of Freiburg and Tubingen. He was ordained in 1856, and was for some time pastor of Kerns. His chief attention, however, was given to historical research, which his subsequent position as librarian at St. Gall enabled him to prosecute with greater freedom. After the death of Dr. Liitolf he became president of the Historical Society of the Five Cantons and editor of the Geschichtsfreund. He was also one of the most active members of the Swiss Geschichts forschende Gesellschaft, and undertook its continuation. of the great historical work left incomplete by Kopp, and afterwards by Litolf, the Geschichte der eidgensssischen Bunde, of which a new volume lately appeared, under his care, bringing down the history to the peace of Austria with Lucerne and the Forest Cantons (1330-36). After serving as rector of the gymnasium at Altdorf, he was made a canon of the Stiftskirche at Luzerne in 1873, where he died in September 1882. He described himself to the last as a theologian of the "Richtung der Lacordaire." (B.P.)

## Rohrich, Timotheus Wilhellm[[@Headword:Rohrich, Timotheus Wilhellm]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born at Alt-Eckendorf in 1802. He studied at Strasburg and Gottingen, and performed the ministerial functions at Furdenheim, in Alsace. In 1837 he was called as pastor to Strasburg, and died in 1860. Rohrich published, Geschichte der Reformation in Elsass und besonders in Strassburg (1830-32, 3 volumes): Matthias Zell (1850): — Mittheilungen aus der Geschichte der  evangelischen Kirche des Elscsses (1855, 3 volumes): — besides, he contributed largely to the Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie and the Strassburger theologische Beitrage. See Reuss, in Denkschrift der theologischen Gesellschaft zu Strassburg (Jena, 1861); Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rohtlieb, Johannes[[@Headword:Rohtlieb, Johannes]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Sweden, was born in Germany in 1806. Educated at German universities, he was in 1833 made assistant pastor of the German Church of St. Gertrude, at Stockholm, and in 1839, on the death of the pastor, succeeded to his office, by appointment of the king. In 1853 Rohtlieb became the agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society in Sweden, which he served until his death. In 1875 he retired from the pastoral charge of his congregation, and died April 11, 1881, a doctor of theology. (B.P.)

## Rohumon[[@Headword:Rohumon]]

             the great serpent, an idol of the Caribbeans.

## Roimus[[@Headword:Roimus]]

             ( ῾Ρόϊμος), a Jew who returned to Jerusalem from Babylon with Zerubbabel (1Es 5:8); evidently the REHUM SEE REHUM (q.v.) of the Heb. texts (Ezr 2:2; Neh 7:7).

## Rok, Or Roc[[@Headword:Rok, Or Roc]]

             in Persian mythology, was an immense bird, so large that it bore elephants to its young in the nest. An egg of this monster once fell from its nest on the Albordshi, and with its fluid overflowed thirty-six towns and villages. Legends resembling this fable are met with everywhere; but it is remarkable that the inhabitants of Greenland are said to make use of very powerful bows, each formed of two claws of some gigantic bird, which are often found in the ice. It would accordingly seem that not everything said with regard to the rok is fable. There have been mammalia and amphibia whose size far exceeded that of any similar animals of our era; and there may, in  like manner, have been birds which could as readily bear away a camel as the condor can a young llama.

## Rokeby, William[[@Headword:Rokeby, William]]

             an Irish prelate, was a native of Rokeby, in Yorkshire, and a doctor of the canon law. He was a brother to Sir Richard Rokeby, lord treasurer of Ireland. He received his early education at Rotheram and finished at Oxford, when he was presented by the monks of Lewes, in 1487, to the rectory of Sandal, near Doncaster. At the close of the 15th century he was nominated to the vicarage of Halifax, in Yorkshirei in 1498 was constituted lord chancellor of Ireland, and afterwards advanced to the see of Meath, in 1507. On February 5, 1511, he was translated by pope Julius II to the see of Dublin, the temporalities of which were accorded to him in June following. In 1514 this prelate confirmed the establishment of a college of clerks, founded at Maynooth by Gerald, earl of Kildare, which was subsequently remodelled. In 1520 he was despatched by the lord deputy and council to Waterford for the purpose of pacifying such discords and debates as existed between the earl of Desmond and sir Piers Butler. Archbishop Rokeby died November 29, 1521. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 178.

## Roland[[@Headword:Roland]]

             in Frankish legends, was a celebrated hero belonging to the circle of Charlemagne's paladins. He was of enormous size, and so strong that he could pull up the tallest pine by the roots, and use it as a walking stick and club. His sword split a block of marble without injuring its edge. The numerous Roland columns found in the towns of North Germany are said to have been erected by Charlemagne in honor of this hero; but they are probably of much later origin, and served to designate the place where justice was administered in the emperor's name, so that they were in some sense his representatives,

## Roldan, Luisa[[@Headword:Roldan, Luisa]]

             daughter of the following, was born in 1654, and became a distinguished artist. She assisted her father in many of his works, was pensioned by Philip IV, and confided with much of the work upon the Escurial. Her principal productions are the statues of Mater Dolorosa, John the Evangelist, and St. Thomas. She died at Madrid in December, 1704.

## Roldan, Pedro[[@Headword:Roldan, Pedro]]

             a Spanish sculptor, was born in 1624 at Seville. He studied at Rome, where he was a member of the Academy of St. Luke. Roldan executed a great number of works in Madrid and at Seville, the best of which is a Christ on the Cross. He died in 1700.

## Rolf[[@Headword:Rolf]]

             in Norse mythology, was one of the most celebrated kings of Denmark, who was induced to adopt the surname Kraki by the following occurrence. A poor youth named Voeggur went to the palace and looked steadily at the king, until asked why he gazed so long, when he responded that he had heard that Rolf was the greatest man in Northland, but that he found the throne occupied by a Kraki (diminutive wight). Rolf responded, “Thou hast given me a name, now give me a present” (which always accompanied the bestowal of a name). Voeggur declared that he had nothing to give. “Then,” said Rolf, “I, who have possessions, will give a present, “ and he handed over a ring of gold, on receiving which Voeggur joyfully  exclaimed, “Lord, I will avenge thee should any come near to thee in malice!” The king's reply to this — “Voeggur is pleased with a little matter” — became proverbial. The armies of Rolf Kraki were celebrated, especially the twelve Berserkers (according to others, eleven, himself being the twelfth), whom he once sent to assist his stepfather Adils, king of Sweden, against Ali, king of Norway. After gaining the victory, Adils refused to give the promised reward to either the Berserkers or king Rolf. The latter, accompanied by the Berserkers, accordingly visited the court of Adils and reminded him of his pledge. Adils invited the guests to a friendly banquet in the largest hall of his palace, in the center of which he caused an immense fire to be built, and then reminded Rolf and the Berserkers that they had vowed never to flee from either fire or water. The fire eventually seized Rolfs clothing, on which he rose, threw his shield into the flames, and passed through them with his companions, while he exclaimed, “He, surely, does not dread the fire who voluntarily rushes into it!” He then seized the servants who had kindled the fire and threw them into it, and emphatically demanded his pay. He obtained the ring Sviagris and a mighty horn filled with gold, and departed; but Adils rapidly assembled his warriors and followed in pursuit. To distract his pursuers, Rolf, having reached the heath of Fyriswall, scattered pieces of gold over the ground, and so actually delayed the pursuit; and when Adils approached him, he threw down the costly ring also. Adils dismounted from his horse to get the ring, and at this moment Rolf inflicted on the rear of his person a shameful wound, as he cried, “I have bent like a hog the richest man in Sweden.” He then picked up the ring himself, and while the king's wound was bound up by his followers, succeeded in gaining the ships with his treasure and his mother, and returned to Denmark. From this incident gold was called Fyriswall seed, or Kraki's seed.

## Rolin, Jean[[@Headword:Rolin, Jean]]

             Cardinal, was born in 1408. At twenty-two he was canon and archdeacon. In 1431 he became bishop of Chalons, which see he exchanged in 1436 for that of Autun. He obtained the purple in 1449, and continued to add to the number of his benefices and lived in luxury. He gained possession by fraudulent means of the abbey of St. Martin at Autun in 1451, built the cathedral in that place and also the one at Chalons, both of which he enriched with works of art. He was confessor to the dauphin, afterwards Louis XI. He died at Auxerre July 1, 1483. See Perry, Hist. de Chalons.

## Roll[[@Headword:Roll]]

             (מְגַלָּה, megillah'; Sept. κεφαλίς: but in Ezr 6:1, the Chald. סְפִר, sephdr, a book, as elsewhere rendered: in Isa 8:1; גַּלָּיוֹן, gillayon, a tablet, once of a mirror, Isa 3:23). A book in ancient times consisted of a single long strip of paper or parchment, which was usually kept rolled up on a stick, and was unrolled when a person wished to read it. SEE BOOK. Hence arose the term megillah, from galal, “to roll,” strictly answering to the Latin volumen, whence comes our volume; hence also the expressions, “to spread” and “roll together” (in Heb. פָּרֵשׂ[2Ki 19:14] and גָּלִל [Isa 34:4]: in Gr. ἀναπτύσσειν and πτύσσειν [Luk 4:17; Luk 4:20]), instead of “to open” and “to shut” a book. The full expression for a book was “a roll of writing, “ or “a roll of a book” (Jer 36:2; Psa 40:7; Eze 2:9), but occasionally “roll” stands by itself (Zec 5:1-2; Ezr 6:2). The κεφαλίς of the Sept. originally referred to the ornamental knob (the umbilicus of the Latins) at the top of the stick or cylinder round which the roll was wound. The use of the term megillah implies, of course, the existence of a soft and pliant material: what this material was in the Old Test. period we are not informed; but, as a knife was required for its destruction (Jer 36:23), we infer that it was parchment. The roll was usually written on one side only (Mishna, Erub. 10, § 3), and hence the particular notice of one that was “written within and without” (Eze 2:10). The writing was arranged in columns, resembling a door in shape, and hence deriving their Hebrew name (דְּלָתוֹת, leaves), just as “column, “ from its resemblance to a columna, or pillar. It has been asserted that the term megillah does not occur before the 7th century B.C., being first used by Jeremiah (Hitzig, in Jer 36:2); and the conclusion has been drawn that the use of such materials as parchment was not known until that period (Ewald, Gesch. 1, 71, note; Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 289). This is to assume, perhaps too confidently, a late date for the composition of Psalms 40, and to ignore the collateral evidence arising out of the expression “roll together” used by Isaiah (Isa 34:4), and also out of the probable reference to the Pentateuch in Psa 40:7, “the roll of the book, “ a copy of which was deposited by the side of the ark (Deu 31:26). The book of Esther is specially designated by the Hebrew term Megillah. SEE MEGALLOTH.

## Roll molding[[@Headword:Roll molding]]

             This term has been popularly, but very incorrectly, given to a molding much used in Decorated and late Early English work, especially in strings and dripstones. Its varieties are numerous, and though some of them bear resemblance to a roll of parchment, others are very different. Some of these varieties, in which the square fillet is more decidedly marked, have been called the “roll and fillet molding.” It is sometimes called the scroll molding, from its resemblance to a scroll of paper or parchment with the edge overlapping. The name of roll molding is often applied to the common round, or bowtell.

## Roll, Reinhard Heinrich[[@Headword:Roll, Reinhard Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Unna, Hesse, November 2, 1683, and studied at Rostock. In 1710 he was rector at his native place, in 1712 at Dortmund, in 1730 professor at. Giessen, and died Oct. 2, 1768,  doctor of theology. He published, De Nummo Cosfessionali et Oblatorio (Rostock, 1707): — Bibliotheca Nobilium Theologorum Historico- Theologica Selecta (1708): — De Sectarum Philosophicarum Scriptoribus Grcecis Potioribus (1709-10): — De Objecto Psalmi lxix (1714): — De Paulo Apostolo Polyhistore (1715): — Jobus Scepticismi immerito Accusatus (1719): — Lineamenta Theologie Naturalis sive Philosophicae (1723): — De Fide Centurionis Capernaitici ad Mat 8:1 sq. (1730). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (where ninety titles of Roll's works are given). (B.P.)

## Rolle, Johann Heinrich[[@Headword:Rolle, Johann Heinrich]]

             a German composer of church music, was born at Quedlinburg in 1718. He was the successor of his father as director of music at Magdeburg in 1752. He died in 1785. Among his principal works are the oratorios Death of Abel and Abraham on Mount Moriah.

## Roller[[@Headword:Roller]]

             (Eze 30:21), chittul, חַתּוּל, a bandage, so called from being wrapped around a broken limb to keep the fractured parts in place till healed. So Rosenmüller explains the figure (Scholia, ad loc.). The roller, in surgery, is a long fillet or strip of muslin or other webbing rolled upon itself in a cylindrical form, employed to give mechanical support in many of the diseases and injuries to which the human body is liable. In the case of a broken arm, the surgeon brings the fragments of the bone together in normal position, and next places the limb in splints or stays lined with cotton, wool, or other soft material, to protect the flesh against unequal pressure, and then secures the whole by firmly winding the roller round and round the limb over the stays, so as to maintain the broken ends of the bone in coaptation until the process of ossific reunion is completed. The familiar manner of this incidental reference shows that the practice of the present enlightened surgery was known to the profession in the days of Ezekiel. The name used to designate this bandage not only implies the form giving the greatest facility to its ready application, but is the very word which scientific works of the present day employ to express the same thing. The object of this revelation, as it would seem, was not to impart  information respecting the special contrivances of the healing art, but to present to the mind of the prophet the great prospective fact that the predicted disability of Pharaoh would be permanent, as one of the essentials to restorative treatment would be wanting.

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

             a French historian, who formerly enjoyed, if he did not merit, an extensive popularity, was the son of a cutler, and was born in Paris, Jan. 30, 1661. He studied at the College du Plessis, where, in 1683, he became assistant to the professor of rhetoric, and four years later obtained the chair for himself. In 1688 he was called to the chair of eloquence at the College Royal de France, and for some ten years he discharged the duties of his office with remarkable zeal and success. In 1694 he was chosen rector of the University of Paris, a dignity which he held for two years, and signalized his brief tenure of office by many useful reforms, both in regard to discipline and study, and by his warm defense of the privileges of the university. His efforts to revive the study of Greek, then falling back into neglect, were particularly creditable to him, although his career as rector constitutes perhaps his best claim to the regard of posterity, and has certainly left a more permanent impression than his writings, for its influence is perceptible even to the present day. In 1699 he was appointed coadjutor to the principal of the College of Beauvais; but was removed from this situation in 1712 through the machinations of the Jesuits, for Rollin was a strenuous Jansenist. For the next three years he devoted himself exclusively to learned study, the fruit of which was his edition of Quintilian (Paris, 1715, 2 vols.). In 1720 he was re-elected rector of the university, and in the same year published his Traite des Etudes, which M.Villemain has pronounced “a monument of good sense and taste,” and which is justly regarded as his best literary performance, for his Histoire Ancienne (ibid. 1730-38, 12 vols.), though long prodigiously popular, and translated into several languages (the English among others), is feeble in its philosophy, jejune in its criticism, and often inaccurate in its narrative. Nevertheless, to multitudes both in this country and in France it has formed the introduction to the study of ancient history. Frederick the Great, then the prince royal of Prussia, among otler princely notabilities, wrote to compliment the author, and opened up a correspondence with him. In 1738 Rollin published his Histoire Romaine (ibid. 9 vols.), a much inferior work, now almost forgotten. He died Sept. 14, 1741.

## Rolling thing[[@Headword:Rolling thing]]

             גִּלְגִּל, galgal', Job 17:13; rendered by the A.V. “wheel” in Psa 83:13. Gesenius (Thesaur. s.v.) prefers chaff, stubble, in both passages. The same word is used for wheel (q.v.) in Isa 5:28; Eze 10:2; Eze 10:6; Eze 23:24, and for whirlwind (q.v.) Psa 77:19 (“heaven”); Eze 10:13 (“wheel”). There is, however, a wild artichoke (Arab. akkub) in Palestine which the Arabs chew with relish, and which in growing throws out branches of equal size and length in all directions, forming a globe a foot or more in diameter. In the autumn this becomes dry and light, breaks off at the ground, and flies before the wind. Thousands of them leap and roll over the plain, and often disturb travelers and their horses. This plant is thought by Thomson to correspond better with the galgal' of Isaiah and the Psalmist than anything before suggested (Land and Book, 2, 357 sq.). Some (Smith, Bible Plants [Lond. 1877]) have held the galgal' to be the so called “Jericho rose” (Anastatica Hierichuntina), a small, ligneous, cruciform plant, which has the singular property of reviving and expanding when placed in water. In the summer it dries up into a ball, which might readily roll before the wind, except that it is held fast to the earth by its strong tap root.

## Rollock, Peter[[@Headword:Rollock, Peter]]

             a Scotch prelate, was made titular bishop of Dunkeld by king James VI. He was one of the lords of session, and accompanied the king to England in 1603. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 97.

## Rollock, Robert[[@Headword:Rollock, Robert]]

             first principal of the College of Edinburgh, was born in 1555 in the vicinity of Sterling, Scotland. From the school at Sterling he went to the University of St. Andrew's, and became a student of St. Salvator's College. As soon as he had taken his degree he was chosen professor of philosophy, and began to read lectures in his own college. He left St. Andrew's in 1583, having been chosen in 1582 to be the principal and professor of divinity of the new Edinburgh University. In 1593 he with others was appointed by Parliament to confer with the popish lords. In 1595 he was appointed one of the visitors of the colleges, and in 1597 was chosen moderator of the General Assembly. He died at Edinburgh, Feb. 28, 1598. His only English work is, Certain Sermons on Several Places of St. Paul's Epistles (Edinb. 1597, 8vo). The rest of his works are in Latin — commentaries on Daniel, St. John's Gospel, Psalms, and on most of the epistles. He also published Prolegomena in Primum Librum Quoes. The. Bezoe: — Tractatus de Vocatione Efficaci (Edinb. 1597): — Quoestiones et Responsiones Aliquot de Foedere Dei, etc. (ibid. 1596, 8vo): — Tractatus Brevis de Providentia Dei: — and Tractatus de Excommunicatione (Lond. 1604; Geneva, 1602,  8vo). See Adam [Melchior], Life of Rollock (supplement to Encyclop. Brit.); Spottiswood, Hist. Book, 6; Chalmers, Biographical Dictionary, s.v.; Allibone, Dictionary of British and American Authors, s.v.

## Roma[[@Headword:Roma]]

             the personification of the city of Rome, and as such called Dea Roma. She was represented clad in a long robe, and with a helmet, in a sitting posture, strongly resembling the figures of the Greek Athena. She was in reality the genius of the city of Rome, and was worshipped as such from early times, though no temple was erected to her till the time of Augustus. After this their number increased throughout the empire.

## Romaic (Or Modern Greek) Version[[@Headword:Romaic (Or Modern Greek) Version]]

             Romaic, or Moderm Greek, is the vernacular language of about 2,000,000 descendants of the ancient Greeks dispersed throughout the Turkish empire, as well as of the inhabitants of the modern kingdom of Greece. In this vernacular several versions of the New Test. exist. The earliest was printed at Geneva in 1638, in parallel columns with the inspired text, and was executed by Maximus Calliergi (or Calliopoli, as he is sometimes called), at the solicitation of Haga, the ambassador of the then United Provinces of Constantinople. This translation, which is remarkable for its close and literal adherence to the Greek original text, is preceded by two prefaces, one by the translator, and the other by Cyrillus Lucaris, patriarch of Constantinople. This edition, which had the title ῾Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δίγλωττος, ἐν ῃ ἀντιπροσώπως τότε θεῖον πρωτότυπον καὶ ἡ ἀπαραλλάκτως ἐξ ἐκείνου εἰς ἁπλὴν διάλεκτον διὰ τοῦ μακαρίτου Κυρίου Μαξίμου Καλλιουπολίτου γενομένη μετάφρασις ἃμα ἐτυπώθησαν. ῎Ετει , was reprinted with corrections in 1708 in London by the Society for Propagating the Gospel in Foreign Parts, and another edition was issued by the same society in 1705. A reprint of this version, in 12mo, was published at Halle, in 1710, at the expense of Sophia Louisa, queen of Prussia, under the title, ῾Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη τοῦ Κυρίου καί Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τοῦτ᾿ ἔσω τὸ θεῖον ἀρχέτυπον καὶ ἡ αὐτοῦ μετάφρασις εἰς κοινὴν διάλεκτον. Μετὰ πάσης ἐπιμυελείας διορθωθέντα, καὶ νεωστὶ μετατυποθέντα ἐν ῞Αλα τῆς Σαξοᾷίας, ἐν τῷ Τυπογραφέιῳ ‘Ορφανοτροφείου. ῎Ετει ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνσάρκου Οἰκονομίας τοῦ  Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ, α. ψ῎. ί.

From this edition the British and Foreign Bible Society published an impression, under the superintendence of the Rev. J.F. Usko, in 1808, with the ancient and modern Greek in parallel columns. As this edition was very favorably received, another was published in 1812. A strict and thorough revision of the text being deemed necessary, the archimandrite Hilarion (subsequently archbishop of Ternovo), with two assistants, was accordingly appointed, in 1819, to execute a new version of the entire Scriptures. In 1827 Hilarion's version of the New Test. was completed, and was printed at the national printing office in the patriarchate, under the eye of the Greek Church. This version, although faithful and accurate as a translation, is considered rather stiff. About the same time, Hilarion completed his translation of the Old Test. from the Sept., which, in 1829, was submitted to the committee of the British and Foreign Bible Society. After mature deliberation, it was concluded to circulate a version prepared from the Hebrew text itself, rather than a mere translation of a translation. The Rev. H. D. Leeves was therefore appointed to reside in Corfu, where, with the assistance of natives, he commenced a translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Modern Greek. In conjunction with the Rev. J. Lowndes (an agent of the London Missionary Society), he engaged the services of Profs. Bambas and Tipaldo, to which, for a short period, were added those of Prof. Joannides. In the fifty-first report (1855) Mr. Lowndes wrote thus: “The first edition of the Old Test. was printed in England in 1840. Select parts had been published previously, as the work advanced. The New Test. followed, and was printed at Athens in 1844. It was not long before it was considered desirable that the whole should be submitted to a general revision, with the view of having the Old and New Tests. printed in one uniform volume; and Mr. Leeves, Prof. Bambas, and Mr. Nicolaides, a native of Philadelphia, undertook to do it. In 1845 Mr. Leeves was removed from the land of the living, and in that year I was appointed agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society. In 1846 I went to Athens to carry on the work of revision that had been just commenced, and between that year and 1850, at different times, Prof. Bambas, Mr. Nicolaides, and myself went over the whole of the Old and New Tests. Editions of the Old Test. were printed again in England in 1849 and 1850. succeeded by a new edition of the New Test. in 1851, when the whole Bible was prepared for dissemination in one uniform volume for the first time.” From that time on several issues of the Bible in Modern Greek were made, making a total up to March 30, 1878, of 446, 435. That there is a great demand for the Word of God may be  seen from the fact that, according to the seventy-fourth report (1878), the British and Foreign Bible Society has decided to print a portable edition of 6000 copies of the reference Bible in Modern Greek, for which edition Dr. Sauerwein is arranging the poetical parts in accordance with the Bible Society's paragraph English Bible. Having before us the latest edition of the New Test. with the title ῾Η Καινὴ Διαθήκη τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ι᾿ησοῦ Χριστοῦ, παραφρασθεῖσα ἐκ τοῦ ῾Ελληνικοῦ. Κατὰ τὴν ἐν Α᾿θήναις ἔκδοσιν τοῦ 1855-1874, we will give a specimen from the Gospel of St. John (Joh 1:1-2) of the three versions, that the reader may judge for himself as to the value of each:

CALLIOPOLITAN.

1. Εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν ητον ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ητον μετὰ θεου, καὶ θεὸς ητον ὁ λόγος.

2. Ε᾿τοῦτος ητον εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν μετὰ θεοῦ.

HILARION.

1. Α᾿π᾿ ἀρχῆς ητον ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ητον ὁμοῦ με τὸν θεόν, καὶ ὁ λόγος ητον θεός.

2. Αὐτὸς ητον ἀπ᾿ ἀρχῆς ὁμοῦ μὲ τὸν θεόν.

BIBLE SOCIETY'S VERSION.

1. ῾Εν ἀρχῇ ητον ὁ λόγος, καὶ ὁ λόγος ητον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, καὶ θεὸς ητον ὁ λόγος.

2. Ουτος ητον ἐν ἀρχῇ μαρὰ τῷ θεῷ.

See The Bible of Every Land, and the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible. Society. (B.P.)

## Romaine, William[[@Headword:Romaine, William]]

             an English divine and writer, was born at Hartlepool, county of Durham, Sept. 25, 1714, and was the son of a Frenlch Protestant who took refuge in England upon the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Romaine attended school at Houghton-le-Spring for seven years, and then entered Hertford College, Oxford, in 1730 (or 1731), and thence removed to Christ Church. He took his degree of A.M. Oct. 15, 1737, having been ordained deacon  the year before. He became curate of Loe Trenchard, Devonshire, in 1737; was ordained priest in 1738, and the same year curate of Banstead and Horton, Middlesex. In 1741 Daniel Lambert, lord mayor of London, appointed him chaplain. In 1748 he became lecturer of St. George's, Botolph Lane, and St. Botolph's, Billingsgate; and in the following year (1749) lecturer of St. Dustan's-in-the-West, which position he held until his death. In 1750 he was appointed assistant morning preacher at St. George's, Hanover Square, and continued until 1756; in 1752 professor of astronomy in Gresham College; curate and morning preacher at St. Olave's, Southwark, in 1756-1759; morning preacher at St. Bartholomew the Great, near West Smithfield, 1759, for nearly two years; chosen rector of St. Andrew Wardrobe, and St. Ann's, Blackfriars, 1764, an election which was disputed, but confirmed by the Court of Chancery in 1766. In the duties of this office he continued faithfully employed until his death, July 26, 1795. Romaine's best known works are, Practical Commentaries on Psalm cvii (Lond. 1747): — The Lord our Righteousness, two sermons (ibid. 1757, 8vo): — Twelve Sermons on Solomon's Song (ibid. 1758-59, 8vo): — The Life of Faith (ibid. 1763): — Scripture Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper (ibid. 1765): — Walk of Faith (ibid. 1771, 2 vols.): — Essay on Psalmody (ibid. 1775). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Romamti-ezer[[@Headword:Romamti-ezer]]

             (Heb. id. [for Romamti' E'zer], רֹמִמְתַי עֶזֶר, or רוֹמִמְתַּי ע8 88, heights of help; Sept. ῾Ρωμεμθιέζερ, v.r. ῾Ρωμετθιέζερ, ῾Ρωμεθμιέζερ), the tenth named of the fourteen sons of Heman, the king's seer in the time of David. He was chief of the twenty-fourth section of the singers, and his family, consisting of twelve persons, were among those engaged in the music of the tabernacle service (1Ch 25:4; 1Ch 25:31). B.C. cir. 1014.

## Roman[[@Headword:Roman]]

             ( ῾Ρωμαῖος), a citizen of the Roman empire (q.v.) (1Ma 8:1; 1Ma 8:23-29; 1Ma 12:16; 1Ma 14:40; 1Ma 15:16; 2Ma 8:10; 2Ma 8:36; 2Ma 11:34; Joh 11:48; Act 2:10; Act 16:21; Act 16:37-38; Act 22:25-29; Act 23:27; Act 25:16; Act 28:17). Such persons, wherever born, were entitled to special privileges. SEE CITIZENSHIP.

## Roman Art[[@Headword:Roman Art]]

             The ancient Romans were characterized by a strong practical feeling. They had immense organizing, governing power; but they had little of that fine aesthetic sensitiveness which is necessary as the foundation of an indigenous, native art with a people. Still, the position of Rome with reference to the general history of art is very important. It is marvellous, indeed, that a people who seemed originally to have had so little native talent for art should have become the most extensive patrons of art in all history. The inability of the Roman people to originate works of high art was recognized by their own writers. Virgil wrote: “To others it is granted to give life to marble and to lend breath to bronze, but the art of Rome is to govern nations, to conquer the proud, and to spare the weak.” The Romans may be compared to rich people in our day who desire to possess works of art without knowing how to appreciate or understand them. Or who wish to use them as a means of displaying their ostentatious luxury. The presence of works of high art also created a proud rivalry among the aristocratic and wealthy which is altogether distinct from the patronage to art which comes from native, artistic impulse. During the first two hundred and fifty years of her existence, Rome might be considered as an Etruscan city, so fully did the Etruscan spirit prevail in all her temples and other works of art. During the first two centuries of the republic, almost no works of art were executed within this great capital, though the names of a few Greek artists in Rome are recorded as early as five hundred years before Christ.

With the conquest of Carthage first, followed by the conquest of Greece and Egypt, a new epoch was opened in the artistic life of the Roman people. Rome now became the great storehouse of the art treasures of the entire world. Greece especially was despoiled to enrich the private palaces and majestic public buildings of the great metropolis. With this gathering of the art treasures of the world into the great capital commences what may with propriety be called the beginning of the development of a true Roman art. The chief development of Roman art lay in the department of architecture. Profusely as painting and sculpture were employed in ornamenting public and private buildings of all grades, both in Rome itself and in all the remotest cities of the vast empire, these arts were practiced exclusively by Greek sculptors and painters. The great majority of architects, also, in the Roman dominions were Greeks, though their work  was characterized by Roman elements and was executed in the Roman spirit.

The Romans used both stone and brick with extraordinary skill in their buildings. These materials were employed with great ingenuity and variety, both with and without mortar. The Romans adopted from the Etruscans the round arch and its consequence, the round vault. Arching and vaulting are the chief characteristics of Roman architecture. By using these they were able to erect massive and lofty structures of pleasing lightness and with economy of material. Indeed, without the arch Roman architecture would not have had an existence. By the use of the arch and the vault Roman architecture has given rise to the Byzantine style, and, through this, has inspired all subsequent architecture. Through the arch Roman architecture forms the connecting link and the transition medium from the art of antiquity to the art of mediaeval and modern times. The Romans used the vault as the transition to the dome, and thus, through half domes, to the light and airy architecture of the Byzantines. They also built circular temples, which, originally at least, were more usually consecrated to Vesta, with a simple circular cell, surmounted by a dome, as in the Pantheon. From the traditions of their early Etruscan neighbors they preferred the square cell to the Greek rectangular oblong cell in their rectangular temples. Especially was this the case in Rome itself. The temples they built in other parts of the empire, especially in Greece and the former Greek colonies, were built after the plan of Greek originals; but these were decorated after the modified Greek manner, which the Romans adopted at the metropolis.

The Romans greatly modified all the styles of Greek architecture. To the Doric they added the Tuscan base. This gave the order much wider adaptability to the uses for which the Romans wished to employ the style; that is, in forming colonnades and pilasters to many kinds of buildings, whether circular, elliptical. or rectangular. They were less fortunate in the modification of the Ionic order, which they adopted from a single known Greek original, making volutes face all four sides of the capital. As half columns or pilasters this modification was more fortunate. The Ionic order was only used by them as an intermediate style, in the second story of buildings, never in temples or other buildings a single story in height. The Corinthian order, which had hardly obtained its full capacity of development under the Greeks, was most happily used by the Romans. The Ionic volute, in a modified form, was introduced in the midst of the  Acanthus. Thus was taken the first step to the complete union of the Ionic and Corinthian styles in the so called composite order, which is the most characteristic and original decorative feature in Roman architecture, though it was doubtless elaborated by the hands of Greek workmen under the Roman rule. The capitals of columns and the entablatures were often covered with an amount of elaborate decoration which finally became overpowering, and almost destructive of good architectural effect. SEE ORDER.

In considering the classes of buildings erected by the Romans, the student of Egyptian or Greek art is surprised at the small number of temples constructed by the Romans in comparison with other edifices. The noblest monument of Roman architecture is the Pantheon, which is preserved almost in its entirety. Of other famous temples, as that of Jupiter Capitolinus, there are now no remains. The most magnificent temple built under the Roman dominion was that of Jupiter Olympus at Athens. The temples at Palmyra and Baalbec surprise by their size and the magnitude of the blocks of stone used in their erection, but in architectural elegance and purity they are very defective.

Of buildings of civil architecture the forum may first be considered. The forum was used, as by the Greeks, as a place for marketing, for assembling the people for the transaction of public business, for the election of officers, and for other purposes. The forum was surrounded by colonnades. These were frequently richly decorated. Besides the original Roman forum, various emperors laid out others, which served similar purposes. In the further development of the public life, the transaction of a portion of public affairs was transferred to special buildings, of which the basilicas are the most important. In the basilicas were held the courts of justice and the exchange for merchants; finally shops and libraries were added, and the basilicas almost served the varied purposes of the forums. The basilicas were generally rectangular and oblong in shape, though some were nearly square and were vaulted. The oblong basilicas usually had a round apsis at one end. These two forms furnished the starting points for the two great early styles of Christian architecture the oblong, for the so called basilican churches in Italy; and the vaulted ones, for the Byzantine style in Constantinople. Thus we find in the Roman basilica the most important specific connecting link between classical and Christian architecture. SEE BASILICA.  Triumphal arches form a most, important feature of Roman architecture. They were very stately in form and costly in execution. This use of the arch they had doubtless derived from the Etruscans. The most important arches to signalize victories are those of Septimus Severus, Titus, and Constantine. The arch of Titus has peculiar interest to Christians, inasmuch as upon a bas-relief on the inside of the arch are cut models of the seven branched candlestick and other vessels of the Temple service which Titus carried with him to Rome after his conquest of Jerusalem. Arches were erected in many cities to commemorate also the erection of public works of great extent by the emperors or other public officials. SEE ARCH.

Originally, the Roman theaters, like those of Greece, were semicircular in form. But, while the Greek theaters were cut in the solid rock on the side of some lofty hill with a beautiful landscape for the scene, the Roman theater was built up, like other edifices, in the midst of the most populous cities, and the walls were decorated with colonnades, with vaulted arcades leading through the different stories to the seats. Theaters of vast size were built in Rome and in many provincial cities. The best preserved is at Orange, in France. But the amphitheatre was the specially characteristic form of theater building with the Romans. This was built of vast size in even the most distant provincial cities. The largest are the Colosseum at Rome and the amphitheaters at Capua, Verona, Pola, Nismes, and Constantine in Africa. It is estimated that the Colosseum could contain over sixty thousand spectators. In its arena gladiatorial sports of the most cruel character took place, and by their ferocity hastened the depravation of manners and morals which largely caused the downfall of the empire. SEE THEATER.

The public baths form another characteristic feature in Roman architecture. These were laid out upon a scale of immense grandeur. The baths of Caracalla covered thirty-six acres. The vast edifices in this structure were highly decorated, and contained almost innumerable works of sculpture and painting. Several thousand bathers could be accommodated at one time. Elegant halls were also provided for reading, conversation, music, boxing, and other lighter games of various sorts. Other baths of vast size were built by various emperors, as Diocletian, Agrippa, Titus, and Vespasian. SEE BATHE.

The arch was most successfully applied to the erection of bridges and aqueducts. Many of these were erected with surprising boldness, and of a  size and length to excite the wonder of the modern beholder. Though frequently without much architectural decoration, the aqueducts generally have graceful outlines, and by their long lines, as they sweep for miles over the plain, mark the power of the people who ruled the world. SEE BRIDGE.

The lack of perfect artistic taste was manifested by the Romans in the erection of columns of victory, which received long sculptured portrayals of the achievements of victors. As the sculpture is thus placed utterly out of the reach of the eye, its effect is lost upon the beholder. SEE COLUMN.

The history of the Roman domestic residence is to be traced in the progress of Roman luxury. In the early career of the state, private houses were extremely simple. During the empire, all the luxurious richness of decoration that wealth and art could supply was employed in adorning the houses of the wealthy. Good taste was soon overwhelmed in costly decoration. The houses in the provincial city of Pompeii indicate what may have been the luxurious decoration of the capital. Even greater profligate expenditures were made upon the villas of the rich on beautiful mountain sides or by the coasts of the sea. SEE HOUSE. The palaces of the emperors presented the climax of luxurious domestic architecture. These palaces, especially in provincial summer resorts, were built on an immense scale, and were rather a vast group of edifices within a fortified enclosure, all laid out and decorated with the fullest luxury of the period. Two of the most famous of these imperial palaces were that of Diocletian at Spalatro, and that of Adrian at Tivoli. SEE PALACE.

The tumular architecture of the Romans is very striking, both with reference to the number and the style of the monuments. Of the tombs of the kingly period, there remain only the monuments attributed to the Curiatii. Of the republic, there remain only the tomb and sarcophagus of Scipio. The tombs of the period of the empire seem to have been decidedly of Etruscan style, both in shape and construction. The earliest of these is that of Cecilia Metella, on the Appian Way; but the grandest and most splendid was that of Adrian, now known as the Castle St. Angelo. The basement was three hundred and forty feet square; the height to the pine cone on the summit was three hundred feet. It was decorated with an immense number of statues. The building called the tomb of Santa Helena, mother of Constantine, shows how the feeling for interior decoration had in that period displaced the earlier feeling for exterior decoration in all  classes of structures. Parallel to these tombs erected above the ground are the columbaria, or underground tombs, with niches for containing a number of cinerary urns. In general structure, these have their antitype in the subterranean tombs, or catacombs, of the Etruscans. Many of these columbaria are exquisitely decorated with arabesques of stucco, which have been the delight of medieval and modern artists. Tumular monuments of more slender upright form, often with highly appropriate architectural decoration, and evidently with a marked Greek impress, are found in a few provincial cities in the north and west of the empire. But in Cyrene in Africa and in Petra in Arabia are found a large number of elaborate and imposing tombs. Those at Petra are deeply cut in the rock, like many Egyptian tombs, but with elaborate Corinthian decorations. Of this same Roman period are a large number of tombs in Palestine, Mesopotamia, and other countries in the Orient. See Toam.

The catacombs of the Etruscans were imitated by the Jews and Christians in Rome, as these classes, like the Etruscans, did not burn their dead. But the Romans themselves, so far as is known, did not imitate fully the Etruscan catacombs for their own dead. SEE CATACOMB.

The Romans invented almost no original sculpture, but they brought from the conquered cities and colonies of Greece countless statues of the first rank. They also had marble copies of many masterpieces made for the decoration of their baths, forums, circuses, palaces, and tombs. SEE SCULPTURE.

Painting, both in tempera and in mosaic, they employed very extensively in decorating the floors and walls of the interiors of all rooms, even of those of shops and smaller houses. SEE PAINTING.

The objects of daily use of every kind, even down to the utensils of the kitchen or the shop, were richly decorated. Artistic decoration had become a necessity in all material objects. But, withal, it is remarkable that they should have depended upon foreign workmen to supply them with all their artistic objects, both large and small. SEE ROME.

In more ways than can be traced, the art of Rome, or rather the art in Rome, furnished the channel for the transmission of the art of classical antiquity, in modified forms, to mediaeval Christianity. SEE ROMANESQUE ART. (G.F.C.)

## Roman Catholic Church[[@Headword:Roman Catholic Church]]

             the name usually given to that organization of Christians which recognizes the Roman pope as its visible head and is in ecclesiastical communion with him. The name may be found in a number of Roman Catholic writers, and is generally used in the constitution of those states in which the Roman Catholic Church is designated as one of the recognized or tolerated State churches. It is, however, not the official name used by the authorities of the Church — who rather dislike it, and substitute for it the name “Catholic” or “Holy Catholic” Church. The name “Roman Church” is applied, in the language of the Church, to the Church or diocese of the bishop of Rome. The views which the members of the Roman Catholic Church, on the one hand, and all other Christians, on the other, take of the doctrine and the history of this Church widely and irreconcilably differ. To the former, the Church is the only form of Christianity that was founded by Christ; all other denominations of Christians are looked upon as deviations from genuine Christianity, and the history of the Church is to the Roman Catholic identical with the progress and development of Christianity. All other Christians agree in viewing the doctrinal system of Rome as abounding in erroneous and antichristian admixtures to the Christianity of the Bible, and its history as the gradual growth of a central and absolute power, which is without a scriptural basis, and prefers and enforces claims for which there is no warrant whatever in the teaching of Christ or the words of the Bible.

I. History. — The Catholic historian begins the history of his Church with the life of the Lord Jesus Christ. While living on this earth, he gathered around him those who were to rule the Church after his ascension. He provided for a complete organization of the g Church by designating Peter as its head. The foundation of the Church was externally completed on the day of Pentecost by the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Several Church fathers have called this day the birthday of the Christian Church; accordingly the Catholic historian claims it as the actual beginning of the Catholic Church. Many of the traditions and legends which ( formerly embellished the histories of the early Catholic Church have now been quite generally abandoned by Catholic writers; they continue, however, to insist that the Scriptures in many places attest the supremacy of Peter as the first among the apostles and the head of the Church. While admitting and lamenting the insufficiency of authentic information on the early history of the Church,  Catholic writers emphatically defend, in opposition to modern criticism, a Roman episcopate of the apostle Peter, the exercise of suprematial powers by several bishops of Rome in the first three centuries, and the actual acquiescence of the Church in the Roman decisions. The pictures of the early Christian congregations, as they are drawn by Catholic writers, bear but little resemblance to the Roman Catholic Church of the present day; but it is contended that all that was subsequently developed in the Catholic system existed as a germ in the primitive Church, and that modern criticism has been unable to prove any irreconcilable difference between the creed of the early Church and the Roman Catholic Church as it now exists.

The growth of an “Old Catholic Church” with an episcopal constitution in the 2d and following centuries is generally recognized by Church historians. It is also quite generally admitted that the bishops of Rome, the imperial city of the West, successfully claimed a greater and greater influence; but only Roman Catholics defend these claims as the exercise of a divine right, while all other writers look upon them as the gradual development of a usurpation which was attended by the most dangerous results. Christianity, in the meanwhile, spread rapidly through all the parts of the Roman world empire, and, by the conversion of the emperor Constantine, entered into the novel position of the ruling Church. The transfer of the imperial residence to Constantinople led to a rivalry between the bishops of Rome and Constantinople, which gradually became fatal to the unity of the Church. The bishops of Rome steadily enlarged their predominant influence in the whole of Western Europe, and rapidly increased their power by the conversion of the Germanic tribes, which gradually grew up to be the most powerful nations of the Christian world. The establishment of the temporal power at the close of the 8th century gave to the popes of Rome both greater influence and greater prestige, and enabled them to gradually convert the episcopal into a papal Church. The pontificate of Hildebrand, who succeeded to the papal throne in 1073 under the name of Gregory VII, completed the papal system and the Roman Catholic Church in their most essential features. Even before his election as pope, he had prevailed upon his immediate predecessors, as their most influential adviser, to make the election of popes in future wholly independent of secular influence, and thus to secure a continuity of pontiffs whose sole aim would be the progress and complete victory of the Church, not only over all other ecclesiastical and religious organizations, but also over all temporal governments. Under his influence, a council held  at Rome in 1059 had decreed that the pope was to be only elected by the cardinals. After he had ascended the papal throne himself, he enforced in 1074 the priestly celibacy, and took the final step for emancipating the Church from the State by forbidding bishops and abbots, through a synod held at Rome (1075), to accept the investiture from secular governments. For nearly fifty years this prohibition remained the subject of a violent controversy between the pope and the secular princes, and though it was finally settled by a compromise (1122), it secured to the pope a general recognition of the important right of confirming the election of all the bishops. One of the leading features of the Roman Catholic system — the absolute supremacy of the pope as vicar of Jesus Christ and head of the Church in all ecclesiastical affairs — is largely due to the influences proceeding from Gregory VII and his successors.

The fundamental idea of Gregory VII, however, was never fully carried out. He had clearly conceived the plan of converting the Roman Catholic Church into a universal theocracy, with the pope at its head as sole sovereign in temporal affairs as well as spiritual. According to this view, all states of the Christian name were to be bound together in the unity of the papal theocracy as members of one body. The princes receive their consecration and divine sanction through the ecclesiastical power; they are appointed “by the grace of God;” but the Church mediates between them and God. Royalty sustains to the papacy the same relation as the moon to the sun, receiving from it its light and its heat. The divine authority with which secular powers are clothed by the Church can therefore be again withdrawn by the Church when the secular powers misuse it. With the withdrawal of this authority ceases also the liability of the subjects to obedience. The gigantic efforts made by the medieval popes, from Gregory VII to Boniface VIII, to enforce these views fill some of the most interesting pages of the history of the Middle Ages. By the semi-military organization of the religious orders, the popes had a well disciplined and trustworthy corps of officers at their disposal, who frequently fought their battles even when bishops ceased to side with them. The Crusades, though in the first place aiming at the deliverance of the holy sepulchre, repeatedly supplied the popes with a willing army for coercing hostile princes. None of the successors of Gregory attained so great a power and came so near realizing the establishment of the papal theocracy as Innocent III. In the struggle against his successors, the noble house of Hohenstaufen perished; but soon the kings of France checked the theocratic aspirations of the popes, and the imprisonment of Boniface VIII by the French made a breach in the  theocratic edifice reared by Gregory VII and his successors which has never been repaired. The right to depose princes and release their subjects from the oath of allegiance was not expressly disowned by the popes, but it ceased to involve any practical danger, and was clearly repudiated by the Church. The transfer of the papal residence, which made the popes disgracefully dependent upon the French kings, and, still more, the papal schism, during which two, or at times three, popes hurled against each other the most terrible anathemas, undermined to a large extent the respect which Catholic countries had thus far had for the papal authority, and rapidly diffused the belief that the Church was pervaded by corruption, and that it needed a thorough reformation in its head and members. Such a reformation was sincerely attempted by the great councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle, which not only endeavored to eradicate many flagrant abuses in the practical life of the Church, but to reduce the constitution of the Church from a papal absolutism to an episcopal constitutionalism by expressly declaring the superiority of a general council over the pope. The success of this scheme would have shaped the subsequent development of the Roman Catholic Church very different from what it has been; but the astuteness of the popes knew how to thwart the manifest reformatory desires of the majority of the bishops, to stifle the cries for a Church reformation, and to reimpose upon a reluctant Church the papal authority, at least in matters of an ecclesiastical nature.

While Western Europe became politically reorganized under Teutonic leadership, and ecclesiastically centralized as the Roman Catholic Church under the leadership of the bishops of Rome, the Eastern churches retained substantially the constitution of the Old Catholic Church of the early centuries. The Council of Nice recognized the higher authority of the metropolitan bishops of Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria. This higher authority was subsequently expressed in the title “patriarch.” Later, the bishops of Constantinople and Jerusalem were added to the number of patriarchs, and the growing importance of the city of Constantinople gradually made the bishop of the city the first among the Eastern patriarchs, a distinction which was expressly sanctioned by the Concilium Quinisextum of 692. The Church of those times was greatly agitated by controversies relating to the Person and Work of Christ. East and West united in the wish to preserve the doctrinal unity of the Church on those important subjects; and oecumenical councils, in which both sections were represented, defined the creed of the Church and expelled the dissenters  from her communion. Whether at these councils any prerogative, honorary or otherwise, was conceded to the patriarchs of Rome continues to be a subject of theological controversy; but even Roman Catholic writers do not claim that the bishops of Rome can be proved to have asserted any superior jurisdiction in any of the other patriarchal dioceses. Gradually some different views sprang up between the East and West relating to questions of constitution, doctrine, and worship. The most important of these controversies was that relating to the procession of the Holy Ghost. SEE FILIOQUE. In the course of the 9th century the controversy grew into a serious dissension, and in the course of the 11th it led to a formal and permanent schism. Many attempts at reconciliation and reunion have since been made, but they were either unsuccessful, or, if successful for a time, without duration. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

In Western Europe, the Roman Catholic Church retained her unity until the 16th century. The leaders of that reformatory party which controlled the councils of Pisa, Constance, and Basle were anxious not to disturb the unity of the Church, and cooperated in the condemnation of men like Wycliffe and Huss, who wanted first of all a scriptural reformation of the doctrine, and who showed no concern about external unity if it stood in the way of a doctrinal reformation. At the beginning of the 16th century, the stifled clamors for a radical revision of the doctrine of the corrupt Church and the restoration of a pure scriptural doctrine burst irresistibly forth in the German and Swiss reformation. SEE REFORMATION.

The whole of England, Scotland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and large portions of Germany and Switzerland, permanently severed their connection with the Roman Catholic Church. The Church rallied, from a sense of self preservation, for extraordinary conservative, and recuperative efforts. Although the Council of Trent (1545-63) did not succeed in bringing back the seceders, it exerted an important normative influence upon the subsequent history of the Roman Church. While it reasserted, in opposition to the Protestants, those doctrines which had been developed by the mediaeval theologians, and promulgated them as parts of the Church doctrine, and thus made a return of those who regarded many Roman Catholic doctrines as an apostasy from pure Biblical Christianity impossible, it issued, on the other hand, decrees for the reformation of the constitution and discipline of the Church, which retained within its pale large numbers who, though favoring a purification of the Church, laid also great stress upon the preservation of its unity and its unbroken historical  connection with the apostolic age.

For the vast territories lost in Europe, the Church received some compensation in the New World, where the monastic orders, conjointly with the Spanish government, subjected the larger portion of the native population to the Church, and filly secured the permanent ascendency of Roman Catholicism. The desire to concentrate the energy of the ablest men within the Church for an effectual arrest of a further advance of Protestantism led to the peculiar organization of the Order of the Jesuits, which plays a prominent part in the subsequent history of the Church. By dint of its extraordinary efforts, it not only checked the further progress of Protestantism in a number of countries, but recovered some that already appeared to be lost. Within the Church its influence was no less remarkable, and it succeeded, like no other community of men before, in strengthening and enlarging, in opposition to the adherents of the episcopalian system, and especially to the Gallicans, the absolute authority of the popes. The rejection by the popes of doctrinal opinions designated as heretical repeatedly called forth very exciting dogmatical controversies, which in one case led to the organization of a separate ecclesiastical community, the so called Jansenists, or Old Catholics of Holland, who recognized the authority of the pope as the head of the Church, but denied the infallibility of his dogmatical decisions, and consequently their obligation to yield to them an unconditional submission. In the second half of the 18th century, extraordinary tempests came down upon the Church. In France and other countries of Southern Europe, an antichristian literature undermined, in the educated classes of the population, not only the attachment to the Church, but a belief in Christianity. The Bourbons of Spain, Portugal, and France, under the influence of freethinking statesmen, forced a pliant pope who had been elected by their influence to abolish the Order of the Jesuits, in their opinion the strongest bulwark of the Church against the advance of a new, freethinking sera. In Germany, the episcopal electors of the empire united with the emperor Joseph II on a plan to establish a National German Catholic Church, which was to be almost independent of Rome. The French Revolution took from the pope his temporal possessions, confiscated the property of the Church, and for a time decreed the abolition of Christianity. Napoleon desired to secure the cooperation of the Church for the execution of his ambitious schemes and the confirmation of his power and his dynasty. He concluded in 1801 with the pope a concordat, which was to restore to the pope his temporal possessions and his ecclesiastical powers; but as a complete agreement was not arrived at, Napoleon once more (1808) occupied the States of the  Church, and declared the “donation of his predecessor Charlemagne” revoked. When he was thereupon excommunicated, he imprisoned the pope, and for several years deprived the Church of her head. In 1814 the allied princes of Europe restored the temporal power of the pope, and Pius VII was enabled to resume the full functions of the papacy as they were exercised before the French Revolution.

An agreement, however, between the pope and the princes assembled at the Congress of Vienna was not attained, and the pope entered through his legate a protest against the work of the congress. In 1816 the Order of the Jesuits was restored for the whole Church, and soon displayed again, as in former times, an extraordinary activity for strengthening and enlarging the papal authority in opposition to episcopal and liberal tendencies still manifesting themselves within the Church, as well as to the legislation of the secular governments. The growth of the liberal and revolutionary party in most of the European countries, which aimed at either curtailing or wholly abolishing the power of the princes, was not only very distasteful to the Roman Catholic Church, but led in most countries to vehement conflicts, especially in regard to the public schools. In Italy, the national tendencies for a political union led to the establishment of a united kingdom of Italy, to which the larger portion of the States of the Church was annexed in 1860, and the remainder, including the city of Rome, in 1870. Though not a few Catholics, including even some of the most prominent members of the Order of the Jesuits, were inclined to look upon the destruction of the temporal power of the popes as favorable to the spiritual interests of the Church, the pope (Pius IX) pronounced an excommunication against the king of Italy and all I statesmen who had aided in the conquest of the Papal States. The successor of Pius (Leo XIII), though believed to be more mildly disposed, has not yet receded from the standpoint of his predecessor. The pontificate of Pius IX became of exceeding importance in the inner history of the Catholic Church. The promulgation of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and of a syllabus which characterized a number of doctrines and views commonly held in civilized countries as heretical or erroneous, indicated a determination on the part of the pope and his advisers to lorce a belief in, and submission to, the extreme theories concerning the papal authority upon the entire Catholic Church. This victory of the extremest papal party within the Catholic Church became complete when, in 1870, the Vatican Council proclaimed the infallibility of the doctrinal decisions of the pope as a tenet of the Catholic Church. A considerable number of bishops, chiefly from Germany, Austria, and  France, made a determined opposition to the adoption of the new doctrine, chiefly on the ground of its being inopportune.

After its adoption by the council, however, the opposing bishops gradually submitted to the demand of the pope to have the doctrine promulgated in their dioceses. Several did so with undisguised reluctance; some (as bishop Beckmann of Osnabriick) were said by their intimate friends to have secretly remained opponents of the innovation even on their death bed; but externally all yielded, and not one of the bishops separated from the Church in consequence of the great change which had been made by the Vatican Council. The lower clergy quite generally followed the example of the bishops. A number of professors of Catholic theology at the German universities continued, however, to refuse their submission, and were therefore excommunicated. As many thousands of laymen sympathized with them, the necessity of providing for their religious wants gradually led to the organization of “Old Catholic” congregations in Germany, Switzerland, and Austria, and even the election of Old Catholic bishops in Germany and Switzerland. In France, a distinguished pulpit orator, father Hyacinthe, has been active in the interest of Old Catholicism, but thus far (1879) without effecting any organization. In Italy, the friends of an Old Catholic reformation have a secret organization, with a bishop elect at its head. The numerical strength which the Old Catholic Church had attained after eight years of hard and incessant labors was far from meeting the expectations of its founders. The total number of the population which expressly and formally severed their connection with what was called, by the Old Catholics, the Vatican Church did not exceed 200,000 persons, an insignificant number if compared with the 200,000,000 who remain nominally connected with Rome. But the reluctance of the bulk of the Catholic population to sever their nominal connection with the Church of their ancestors cannot be taken as a proof that the Catholic Church retains its control over the nations which refused to separate from her in the 16th century. The history of the Catholic nations during the last century furnishes, on the contrary, ample proof that the influence of the national Church in all these countries has to a very large extent been undermined. — In Spain the Cortes frequently defied the authority of the Church. In 1835 nearly all the convents were abolished, and only a few of them have ever been restored. In 1837 the Cortes abolished tithes and confiscated the entire property of the Church. In 1840, during the provisional regency of Espartero, the papal nuncio was expelled from the country; and in 1841 the union of the Spanish Church with Rome was declared to have ceased. Repeatedly the Cortes decided in favor of  religious toleration, especially during the short time when Spain was a republic. King Amadeo I, and still more Alphonso XII (since 1874), deemed it expedient to seek a reconciliation with the pope; but even they have been unable to grant all the demands of the Church. — Portugal has been, almost without interruption, at variance with the claims of the popes. All the religious orders of men, and nearly all those for women, have been suppressed. In the Cortes a liberal, anti-Roman party is invariably in the ascendency; even the majority of the priests and bishops sympathize more with the government than with the pope, and up to the end of 1878 the government had forbidden and prevented the promulgation of the doctrine of papal infallibility. — In France the revolution of 1830 not only expelled the Bourbons from the throne, but stripped, to a large extent, the Church of its political power. According to the new constitution, the Roman Catholic Church was no longer the religion of the State, but only of the majority of Frenchmen. The affairs of the nation were for many years conducted by a Protestant prime minister, Guizot.

Napoleon III endeavored to strengthen his dynasty by making extensive concessions to the hierarchy; and even after the establishment of the republic in 1871, the majority of the Legislative Assembly and one of the presidents of the republic (MacMahon) favored the Catholic restoration in order to check the confirmation and advance of republican principles; but in 1879 the success of the Republican party at the general election, in spite of its denunciation by all the bishops, placed the government of the country in the hands of statesmen who are fully determined to annihilate the influence of the Catholic priesthood upon the government of France and upon the education of the rising generation. — In the little kingdom of Belgium, which, in 1830, established its independence of Holland, the Catholic Church has, on the whole, exercised a greater influence upon legislation than in any other country of Europe; but, notwithstanding the immense power of the Church, the liberal party, which is in open and bitter enmity to the Church, secured at the general election in 1878 a majority in both chambers, and has since prepared a law on public education which will exclude the influence of the Church. — In Austria the close alliance between the absolute government and the popes for the suppression of all liberal tendencies was terminated by the introduction of a constitutional form of government in 1848. An attempt which was made in 1855 to re- establish this alliance by a new Austrian concordat, which gave to the Catholic bishops a far reaching influence upon public affairs, was of short duration. The reestablishment of a parliamentary government has shown  that the majority of both houses are adverse to the continuance of Church influence upon public affairs, and that they uphold the principles of religious toleration and of State education. Italy has, like Spain and Portugal, expelled the religious orders and confiscated the property of the Church; it has fully secularized public instruction, and, more than any other government of the world, it is impelled to reject the claims of the Church, because these claims involve the destruction of Italian unity. Among the states of Spanish and Portuguese America there is not one which has not had, from time to time, its conflicts with pope and bishops. The progress of religious toleration and of a secular school system, after the Protestant models of Germany and the United States, and in opposition to the bishops, proves that the Church has ceased to have a firm hold on any of these states. SEE OLD CATHOLICS.

In the Protestant countries of Europe the Roman Catholic Church has been greatly benefited since the beginning of the 19th century by the progress of religious toleration. The laws impeding the free exercise of the Roman Catholic form of worship, or its self-government, were quite generally repealed, or fell, at least, into disuse. Thus congregations were reorganized in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark, where the Church had been almost extinct since the 16th century, and vicars apostolic were appointed as an initial step towards the reconstruction of dioceses. — In Holland, where the Church had been for two hundred years without a hierarchical organization, although it had not ceased to have a considerable Catholic population, the constitution of 1848 proclaimed the principle of religious liberty. Thus even the Jesuits were allowed to return, and in 1853 the Catholic hierarchy was re-established by the erection of one archbishopric and four bishoprics. In Great Britain the government had to yield, in 1829, to the agitation of the Irish Catholics for equal political rights, and to open both houses of Parliament to its Catholic subjects. This was followed by the restoration of the Catholic hierarchy in 1850, in which year pope Pius IX divided the kingdom into one archbishopric and twelve bishoprics. The ancient hierarchy of the Roman Catholic Church had become extinct in 1585, by the death of bishop Goldwell of St. Asaph. In Scotland, when the ancient hierarchy had become extinct by the death of archbishop Betoun of Glasgow, in 1601, the hierarchy was established by pope Leo XIII, who in 1878 established two archbishoprics and four bishoprics. As Ireland at the time of the Catholic emancipation numbered alone seven millions of Roman Catholics, and a tide of Irish emigration filled the cities of England and  Scotland with a large Catholic population, the Catholic Church appeared at home and abroad as a great power; and the number of churches, of priests, and Catholic institutions rapidly increased.

The indignation felt among Protestants at this revival of the Church of Rome induced Parliament, in 1851, to adopt a resolution declaring all papal edicts, and all jurisdictions, ranks, or titles created by them, null and void; and fining every person who, without legal authority, accepted any ecclesiastical title derived from the name of any place in the kingdom. But the new Catholic bishops knew how to evade the laws; and the liberal tendency of English legislation gave to the Roman Catholics a position which even Roman Catholic writers have often praised as the most favorable in Europe. The hopes awakened by this restoration for the future of Roman Catholicism in England were greatly strengthened by a movement within the Established Church of England, which aimed at a revival of the Catholic elements of this Church. Under the leadership of Pusey and Newman, this movement — sometimes called the Oxford movement because it had its chief center in Oxford — gradually developed tendencies to Roman Catholicism and led a considerable number of graduates of English universities over to the Church of Rome, Among the new Catholics were many men of great reputation, influence, and wealth. The most prominent were, Dr. Henry Newman, one of the leaders of the movement, who, as superior of the religious order of the Oratorians (consisting almost wholly of former members of the Anglican Church), as rector of the Catholic University of Dublin, and by a number of literary works, displayed a great activity for the Roman Catholic Church, and, as a reward for his services, was raised, in 1879, to the cardinalate; archbishop Manning of Westminster, created cardinal in 1875; the marquis of Bute, one of the richest noblemen of the United Kingdom; the marquis of Ripon, a prominent English statesman and member of the Privy Council. The number of Anglican clergymen, members of the nobility, and literary persons who, since the beginning of the Oxford movement, have joined the Roman Catholic Church exceeds one thousand. By these accessions the Church has received a higher social standing and a greater influence upon English society than it had before. This is especially apparent in the colonies, where the government recognizes the power of the Catholic bishops and missionaries to cooperate for the confirmation of the English rule, and is willing to secure this cooperation by favors and concessions. It is, however, a noteworthy fact that, in spite of all the accessions to the Church from the higher ranks of English society, the total Catholic population shows not only no notable progress, but the estimates by the  most careful statisticians give even lower figures for it than were assumed some ten years ago.

This would indicate that the losses sustained by the Church, especially among the lower classes of the population, must, at least, equal in number the gains.

On the other hand, the territorial rearrangement of Germany by the Congress of Vienna placed nearly all the German Catholics, except those of Austria and Bavaria, under Protestant governments. The great wars of 1866 and 1870 severed the connection between Catholic Austria and the German Catholics, and placed Protestant Prussia and a Protestant emperor at the head of the German nationality. The laws of all the German states place the Roman Catholics on a level with Protestants; but divergent opinions on the limits of the ecclesiastical and the secular powers have repeatedly led to fierce conflicts between the Church and the German governments, especially Prussia. The two Prussian archbishops of Cologne and Posen were imprisoned in 1837, and kept prisoners until 1840, for refusing obedience to royal ordinances concerning mixed marriages. A new conflict began in 1872, which occupies a prominent place in the modern history of Roman Catholicism, under the name Kulturkampf and was not yet ended at the beginning of 1879. The Prussian government, alarmed at the increase of power which the Vatican Council had placed in the hands of the pope, deemed it necessary to divest the bishops of the influence which they had thus far exerted upon the national schools; to check the absolute control of the lower clergy by the bishops; and to extend the jurisdiction of the State over both bishops and lower clergy. The bishops regarded some of the laws adopted in Prussia for this purpose as inconsistent with their duties towards the Church, and refused to submit to them. In consequence of the conflicts which were caused by this attitude of the bishops, a number of the Prussian bishops were deposed from their sees; and several other sees which became vacant by the death of their occupants could not be filled on account of the insuperable disagreement between the Prussian government and the pope. At the beginning of 1879, of the twelve archbishoprics and bishoprics of Prussia, only two were actually filled. During the progress of this conflict, the bulk of the Catholic population of Germany showed a marked sympathy with the bishops; and the universal suffrage which has been adopted in Germany for the elections to the Reichstag yielded in no country of the world so compact a host of ultramontane deputies as in Germany.

Thus the Catholic districts of  Germany came to be looked upon as a bulwark of the Roman Catholic Church in general. Previously the German Church had won within the Catholic Church a great prestige for superiority in the province of literature; and not a few of its literary productions had been translated into the languages of most of the other Catholic nations. The elevation of Dr. Hergenrother, a university professor, to the cardinalate by pope Leo XIII, in April, 1879, was regarded as an encouraging tribute to the science of Catholic Germany by the head of the Church. The Roman Catholic Church has suffered the greatest numerical losses in Russia. At the second partition of Poland, in 1793, nearly all the dioceses of the United Greeks in the former Polish empire were incorporated with Russia. The empress Catharine II made incessant efforts to reunite the United Greeks (who, during the Polish rule, had been induced to recognize the supremacy of the pope) with the Orthodox Greek Church; and it is said that, during her reign, no no less than seven millions of United Greeks separated from Rome. No exertions to this end were made by the emperors Paul I and Alexander I; but Nicholas I and Alexander II followed in the footsteps of Catharine. In 1839, 3 bishops and 1305 priests, representing a population of more than 2,000,000, declared, at a synod held at Plock, in favor of reunion with the Russian State Church. After this only one United Greek diocese remained (Chelm), with a population of 250,000, nearly all of whom, in the years 1877 and 1878, likewise joined the Russian Church. As the Russian government forbids secession from the State Church to any other religious denomination, a return of the United Greeks to the communion of Rome is for the present impossible. Roman Catholic writers unanimously assert that measures of the utmost severity and cruelty have been resorted to to bring about this separation from Rome; and their statements are fully confirmed by nearly all writers who are not Russians. — In the United States of America the Roman Catholic Church enjoys a degree of independence which it has hardly ever possessed in any other country. Owing to the rapid increase of the population in general, and to the large influx of immigrants, it has already attained a high rank among the national divisions of the Roman Catholic Church. SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES.

The missionary labors of the Catholic Church in non-Christian countries received a great impulse by the foundation of the Order of the Jesuits. The latter sent out a larger number of missionaries than any other religious order has done before or after its foundation. In some countries of Eastern  Asia the Catholic missions appeared, at times, to become a complete success. — In Japan the Church embraced, at one time, more than 200,000 Christians, and counted among her adherents several princes. — In China the Jesuits obtained a great influence at the courts of several emperors, and the permission to establish missions throughout the empire. — In Hindostan, Corea, Anam, and other countries, numerous congregations were collected, and many natives became priests and members of religious orders. Many of these missions have had to suffer bloody persecutions; but most of them have survived, though in a crippled form and with reduced numbers, to the present day. Pope Gregory XV established for the chief and central direction of the Catholic missions, in all parts of the world, the Congregatio de Propaganda Fide, which consisted of 15 cardinals, 3 prelates, and 1 secretary. Pope Urban VIII connected with this institution, in 1627, a seminary for the training of foreign missionaries (Collegium Urbanum de Propaganda Fide), which still exists, and has always been famous for the large number of nationalities represented among its pupils. Besides the seminary of the Propaganda, the Roman Catholic Church has seminaries specially devoted to the education of foreign missionaries at Paris, Lyons, and in several other places; and at present most of the religious orders educate some of their members in their own institutions for the missionary service. For the financial support of the Catholic missions, a central Society for the Propagation of the Faith was established in 1822 at Lyons, which has of late had an annual income of about 5,000,000 francs. This society has branches in nearly all countries of the world; only Austria and Bavaria have preferred to establish their own societies for the support of foreign missions. A children's missionary society, called the “Society of the Holy Childhood of Jesus,” devotes its revenue chiefly to the efforts for the baptism and Catholic education of pagan children. It has branches in all countries. It is admitted by all Catholic writers that the sums annually contributed for the support of the Catholic missionaries fall far below the aggregate annual income of the Protestant missionary societies.

II. Doctrines. — As the Roman Catholic Church agrees with the Greek and the Protestant churches in regarding the Holy Scriptures as divinely inspired, and as an authority in matters of faith and morals, she holds many points of Christian belief in common with these large divisions of the Christian Church. Conjointly with them, she believes in the unity of divine essence, the Trinity of the divine persons (Father, Son, and Holy Ghost),  and the creation of the world by the will of God out of nothing for his glory and the happiness of his creatures. Among other points of belief which are common to the Roman Catholic, Greek, and Evangelical Protestant churches are the following: the original innocence of man; his fall in Adam, and redemption by Christ; the incarnation of the Eternal Logos and Second Person in the Holy Trinity; the divine human constitution of the Person Christ. In regard to the procession of the Holy Ghost, the Roman Catholic Church has added to the Nicene Creed the “Filioque” (“and from the Son”), and accordingly believes that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son; while the Greek Church believes, in strict accordance with the original Nicene Creed, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only. The Roman Catholic Church holds, in common with the Greek, but in opposition to evangelical Protestants, the following doctrines: The authority of ecclesiastical tradition as a joint rule of faith with the Scriptures; the veneration of the Virgin Mary, the saints, their pictures and relics; the infallibility of the Church; justification by faith and works as joint conditions; the seven sacraments or mysteries; baptismal regeneration, and the necessity of water baptism for salvation; priestly absolution by divine authority; transubstantiation and the adoration of the consecrated elements; the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead; prayers for the departed. The infallibility of the Church was formerly lodged by the Roman Catholic Church in the general councils conjointly with the pope, but since 1870 also in all the doctrinal decisions of the popes; by the Greek Church it is attributed to the seven ecumenical councils, and the patriarchal oligarchy as a whole.

The immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, which was proclaimed as a dogma by the pope in 1854, is rejected by the Greek Church as blasphemous, although it practices the veneration of the Virgin no less than the Roman Catholic. In regard to the Holy Scriptures, the Roman Catholic Church includes in its canon the Apocrypha of the Old Test., which are excluded from the Protestant canon. The Latin (Vulgate) translation of the Bible is placed on a par with the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, while Protestantism claims divine authority only for the original Scriptures of the inspired authors. As regards the popular use and circulation of the Bible, the Roman Catholic Church has generally discouraged the reading of unannotated Bibles in the native tongues, and commanded her members to seek on this subject the previous advice of their pastors and spiritual guides.  With regard to the unity of the Church, the Roman Catholic Church teaches that Christ founded one, and only one, infallible visible Church which was to represent him on earth as the teacher of religious truth, and to which, therefore, all men ought to submit. The Roman Catholic Church claims to be this communion, and therefore asserts that outside of her there is no salvation (“extra ecclesiam nulla salus”). She does not admit the Protestant distinction between a visible and invisible Church, but demands that all should belong to the visible Church. She admits, however, that there may be cases when insurmountable difficulties prevent persons from joining her communion, and when God will save them though they have not been formally received into her pale. As there is, in the opinion of the Church, only one Church and one baptism, all persons, children or adult, to whom the ordinance of baptism is administered in due form are thereby received into the Catholic Church. The children of Protestants and other non-Catholics are therefore regarded as belonging to the Catholic Church until they cut themselves loose from it by their own erroneous belief.

In regard to the future life, the Roman Catholic Church admits a temporary middle place and state (lasting until the final judgment) between heaven and hell, for the purification of imperfect Christians, which may be advanced by prayers and masses in their behalf. The center of Catholic worship is the mass, which the Church holds to be an actual, though unbloody, repetition of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, by the priests, for the sins of the living and the dead. It is offered, as a rule, daily by every priest. To the laity the eucharist is now administered in only one kind, the bread, the Church believing that Christ is wholly present in the consecrated bread as well as in the wine, and that therefore the reception of one kind is fully sufficient.

An important difference between Roman Catholic and Protestant ethics exists in the doctrine of good works, the Roman Catholic Church believing that works of supererogation, which are not commanded, but recommended (consilia evangelica), with corresponding extra merits, constitute a treasury at the disposal of the pope for the dispensation of indulgences. These indulgences are transferable to the souls in purgatory.

As the Church is the plenipotentiary and infallible representative of Christ, her commandments are no less binding upon the faithful than the divine commandments recorded in the Scriptures. Among the commandments given by the Church are the duty of the faithful to go once a year to  confession, to receive once a year the eucharist, and to attend mass on every Sunday and holiday. Upon her clergy the Church has imposed the duty of celibacy; as this, however, is not a part of Church doctrine, the priests of those of the Eastern churches which recognize the supremacy of the pope are allowed to marry.

Paintings and images are quite commonly used in Catholic churches as fitting ornaments, and as objects calculated to excite and keep alive feelings of devotion. The crucifix may be mentioned as the principal among them. A number of ceremonies and vestments are used in the celebration of divine worship. They are intended to give a peculiar dignity to the sacred mysteries of religion; to raise the mind of the beholder to heavenly things by their various and appropriate import; to instruct the ignorant and keep alive attention; to give to the ministers of religion a respect for themselves and for the awful rites in which they officiate.

In the celebration of the mass and other services of the Church, the Latin language is used. The Church cherishes it as a bond of union which connects the churches of the present with each other, as well as with the primitive apostolic Church of Rome. For the use of the people, translations into the vernacular languages are made, and are in common use. The Eastern churches which have entered into a corporate union with Rome are allowed to retain at divine service the use of their old liturgical languages. Latin is also the language of the Breviary, which contains the prayers and religious readings prescribed by the Church for the daily devotional exercises of the priests.

III. Constitution. — The Roman Catholic Church believes in a special priesthood in which all the offices of the Church are vested. The powers conferred upon the priesthood are twofold — the priestly power, potestas ordinis, and the governing power, potestas jurisdictionis. The former is vested in its fulness in the bishops, who alone have the right to provide for the continuation of the hierarchy by means of ordination. Subordinate to the bishop are the orders of priest and deacon. These two orders, together with that of bishop, constitute the ordines majores, and form the keystone of the entire hierarchy. Several minor orders, ordines minores, the number of which has varied, are preparatory steps for the entrance into the hierarchy, and are no longer of any practical significance. The governing power is possessed in its fulness by the pope, who alone has apostolic authority, and may exercise it in any part of the Church. The bishop has  governing power only over one diocese, and, according to the present Church law, can practically exercise it only with the sanction of the pope. A number of episcopal dioceses are commonly united in an ecclesiastical province, the head bishop of which bears the title of archbishop, presides at the provincial councils, but otherwise interferes but rarely and only in special cases in the administration of the suffragan dioceses. If a country has more than one ecclesiastical province, one of the archbishops has frequently the title of primate, and as such ranks the other archbishops and presides at national councils. As all the Eastern patriarchates have severed their connection with Rome, the name patriarch has totally lost the signification it had in the early Church. It is an honorary title which confers no degree of jurisdiction superior to that of archbishop or primate. The Church has at present, besides the pope, twelve patriarchs — namely, four of Antioch (for the Latin, Greek, Syrian, and Maronite rites respectively), and one each of Constantinople, Alexandria, Jerusalem, Babylon (of the Chaldaean rite), Cilicia (of the Armenian rite), the East Indies, Lisbon, and Venice. Those fragments of Eastern churches which in course of time had entered into a corporate union, with the privilege of retaining the use of their ancient liturgical languages, the marriage of priests, and other ancient customs, are technically designated as the Eastern or Oriental rite, in opposition to the Latin rite.

For the purpose of deliberating and legislating on ecclesiastical affairs, a system of councils or synods has gradually been developed, consisting of ecumenical, national, provincial, and diocesan synods. Ecumenical councils are such as represent the entire Church, and to which now all the ordained bishops of the Church are invited. The Church now numbers twenty of these councils, the latest of which — the Vatican Council — was held from Dec. 8, 1869, to Oct. 20, 1870. (For a list of the first nineteen, SEE COUNCILS.) Up to the Vatican Council, large portions of the Church, including many bishops and provincial synods, have asserted the superiority of an ecumenical council over the pope. After the proclamation of the infallibility of the pope, it is no longer possible for any Roman Catholic to claim for an cecumenical council any kind of superiority. A national council is one consisting of all the archbishops and bishops of a country, under the presidency of the primate. The Church law makes no provision for their regular periodicity, and they have generally been convoked for some special reason. Provincial synods are meetings of the bishops of an ecclesiastical province under the presidency of the metropolitan or  archbishop. Diocesan synods are meetings of the clergy of a diocese under the presidency of the bishop. The Ecumenical Council of Trent desired to introduce these two classes of synods to a larger extent than had been the case before into the regular organism of the Church, and therefore provided that a provincial synod was to be held every third year in each ecclesiastical province, and a diocesan synod annually in each diocese. This provision, however, has been carried out but very imperfectly, and in the 18th century the diocesan synods fell into disuse in every country of Europe except Italy.

The pope is assisted in the government of the universal Church by the college of cardinals, which is divided into cardinal bishops, cardinal priests, and cardinal deacons. The bishops of every grade are, in a similar manner, aided in the government of their dioceses by a chapter, and frequently by an assistant bishop. The diocese is divided into parishes, a number of which is generally united into a deanery, at the head of which is a dean. The papal almanac (La Gerarchia Cattolica) for 1878 publishes the following summary of the Catholic hierarchy: The full number of the members of the college of cardinals is 73; namely, 6 cardinal bishops, 51 cardinal priests, and 16 cardinal deacons. Of patriarchal sees there are 12, 7 of which belong to the Latin and 5 to the Oriental rite. The number of archiepiscopal sees in December, 1877, was 172, of which 151 belonged to the Latin and the remainder to several Oriental rites. Of the Latin archbishops, 13 were immediately subject to the Holy See, and 138 were connected with ecclesiastical provinces. Of the Oriental archbishoprics, 1 Armenian, 1 Graeco-Roumanian, and 1 Graeco-Ruthenian are at the head of ecclesiastical provinces; 4 Graeco-Melchite, 4 Syrian, 5 Syro-Chaldean, 5 Syro-Maronite are subject to the patriarchs of the several rites. Of episcopal dioceses there were 719, of which 664 belonged to the Latin and 55 to several Oriental rites. If we add the six suburban sees of the cardinal bishops, the total number of episcopal sees would be 725, of which 670 belong to the Latin rite. Immediately subject to the Holy See are 87 Latin and 4 Eastern (3 Graeco-Ruthenian, 1 Graeco-Bulgarian) bishops; 577 Latin sees and 8 Oriental (1 Armenian, 3 Graeco-Roumanian, and 4 Graeco-Ruthenian) were suffragans in ecclesiastical provinces; 43 Oriental bishops (16 Armenian, 9 Graeco-Melchite, 8 Syrian, 7 Syro-Chaldeean, and 3 Syro-Maronite) were subjects to the patriarchs of the several rites. There were also 18 sees not connected with a diocese (nullius dioeceseos);  their occupants are 12 abbots, 1 archabbot, 1 archimandrite, 1 archpriest, 1 provost, and 2 prelates.

Where it is found impracticable to establish dioceses in accordance with the provisions of the canonical law, vicars apostolic are appointed in place of bishops. They are placed under the immediate supervision of the Congregation of Propaganda, which is charged with a general superintendence of missionary districts. Besides vicars apostolic, the pope appoints for the superintendence of churches in non-Catholic countries apostolic delegates and apostolical praefects, both of whom are likewise placed under the Congregation of Propaganda. The aggregate of delegates, vicars, and praefects was (in 1878) 154, making a total of 1148 hierarchical titles. The total number of dignitaries composing the Catholic hierarchy, inclusive of the assistant bishops, was 1198. The Catholic hierarchy received a very large increase during the pontificate of Pius IX. The number of bishoprics raised to the rank of archbishoprics was 24; number of archbishoprics created, 5; number of bishoprics created, 132; of sees, nullius dieoseos, 3; of apostolic delegations, 3; of vicariates apostolic, 33; of praefects apostolic, 15; total. 215 hierarchical titles.

A large proportion of the new episcopal and archiepisaopal sees belong to English-speaking countries. The hierarchy of England and Wales, as restored Sept. 29, 1850, by letters apostolic of Pius IX, comprises the province of Westminster, consisting of the archiepiscopal see of Westminster and twelve suffragans. In the United States 34 new episcopal sees were established during the pontificate of Pius, and 10 sees raised to archbishoprics. The first addition made by pope Leo XIII to the Catholic hierarchy was the restoration of the hierarchy of Scotland on March 4, 1878. It comprises the archiepiscopal see of Glasgow, which is without suffragan sees, and the province of St. Andrew's and Edinburgh, which consists of the archiepiscopal see of St. Andrew's and Edinburgh, with four suffragan sees. At the beginning of 1879 the British empire had 14 archbishops, 76 bishops, 33 vicars apostolic, and 7 prefects apositolic. Of the archbishoprics, 1 was in England, 2 in Scotland, 4 in Ireland, 4 in British North America, 1 in the West Indies, 2 in Australia; of the bishoprics, 12 in England, 4 in Scotland, 24 in Ireland, 2 in the European colonies, 1 in Africa, 18 in North America, 1 in the West Indies, 11 in Australia, 3 in New Zealand; of the vicariates apostolic, two thirds are in the Asiatic possessions. Most of these vicariates are at present held by archbishops and bishops who take their title from their see in partibus  infidelum. Including eight coadjutors or auxiliary bishops, the total number of archbishops and bishops holding office in the British empire at the beginning of 1879 was 123, a larger number than is at present found in any other country except only Italy. Adding to this the 63 archbishops and bishops holding office in the United States, the total number of episcopal dignitaries in the English-speaking world at the beginning of 1879 was 189, being about one sixth of the entire Catholic hierarchy of the world. The steady advance of British dominion in all parts of the world, and the rapid development of the United States, Australia, British North America, and other English-speaking territories, cannot fail to increase rapidly the numerical strength of the English-speaking bishops in the Roman Catholic hierarchy.

PopulationRom. Cath.Prot.East ChurN.Amer.590000002300000035000000S. Amer2700000025000000400000Europe3125000001490000007460000075000000Asia83100000094000006000009500000Africa205000000220000011000003500000Austr.45000006000002000000Total143900000020920000011370000088000000An important element in the Catholic hierarchy is the religious associations, orders of men and women whose members live together in convents. They are very numerous and have various organizations. They are more or less exempt from the jurisdiction of the bishops, and placed under the special jurisdiction of their own superiors, most of whom reside in Rome. While the aim of the oldest of these communities was the attainment, by retirement from the world, of a higher religious perfection, they have in the course of time regarded an active participation in the ministrations of the clergy as an important part of their duties. Their strict organization has especially enabled them to take the lead in the direction of the foreign missions of the Church, and display a remarkable activity in the province of education. Most of the popes have valued their services very highly, and conferred upon them extensive privileges.

IV. Statistics. — The Roman Catholic Church still continues to be by far the most numerous branch of Christianity. The following table gives an estimate of the Roman Catholic population of each of the large divisions of the world, and of the relation of Roman Catholics to the total population,  the Eastern churches, and the Protestant churches, including in the last division all Christians not belonging to either the Roman Catholic or the Eastern churches: It will be seen from the above table that the total number of Roman Catholics still exceeds the aggregate number of all other Christians. Among the large continents, South America is almost exclusively Catholic, only two territories (British and Dutch Guiana), together with the Falkland Islands, being under Protestant governments. Many of the other countries are gradually receiving a Protestant population by immigration. The largest number of immigrants is found in Brazil; a smaller number in Chili and the Argentine Confederation. In Europe, the Roman Catholics are about one half of the total population; they are increasing at a slower ratio than the Protestants and the Eastern churches, because in some of the largest Catholic countries, as France and Spain, the natural increase of the population is slower than in most countries of Europe. In North America, which very rapidly rises in the scale of continents, Roman Catholicism is in a decided minority, although in Mexico and Central America nearly the entire population is still connected with it. The same is the case with Australia, where the total population increases with still greater rapidity than in North America, and where the Roman Catholics are a decided minority in each of the colonies.

A continuance of the rapid increase of the population of North America and Australia, together with a continuance of the numerical proportion .between Protestants and Catholics, would materially change the relative position of both in the list of the prominent religions of the world. Outside of Europe, America, and Australia, the Roman Catholic Church predominates in the Spanish, Portuguese, and French colonies, the most populous of which, the Philippine Islands, have a Catholic population now estimated at about 6,000,000. In Western Asia, one entire Eastern communion, the Maronites, and fragments, more or less considerable, of all the others, have connected themselves with the Church of Rome. In Hindostan, Anam, and China, an aggregate population of about 2,000,000 has for several hundred years adhered to that Church, in spite of repeated and bloody persecutions; and even in Japan under the new era of religious toleration which has been opened by the establishment of intercourse with the Christian nations of Europe and America, descendants of the former Catholics to the number of about 20,000 have openly declared themselves as still attached to the Church. Though this Church continues to make some progress in all her mission fields, no conquests have been made in the 19th century equal to the success of the Jesuit missionaries in Eastern Asia  in the 16th and 17th centuries, or to that of the Protestant missionaries in the 19th century in Madagascar. It is a noteworthy fact that the Latin nations of Europe and America are almost a unit in their adhesion to the Roman Catholic Church. The Reformation having been suppressed in the 16th century by force in all the Latin countries, the Waldenses in Italy, and some of the French-speaking cantons of Switzerland, with a few hundred thousand Reformed Frenchmen, were, at the beginning of the 19th century, the only dissenters from Rome in Latin Europe and America. The introduction of religious toleration begins to make notable inroads upon the religious uniformity of some of these countries, Thus, the number of native Protestants was in 1878 estimated in Spain at 12,000, in Mexico at 12,000; Italy had 170 new evangelical congregations and 111 stations; and in France and Belgium a number of prominent men advised the liberal Catholics to sever their connection with Rome, and, even if they were not prepared to embrace fully the doctrines of one of the Protestant churches, to inscribe themselves in the civil registers as Protestants.

The principality of Romania, which became an entirely independent state in 1878, also speaks a language chiefly of Latin origin, and is, therefore, sometimes classed with the Latin nations. Of its population, no more than one percent belongs to the Roman Catholic Church. With the restoration of the German empire under Protestant rule, the Roman Catholic Church has almost wholly lost any controlling influence upon the Teutonic nations. Great Britain, with a number of inchoate colonial states, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Holland, are an unbroken phalanx of Protestant states. The government of polyglot Austria can hardly be called any longer Teutonic. In Belgium, a Teutonic nationality is united with a Latin into one state, which nominally is wholly Catholic, though it is now, like Austria, Italy, Portugal, and many other nominally Catholic states, under a liberal administration, which is in open conflict with the demands of the Catholic hierarchies. Of the Slavic nationalities, several, like the Poles and Czechs, are predominantly Roman Catholic; but there is now no Catholic Slavic state. The governments of all the Slavic states — Russia, Servia, Montenegro, and Bulgaria — belong to the Orthodox Eastern Church. To the same Church belongs nearly the entire population of the kingdom of Greece, in which the Roman Catholic Church numbers a population of only 12,000 souls, or less than one percent The Roman Catholics constitute a majority in only six entirely independent states of Europe, viz. Portugal, Spain, Italy, France, Belgium, and the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. In the last-named state the Roman Catholics constitute, among the inhabitants of  Austria proper, 92 percent, and in the lands of the Hungarian crown 59 percent In France they are 98, and in each of the four other states more than 99 percent In North and South America the Roman Catholics are a majority in Mexico, the five states of Central America, in Brazil, and the nine republics of South America, constituting in each of these sixteen states more than 99 percent

V. Literature. — As the Roman Catholic Church is indissolubly connected with the history of the Christian religion, the manuals of Church history are the principal sources of information on its history. The most important works of this class have been enumerated in the article SEE CHURCH HISTORY. The Creeds of the Roman Catholic Church may be found in Danz, Libri Symbolici Ecclesioe Romano — Catholicoe (Weimar, 1835); Streitwolf and Klener, Libri Synmbolici Ecclesioe Catholicoe, Conjuncti atque Notis Prolegomenis Indicibusque Instructi (Gott. 1838, 2 vols., which contains the Conc. Trid., the Professio Fidei Tridentina, and the Catechismus Romanus); Denzinger, Enchiridion Synbolorum et Definitionum quoe de Rebus Fidei et Motrnu a Conciliis (Ecumenicis et Summis Pontificibus Manarunt (4th ed. Wurzb.1865, which includes the definition of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary [1854], and the Papal Syllabus [1864]); Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (N.Y. 1877; vol. 2 includes all the Latin creeds from the Confession of Peter to the Vatican decrees). Bellarmin's Disputationes, Bossuet's Exposition, Mohler's Symbolik, and Perrone's Proelectiones Theologicoe are regarded as the ablest Roman Catholic expositions of the Roman Catholic system. Among Protestant expositions of the Roman Catholic doctrines, the most notable are the Symboliks of Marheineke, Kollner, and Baier, and Hase's Handbuch der protestantischen Polemik (3d ed. Leips. 1871). A full account of the constitution of the Roman Catholic Church is given in the manuals of Church law. Among the best'works on this subject are Schulte, Lehrbuch des kathol. Kirchenrechts (3d ed. 1873); and Richter, Lehrbuch des kathol. u. evangel. Kirchenrechts (1877, 8th ed. by Dove). The largest work on the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church is Neher, Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik (1864-68, 3 vols.), containing Europe and America. A complete list of the Roman hierarchy is annually published at Rome under the title La Gerarchia Cattolica. (A.J.S.)

## Roman Catholic Church In The United States[[@Headword:Roman Catholic Church In The United States]]

             I. Origin and Progress. —

1. As the discovery of America by Columbus occurred a quarter of a century before the first public appearance of Luther, the Roman Catholic Church was the first to occupy the newly discovered world. The attachment of Columbus to his Church was so strong that efforts have recently been made though without success, to obtain from the pope his canonization. Many of the following explorers were equally fervid in their faith. Ojeda, who in 1510 settled the Isthmus of Darien, is said by Catholic historians to have been as pious as a monk. Balboa, governor of Darien, who in 1513 discovered the Pacific Ocean; Magellan, who first raised the cross on the most southern cape of America (1521); Cartier, the discoverer of Canada (1534) Champlain, the first governor of Canada; La Salle, the pioneer navigator of the Great Lakes — are all praised for their piety. The Upper Mississippi was discovered by the Jesuit Marquette. For more than a hundred years (1492-1607) no permanent settlement was made by Protestants in the New World. The few attempts which had previously been made by French Huguenots in South Carolina and Florida, and by the English on Roanoke Island (1585 and 1587), had failed, The Spaniards, in the meanwhile, not only laid the foundation of Catholic colonial empires throughout South America, Mexico, and Central America, but they also formed settlements in territory now belonging to the United States, the oldest of which, St. Augustine, was founded in 1565.

Nearly forty years before, in 1528, the first Catholic missionaries set foot within our present territory, forming part of the expedition of Narvaez to Florida. One of their number, John Juarez, had been appointed by the pope bishop of Florida. Bishop Juarez, and one of his companions, John of Palos, perished probably in the same year, either of hunger or at the hand of the Indians. In 1549 a Dominican friar, Louis Cancer, was slain by an Indian of Florida after he had barely landed. The first Catholic Church was erected in St. Augustine, soon after the foundation of the town by Melendez; and from this center many Franciscan, Dominican, and Jesuit missionaries began to labor among the Indians of Florida, Alabama, Georgia, and Carolina. The most celebrated religious establishment of these missions was the Franciscan monastery of St. Helena at St. Augustine. The missions began to grow until the cession of Florida by Spain to England in 1763, which proved a fatal check, and gradually led to the entire destruction of the mission, which at the beginning of the Revolutionary War had become entirely extinct.  The first Catholic missionaries in New Mexico were two Franciscan monks. father Padilla and brother John of the Cross, who accompanied in 1542 the exploring expedition of Coronado. They began to preach in two Indian towns, but both soon perished. Three other Franciscans, who in 1581 erected a new mission, shared the same fate. The foundation of Santa Fd, in 1582, the second oldest city of the United States, laid the firm foundation of the Catholic Church at the headwaters of the Rio Grande, where gradually whole tribes embraced the Catholic religion. Texas was visited as early as 1544 by a Franciscan missionary, father de Olmos, but the real foundation of the Texan missions, which gradually became very extensive, was laid in 1688 by fourteen Franciscan priests and seven lay brothers. l,

The first Catholic mission of California was begun in 1601 by a band of Franciscan monks; but the real founder of the Church in that state was father Juniper Serra, an Italian Franciscan, who in 1769 established the first mission in San Diego, and in 1776, a few days before the declaration of the independence of the United States (June 27), founded the city of San Francisco. In 1570, father Segura and eight other Jesuit fathers landed in Chesapeake Bay, Maryland, with the son of an Indian chief whom Spanish navigators had brought away with them from that region, and who had received a good education in Spain. All of them were treacherously murdered at the instigation of this Indian youth. Sixty-four years later, in 1634, two English Jesuits, fathers Andrew White and John Altham, who accompanied Lord Baltimore, resumed the missionary labors among the Maryland Indians, and in 1639 they reported that many tribes had been visited, numerous converts made, and four permanent stations established.

The first Catholic chapel in New England was reared by French missionaries on Neutral Island, in Schoodic River, Maine, in 1609, eleven years before the foundation of Plymouth. In 1612, a new mission was established on Mount Deserts Island, but it was soon after destroyed by the English. In 1646, father Druillettes, a Jesuit, who has been called by Catholic historians the apostle of Maine, established a mission on the Upper Kennebec, which gradually succeeded in converting the entire tribe of the Abnakis. The cession of Canada by the French to the English in 1763 interrupted for some time the Catholic mission among the Abnakis; but after the Revolutionary War it was reorganized, and has since then continued to exist until the present day.  The first Catholic missionary among the Indians in the State of New York was father Jogues, a Canadian Jesuit. He attempted in 1646 to found a mission among the Mohawks, and was massacred in the village of Caughnawaga (now Schenectady). The first Catholic church was established in November, 1655, among the Onondagas, on the site of the present city of Syracuse; but three years later the missionaries barely escaped with theirlives from a plot to destroy them. The close of a bloody war between France and the Five Nations in 1666 led to the reestablishment of the old missions, and to the foundation of new ones among the Onondagas, Senecas, Cayugas, Oneidas, and Mohawks. In 1668 the cross, as a Catholic historian says, “towered over every village from the Hudson to Lake Erie,” and the Mohawks especially “became firmly attached to the Church;” but the recognition by France of the English claims to the State of New York, in the treaty of Utrecht, 1713, was the death knell of the Catholic missions among the Indians of New York. Among the Indians of Vermont mass was said for the first time in 1615.

The regions along the Great Lakes, in the present states of Michigan and Wisconsin, were first visited by Canadian Jesuits in 1641. The field proved ungrateful, and the missions terminated when the French government suppressed the houses of Jesuits and confiscated their property. All along the banks of the Mississippi, the shores of which were discovered by Marquette in 1673, the Jesuits preached and established missions. Among the Indians converted by them was Chicago, the chief of the Illinois. With the suppression of the Order of the Jesuits and the increase of English power, the Catholic missions among the Indians generally disappeared from the Gulf of St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico. After the establishment of the independence of the United States, some of the Indian missions were gradually reestablished, but their progress was slow. In 1833 the bishops of the United States assembled at the Council of Baltimore confided the Indian missions in the United States to the Jesuits. Catholic historians complain (Murray, Popular Hist. etc., p. 343) that “the Catholics of the United States have shown little interest in the Indian missions, and done little to cheer and support the missionaries.” The latter had to look to Europe bor the necessary means. The most famous among the Jesuit missionaries of the 19th century was father De Smet, a Belgian, who is compared by the historians of his Church to Francis Xavier, and is said “to have opened heaven to over 100,000 Indians.”

2. The proper history of the Catholic Church in the English colonies begins with the immigration of Leonard Calvert, second son of Lord Baltimore, and about 200 English and Irish Catholics, into Maryland. Lord Baltimore, who had left the Anglican communion for the Church of Rome, had received (June 20, 1632) from king Charles I the grant of a large tract of land lying north of the Potomac, for founding a Catholic colony in the New World as a refuge from persecution. The charter drawn up by him guaranteed liberty of worship to all Christians, and secured a voice to all freemen in making the laws. He died soon after the charter had received the royal sanction, and his eldest son, Cecil Calvert, second Lord Baltimore, commissioned his brother Leonard Calvert to carry out their father's design, and appointed him governor of the new colony. Leonard Calvert, with his colonists, landed in 1634, and in the same year the city of St. Mary was founded. The colonists were accompanied by two Jesuits, who were soon followed by several more Jesuits and Capuchins. A civil contest between the new colonists, on the one hand, and Captain William Clayborne, who with a party of men from Virginia had settled, in 1631, on Kent Island, Chesapeake Bay, and a company of Puritans who had settled in Maryland in 1642, on the other hand, resulted in favor of Clayborne and the Puritans, who made themselves complete masters of the province. Thereupon the Catholics were in 1644 deprived of equal rights, but these were restored in 1646. In 1649 the General Assembly of Maryland, composed of eleven Catholics and three Protestants, passed the Toleration Act, which enacted that no person believing in Jesus Christ should be molested in the free exercise of his religion. The Toleration Act was repealed in 1654 by an assembly in which the Puritans had a majority, and which denied the protection of the law to the Catholics; but in 1660 the new king, Charles II, restored Lord Baltimore to his rights as proprietor, and thus the Catholics received back their rights. In 1692, after the expulsion of James II, an Anglican governor was sent to Maryland, and in 1704 a law was passed to prevent “the increase of popery.” The stringent provisions of this act remained in force until the Revolution; only the first provision, which forbade bishops and priests to say mass or exercise their ministry, was so far modified that “Catholics were permitted to hear mass in their own families and on their own grounds.”

The colony of Pennsylvania was founded by Penn on the basis of religious toleration, and the Catholic immigrants from Ireland and Germany were allowed to live in comparative peace, but their creed was regarded with  contempt. In the Dutch colony of New Netherlands, Protestantism was declared to be the religion of the State, but actually the few Catholics appear not to have been troubled. In 1664 the colony passed into the hands of the Catholic duke of York, afterwards James II, and its name was changed to New York. In 1683 the colony received a Catholic governor, colonel Thomas Dongan; and in the same year the first legislative assembly of the colony granted, like Maryland, religious liberty to all “professing faith in God by Jesus Christ.” After the expulsion of James, another assembly in 1691 repealed the Toleration Act of 1683, and passed stringent laws against the Catholics. In 1696 only seven Catholic families were found on Manhattan Island. New laws of extreme severity were passed against Catholics in 1700, 1701, and 1702; and at the beginning of the Revolutionary War the Catholic Church was almost unknown in New York, and the few Catholic inhabitants of New York city had to go to Philadelphia to receive the sacraments. The laws of the New England colonies, of Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, retained rigid penal laws against Roman Catholics on their statute books. At the beginning of the Revolutionary War, out of the 3,000,000 inhabitants in the American colonies, only about 25,000 were Roman Catholics, of whom 15,000 lived in Maryland. There were about twenty-five priests and about twice as many congregations.

3. On the eve of the War of Independence, the Continental Congress of Philadelphia, in 1774, pronounced for the broadest toleration. In 1776 the Catholics of Maryland were fully emancipated, owing largely to the influence of Charles Carroll, one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence. The other twelve original states, one after another, granted the Catholics liberty of conscience, the right to build churches and worship as they pleased; but full and unreserved equality of civil and political rights was withheld from them in some of the states much longer. The Federal Constitution, adopted in 1787, provides in art. 6, sec. 3, “No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification for any office or trust under the United States.” Among the framers and signers of this Constitution were two Catholics — Daniel Carroll, of Maryland, and Thomas Fitzsimmons, of Pennsylvania. The right thus obtained was further secured by the enactment of the first article of the amendments to the Constitution, which declares “that Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.”  Until the close of the Revolutionary War, the Catholics of the United States were under the jurisdiction of the vicar apostolic of the district of London, England, who, during the whole of the war, held no kind of intercourse with the American churches. After the establishment of the independence of the United States, the clergy of Maryland and Pennsylvania were naturally impressed with the importance of having an American superior for American churches, and they asked the pope to allow the clergy to elect a superior, subject to the approbation and confirmation of the pope. In reply to the request, the pope, after consulting Benjamin Franklin through the nuncio in Paris, appointed in 1784 the Rev. Dr. Carroll praefect apostolic, with many of the powers of a bishop. In view of the extraordinary difficulties which the new praefect encountered from the vastness of his territory, and also from the insubordination of several priests and a part of the laity, it was soon deemed necessary to apply to Rome for a bishop. The request was granted, with the privilege of selecting the candidate and of locating the new see. Accordingly, Dr. Carroll was elected bishop, and Baltimore chosen as his see. On Aug. 15, 1790, Dr. Carroll was consecrated bishop in England. The number of Catholics at this time was estimated by Dr. Carroll himself at about 30,000, in a total population of 3, 200,000. Of these, 16,000 lived in Maryland, 7000 in Pennsylvania, 3000 at Detroit and Vincennes, 2500 in Illinois, and in all the other states there were not more than about 1500. The arrival, between 1791 and 1799, of twenty-three French priests who fled from France in consequence of the Revolution, enabled bishop Carroll to extend and partly consolidate his vast diocese. Many of the immigrant priests were men of considerable ability; and six of them — Flaget, Cheverus, Dubois, David, Dubourg, and Marechal — afterwards became bishops. Another important addition to the ranks of the priests was made in 1795 by the consecration of the young Russian prince Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, who displayed great and successful activity for the extension of the Catholic Church in Western Pennsylvania. In 1787, the first priest appeared in Kentucky; in 1789, the first church was commenced in Charleston, S.C.; in 1803, the first church was consecrated in Boston. Several missionaries began to penetrate into the almost trackless wilds of Indiana, Ohio, and Michigan. Soon after the dawn of the 19th century, the great tide of immigration from the Old World began to set in, and as a large portion of it came from Catholic Ireland, the Catholic Church in the United States increased very rapidly in number. The city of New York, which had in 1790 a Catholic population of about 100, numbered 14,000 Catholics in  1807. At the same time there were about 70 priests and 80 churches in the United States, with a Catholic population of probably 150,000.

With the external expansion, the progress of internal organization kept pace. In Nov., 1791, bishop Carroll convened the first diocesan synod in Baltimore, which was attended by 22 clergymen. In 1800 father Leonard Neale was appointed his coadjutor, with the title of bishop of Gortyna inpartibus. In 1808 Baltimore was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see, with four suffragan bishoprics — New York, Philadelphia, Boston, and Bardstown (this see was in 1842 transferred to Louisville). The purchase of Louisiana from France in 1803 added to the American Church a new diocese, New Orleans, which had been erected in 1793. As the see was vacant at the time of the purchase, Dr. Carroll was directed by Pius VII to administer its ecclesiastical affairs. He accordingly appointed a vicar- general, but the contentions which arose on the subject of jurisdiction led to protracted discords. Archbishop Carroll died Dec. 3, 1815, the last years of his episcopate having been marked by the continuance of a very rapid increase of the Catholic population, which at this time was estimated at 200, 000. A number of religious orders, especially Jesuits, Sulpitians, Augustinians, Dominicans, and Carmelites, not only swelled the numbers of the clergy, but established a number of Catholic institutions of learning. Archbishop Carroll was succeeded by Dr. Ambrose Marechal, after whose death, in 1828, Dr. James Whitfield became archbishop. Yielding to the urgent advice of the learned bishop of Charleston, Dr. England, archbishop Whitfield in 1829 assembled the first provincial council of Baltimore. Several new episcopal sees had in the meanwhile been established, and the provincial council was attended by the bishops of Charleston, Bardstown, Cincinnati, Boston, and St. Louis. As all the bishops had at this time numerous conflicts with the lay trustees, who claimed the right of electing the priests and administering the Church property, the council passed two decrees against the abuse of power by lay trustees. Another decree strongly recommended the establishment of a society for the diffusion of good books. The Catholic population of the United States was estimated by the assembled fathers at 500,000, the rapid increase being chiefly due to the stream of immigration from Ireland. The second provincial council of Baltimore, in 1833, was composed of ten prelates, and directed that the Indian tribes of the Far West and the Catholic negroes of Liberia should be confided to the care of the Jesuits. The mission of Liberia, which was begun in 1842, proved a complete failure, and was abandoned in 1845. At  the date of the second council the Church consisted of 12 dioceses, with 38 priests, of whom 72 were Americans, 91 Irish, 73 French, 17 Italians, 39 Belgians and Germans, some English and Spanish, and 1 Pole. Archbishop Whitfield died in 1834, and was succeeded by Samuel Eccleston. During his administration five more provincial councils were held in Baltimore, in the years 1837, 1840, 1843, 1846, and 1849. Most of these councils recommended the erection of new episcopal sees, the number of which, therefore, received a large increase. While there were only sixteen in 1840, they numbered twenty-seven in 1850. The council of 1840 also recommended the formation of Catholic temperance societies; that of 1846 chose “the Most Blessed Virgin, conceived without sin, as the patroness of the United States;” and that of 1849, which was attended by twenty-five bishops, asked the pope for the definition of the immaculate conception as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, a request which a few years later was complied with by pope Pius IX.

Many dioceses during this period were greatly troubled by conflicts between the bishops and the lay trustees of the churches. The latter were often unwilling to abandon the control of the churches which had been built by the contributions of the faithful, and the bishops were inflexible in claiming the sole control over the entire Church property of their dioceses. Repeatedly priests and congregations were excommunicated. Sometimes excommunicated priests defied for years the authority of the bishops; but finally the bishops carried their point, and the trustee system was completely crushed out, chiefly through the efforts of John Hughes, bishop of New York. The steady progress of Roman Catholicism, which the majority of Americans continued to regard as a form of ecclesiastical despotism, irreconcilable with, and therefore dangerous to, the free political institutions of the country, led, from 1834 to 1844, in several cities to popular outbursts of Protestant indignation, and even to unlawful attacks upon Catholic church edifices and monasteries.

The immense influx of Catholic immigrants from Ireland and Germany during the decade from 1840 to 1850. which annually added more than 200,000 Catholics to the population of the country, and the great industrial advantages which the people generally derived from the more rapid development of the resources of the country, gradually softened the popular feeling with regard to a religious system which had so long been an object of intense aversion. The spread of the Roman Catholic Church in consequence of immigration was most rapid in the Middle Atlantic and the  Western States, which could offer to immigrants the best prospects of material success. The Southern States, with their negro-labor system, offered the least inducement to immigrants, and consequently received the smallest increase of Catholic population. In 1846 Oregon City was raised to the rank of a metropolitan see; in 1847, St. Louis; in 1850, New Orleans, New York, and Cincinnati. Thus in 1850 the Catholic Church had 6 archbishoprics, with 27 episcopal sees, 1800 priests, 1073 churches, 600 stations, 29 ecclesiastical institutions, 17 colleges, and 91 female academies. The Catholic population, which had received a large increase not only by the continuance of immigration, but by the cession of California and New Mexico to the United States, was estimated at 3,500,000. In May, 1852, archbishop Kenrick of Baltimore, who had succeeded in 1851 archbishop Eccleston, presided over the first plenary or national council of the United States. It was composed of six archbishops and twenty-six bishops, and, besides proposing to the pope the creation of several new dioceses, it strongly urged the necessity of establishing Catholic schools, and solemnly condemned secret societies, especially the Freemasons. In 1858 the pope conferred the rank of primacy on the see of Baltimore. Archbishop Kenrick died in 1864, and was succeeded by Dr. Spalding, formerly bishop of Louisville. In 1866 the second plenary council was held in Baltimore. It was presided over by archbishop Spalding, and seven archbishops, thirty-eight bishops, three mitred abbots, and over one hundred and twenty theologians took part in the deliberations. The council expressed a wish for the establishment of a Catholic university. The Vatican Council, which began in 1869, was attended by forty-nine prelates of the United States. Only a few of them were opposed to the promulgation of papal infallibility as a doctrine of the Catholic Church, and all readily acquiesced in the decision of the council. The Old Catholic movement in some countries of Europe found no echo in the United States. Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore died in 1872, and was succeeded by James Roosevelt Bayley, bishop of Newark. In 1875 archbishop McCloskey of New York was raised to the dignity of the cardinalate, and the dioceses of Boston, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, and Santa Fe were raised to the rank of metropolitan sees. Thus the number of archbishoprics in the United States rose to eleven. After the death of archbishop Bayley, in October, 1877, bishop James Gibbons of Richmond was appointed archbishop of Baltimore. The number of episcopal dioceses in 1879 was 49; of vicariates apostolic, 7; of prefectures apostolic, 1. The total number of dioceses (including archdioceses, vicariates apostolic, and prefectures  apostolic) was 68. Many of the dioceses have a large Roman Catholic population. Sadlier's Catholic Directory for 1879 claims, according to reports furnished by the bishops for each of the following dioceses, a Catholic population exceeding 200,000; Baltimore, 300,000; Boston, 310,000; Cincinnati, 200,000; New Orleans, 250,000; New York, 600,000; Albany, 200,000; Brooklyn, 200,000; Philadelphia, 275,000; St. Louis, 250,000; Chicago, 230,000. The number of priests in 1876 was 5074; that of churches, 5046; that of stations, 1482.

II. The religious orders of men and women which have been since the beginning of the 19th century the object of hostile legislation in nearly every country of Europe, have never been legally interfered with in the United States. Consequently, their history shows a steady increase of number; and they have grown all the more rapidly, as the expulsion of many orders from European countries and the urgent applications of the American bishops, who have always been, and still are, in need of more missionaries, have frequently induced large numbers of European nuns and monks to settle in the United States. In 1877 there were, according to Murray's Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States (N.Y. 1877), twenty-seven different religious orders of men in the United States. Three of these (the Franciscans, Dominicans, and Jesuits) worked as early as the 16th century among the Indians; the Augustinians and Sulpitians founded their first establishments in 1790 and 1791. The Trappists followed in 1805, the Priests of the Mission in 1816, the Redemptorists in 1832. Eight religious orders established themselves between 1840 and 1850, and eleven between 1850 and 1877. One of the orders, the Paulists, arose in the United States, opening its first house in New York ins 1858. Among the orders which have the largest number of members and houses are the Jesuits, with 30 houses and 750 members; the Christian Brothers, with 49 houses and 700 members; the Augustinians, with 13 houses and 60 members; the Priests of the Mission, with 13 houses and 142 members; the Benedictines, with 12 houses and 300 members; the Brothers of Mary. In all, there are about 260 establishments of religious orders of men, with more than 3000 members. The religious orders of women are much more numerous than those for men. In all, there are forty-four religious orders of women, four of which (the Sisters of Charity, the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy, and the School Sisters of Notre Dame) have each more than one thousand members.

III. Educational Establishments. — As the Catholic Church is opposed to the principle of undenominational schools which prevails in all the states of the Union, strenuous endeavors have been made to gather the children of Catholic parents into parochial schools. The first council of Baltimore, held in 1829, expressed the wish that schools should be established where youth might imbibe principles of faith and morality along with human knowledge. The second plenary council of Baltimore warmly appealed to pastors and people to establish Catholic schools where the Catholic faith might be taught as a science. The bishops, accordingly, have endeavored to provide not only for the establishment of colleges, seminaries, and academies, which, as with other religious denominations, have a sectarian character, but to connect as much as possible with every parish church a Catholic parochial school. The number of schools of this character is at the present time very large, and in some of the older and more populous dioceses nearly every church has its parochial school. The number of Catholic schools in 1877 exceeded 1700, and the number of children educated in them was over 500,000. The teachers are to a large extent supplied by the religious orders. Though the expenses for supporting these schools are comparatively small, the aggregate amount which has annually to be raised by voluntary contributions is felt as a heavy burden, and incessant efforts are made, therefore, to obtain a part of the common school fund of the states for the support of schools of a strictly Catholic character. Only in a few exceptional cases have these efforts been successful; as a general rule, the claims of the Church have been uncompromisingly rejected.

The number of Catholic female academies has grown with great rapidity. Towards the close of the last century, the Clarist Nuns, during a brief stay in America, opened a school at Georgetown, D.C., which subsequently passed into the hands of the Visitation Nuns, and grew into a flourishing academy which dates its foundation from 1799. The purchase of Louisiana from France gave to the Catholic Church of the United States an Ursuline academy at New Orleans, with 170 pupils. The foundation of St. Joseph's Academy at Emmettsburg, Md., in 1809, by mother Seton, marks an epoch in the history of Catholic education for young American women. In 1812 the Loretto Nuns of Kentucky entered the field; in 1818 the Ursuline Convent was opened at Boston, and the Ladies of the Sacred Heart began their labors at the South. The Sisters of St. Joseph founded their first establishment in 1836; the Sisters of Notre Dame, in 1840; the Sisters of the Holy Cross and the Sisters of Providence, in 1841; the School Sisters  of Notre Dame (founded by Peter Fourier), in 1847. Other orders followed, and in 1877 the number of Catholic female academies exceeded 400, the best and most widely known of which were under the direction of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, the Sisters of Charity, the Visitation Nuns, the Ursulines, the Sisters of St. Joseph, the Sisters of Mercy, the Sisters of the Holy Cross, the Sisters of Notre Dame, and the Sisters of Providence. It is maintained that in not a few of the convent boarding schools one third, and in some cases even one half, of the pupils are Protestant and other non- Catholic young ladies.

In the 17th century an attempt to found a Catholic college in New York was made by three Jesuits during governor Dongan's term of office, but it did not find sufficient support. Several years after the Revolution, bishop Carroll founded Georgetown College. Some time later, St. Mary's College, Baltimore, was established. It was chartered in 1805. Mount St. Mary's, Emmettsburg, stands next in point of age. In 1878 there were in the United States seventy-eight Catholic colleges and seminaries with power to confer degrees. Among the largest colleges are St. John's College, Fordham, N.Y.; the University of Georgetown, D.C., with a literary, a medical, and a law department of forty professors, a library of 30,000 volumes, an astronomical observatory, a conservatory of plants, and cabinets; Mount St. Mary's College, Emmettsburg, Md.; St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; St. Joseph's College, Alabama; St. Xavier's College, Cincinnati, O.; the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass.; the College of St. Francis Xavier, New York; and Santa Clara College, California.

The first theological seminary in the United States was opened in 1791 in Baltimore. Mount St. Mary's Seminary, Emmettsburg, was founded in 1809; St. Joseph's Seminary, near Bardstown, Ky., in 1811. In 1878 there were 23 theological seminaries, with about 1300 ecclesiastical students.

Catholic normal schools have been established at St. Francis, Wis., and at Baltimore, Md. The following table gives the number of higher Catholic schools, and the number of pupils of parochial schools, in each of the ecclesiastical provinces:

Ecclesiastical ProvincesHigher SchoolPupils in Catholic Parish Scools1. Baltimore5918,0002. Boston4330,000

3. Cincinnati11180,0004. Milwaukee2738,0005. New Orleans8212,0006. New York12280,0007. Oregon City14?8. Philadelphia6843,0009. St. Louis8868,00010. San Francisco24?11. Santa Fe10?Total648about 500,000IV. Statistics. — Owing to the large influx of Catholics from Ireland and Germany, and the acquisition of large Catholic territories from France and Mexico, the Roman Catholic population of the United States has increased at a much more rapid rate than the total population of the United States. The following table, giving the estimated Roman Catholic and the total population of the United States at different periods of our history, is instructive:

YearTotal PopulationRoman Catholic PopulationReactional Part of Total Pop. Formed by Roman Catholics17763,000,00025,0001/12017903,200,00030,0001/10718005,300,000100,0001/5318107,200,000150,0001/4818209,600,000300,0001/32183013,000,000600,0001/21184017,000,0001,500,0001/11185023,300,0003,500,0001/7186031,500,0004,500,0001/7187640,000,0006,500,0001/6It is the unanimous opinion of the foremost Catholic writers on the history of the Catholic Church in the United States that their Church has suffered from its first organization to the present time very large losses; and that though many accessions have been received from other religious  denominations, the losses by far exceed the gains. Bishop England of Charleston remarked in 1836: “We ought, if there were no loss, to have five millions of Catholics; and as we have less than one million and a quarter, there must be a loss of three millions and a quarter at least. We may unhesitatingly assert that the Catholic Church has within the last fifty years (1786-1836) lost millions of members in the United States.” Bishop Spalding of Peoria (in his Life of Archbishop Spalding) likewise states: “To confine ourselves to the period in which the hierarchy has been in existence (1790-1870), we have lost in numbers far more than we have gained, if I may express an opinion beyond all doubt.” The same opinion is often and forcibly expressed by Dr. O. Brownson and other prominent Catholic writers. Some of the writers referred to (as bishop Spalding) console themselves with the hope “that the number of those who are here lost to the faith is, in proportion to the Catholic population of the country, continually decreasing, while the number of converts each year grows larger.” From some dioceses accessions are reported to the Church of persons born of non-Catholic parents which are larger than those reported from any other country save England. Archbishop Spalding of Baltimore claimed that of 22, 209 persons confirmed by him in five years, 2752 were “converts.” Bishop Gibbons of Richmond (now archbishop of Baltimore) claimed that 14 percent of those who were confirmed by him since he came to the diocese of Richmond were “converts,” and in North Carolina 35 percent A comparatively large number of men who have attained great prominence in the history of the Roman Catholic Church have entered that Church as adults, and as seceders from other religious communions. Among these men are archbishops Bayley of Baltimore, and Wood of Philadelphia; bishops Rosecranz of Columbus, and Wadhams of Ogdensburg; father Hecker, the superior of the Paulists; Dr. Ives, a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church; Dr. O. Brownson; and mother Seton, the foundress of the Sisters of Charity.

The following tables give the lists of the archbishoprics, bishoprics, and vicariates apostolic, with the number of priests, churches, and members in each, the year of their foundation and their territorial extent. Thus it not only presents a summary of the Church at the beginning of 1879, but it exhibits its gradual growth and its comparative strength in different parts of the Union:  1. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF BALTIMORE

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. Baltimore (Archbishopric, 1808.)1789258127300,0002. Charleston18201615510,0003. Richmond1821272218,0004. Savannah1850272525,0005. St. Augustine1870102010,0006. Wheeling1850306318,0007. Wilmington (del)1868162514,0008. North Carolina (V.A.)18687131,700Total391310396,700 2. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF BOSTON

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. Boston (Archbishopric, 1875)1808213137310,0002. Burlington1853326535,0003. Hartford184410093150,0004. Portland1855657780,0005. Providence18728862136,0006. Springfield18719886150,000Total596520861,000 3. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF CINCINNATI

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. Cincinnati (Archbishoric, 1833.)1822168197200,0002. Cleveland1847159197125,0003. Columbus1868597760,0004. Covington1853565240,0005. Detroit1832127194175,0006. Fort Wayne18579711280,000

7. Louisville1808121102150,0008. Vincennes183412215485,000Total9091085915,000 4. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF MILWAUKEE

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholic s1. Milwaukee (Archbishopric, 1844.)1844228260195,0002. Green Bay18687310965,0003. LaCrosse1868489446,0004. Marquette and Saut Sainte Marie18655. St. Paul1858108168115,0006. Northern Minnesota (V.A.)1875444218,500Total520701468,500 5. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF NEW ORLEANS

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. New Orleans (Archbishopric, 1870)179316894250,0002. Galveston1847413525,0003. Little Rockk184316234,0004. Mobile182435266,0005. Natchez1837254112,5006. Natchitoches1853151730,0007. San Antonio1874374745,0008. Brownsville (V.A.)1874221030,000Total353293402,500 6. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF NEW YORK

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. New York1808250150600,000

(Archbishopric, 1850)2. Albany1847163164200,0003. Brooklyn185313579200,0004. Buffalo1847150135100,0005. Newark1853178134100,0006. Ogdensburg1872538158,0007. Rochester1868607965,000Total9898221,323,0007. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF OREGON

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. Oregon (Archbishopric, 1845.)1846232220,0002. Nesqually1850152311,5003. Idaho (V.A.)186813145,650Total515937,150 8. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF PHILADELPHIA

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. Philadelphia (Archbishopric, 1875.)1809232128275,0002. Erie1853618145,0003. Harrisburg186810093150,0004. Pittsburgh and Allegheny1843 18765. Scranton1868577050,000Total634502645,000 9. ECCESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF ST. LOUIS

Estab- lishedPriestsChurchesRoman Catholics1. St. Louis (Archbishopric, 1847.)1826250207250,000

2. Alton1857140165100,0003. Chicago1844204194230,0004. Dubuque1837189155120,0005. Levenworth18776910470,0006. Nashville1837272910,0007. Peoria1877609360,0008. St. Joseph1868263018,0009. Nebraska (V.A.)1859545939,000Total10191036897,000 10.ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF SAN FRANCISCO

Estab- lishedPriestsChurch esRoman Catholics1. San Francisco (Archbishopric, 1853.)1853128103180,0002. Grass Valley1868313514,0003. Monterey and Los Angeles1850383524,000Total197173218,000 11. ECCLESIASTICAL PROVINCE OF SANTA FE

Estab- lishedPriestChurchesRoman Cath.1. Santa Fe (Archbishopric, 1875.)18505229109,0002. Arizona (V.A.)1869141830,0003. Colorado (V.A.)1868214120,0004. Indian Territory (P.A.)187643,780Total9188162,780V. Periodicals. — The Shamrock, an Irish-American paper established in New York in 1815, and edited by Thomas O'Conor, father of the distinguished jurist Charles O'Conor, is named as the first American journal to which the term Catholic may be applied, as it incidentally defended Catholic as well as Irish interests. The real founder of Catholic journalism in America was bishop England of Charleston, who in 1822 established the United States Catholic Miscellany at Charleston, S.C. It  was discontinued in 1861. Among the Catholic journals still (1879) existing, the Catholic Telegraph of Cincinnati, established in 1831, and the Pilot of Boston, established in 1837, are the oldest. Since then the number has been largely increased. Among the weekly organs of the Church, besides those already named, the Freeman's Journal of New York, edited by James A. McMaster, and the Tablet, likewise of New York (which has counted among its frequent contributors Dr. O. Brownson, Mrs. J. Sadlier, and Dr. J.V. Huntington), are best known. The Catholic World of New York, established in 1865 by I.T. Hecker, the founder of the Order of the Paulists, stands at the head of the magazines in age and rank. When Dr. O. Brownson, a journalist of considerable note, became in 1844 a Roman Catholic, he of course turned the service of the periodical edited by him to the defense of the Catholic Church, and thus gave to the Romanists of the United States their first Quarterly Review. Brownson's Review was suspended in 1864, revived in 1873, but finally discontinued a short time before the author's death. It was succeeded by the American Catholic Quarterly Review, established in Philadelphia in 1876, and edited by Dr. James A. Corcoran. Among the daily papers of the United States the Roman Catholic Church is feebly represented. Murray, in his Popular History of the Catholic Church in the United States (5th ed. 1877, p. 553), says, “There is not a daily paper in the United States fit for a Catholic child to read.” This remark, however, can only be applied to the daily papers published in the English language; for the German Catholics had at the same time five daily papers, expressly established for the defense of Catholic interests and fully under Catholic control. The Weltrundschau uber die kathol. Presse (“ Review of the Catholic Press of the World, “ Wiirzburg, 1878) enumerates 109 Roman Catholic papers of the United States, of which 36 were published in German, 2 in German as well as in English, 3 in French, 2 in Polish, 1 in Bohemian, and the others in English.

VI. Literature. — The principal works on the history of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States are the following: De Courcy, Catholic Church in the United States (transl. by Shea); M'Gee, Catholic Hist. of North America; Shea, Hist. of the Catholic Missions in the United States; Murray, Popular Hist. of the Catholic Church in the United States (5th ed. 1877), Clarke, Lives of the Deceased Bishops of the Catholic Church in the United States (2 vols.); Bayley, Sketch of the Catholic Church on New York Island; Fitton, Hist. of the Church in New England; Finotti, Bibliographia Catholica Americana; O'Connell, Catholicity in the  Carolinas and Georgia (N.Y. 1879); Murray, Catholic Education in the United States (1879); Neher, Kirchliche Geographie und Statistik von Amerika (Ratisbon, 1868). The latest statistics from official reports of the bishops are annually published in Sadlier's Catholic Directory, Almanac, and Ordo (New York). (A.J.S.)

## Roman Catholic Emancipation (Or Relief) Acts[[@Headword:Roman Catholic Emancipation (Or Relief) Acts]]

             After the Reformation, both in England and in Scotland, Roman Catholics were subjected to many legal penal regulations and restrictions. As late as 1780, the law of England — which, however, was not always rigidly enforced — made it felony in a foreign Roman Catholic priest and high treason in a native to teach the doctrines or perform the rites of his Church. Roman Catholics could not acquire land by purchase. If educated abroad in the Roman Catholic faith, they were declared incapable of succeeding to real property, which went to the next Protestant heir. A son or other nearest relation being a Protestant was empowered to take possession of the estate of his Roman Catholic father or other kinsman during his life. A Roman Catholic could not be guardian even of Roman Catholic children, he was excluded from the legal profession; and it was a capital offense for a Roman Catholic priest to celebrate a marriage between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic. In 1780 it was proposed to repeal some of the severest disqualifications in the case of those who would submit to the following test. This test included an oath of allegiance to the sovereign, an abjuration of the Pretender, and a declaration of disbelief inl the several doctrines that it is lawful to put heretics to death, that no faith is to be kept with heretics, that princes may be deposed or put to death, and that the pope is entitled to any temporal jurisdiction within the realm. This bill eventually passed into law in England. In 1791 a bill was passed affording further relief to such Roman Catholics as would sign a protest against the temporal power of the pope and his authority to release from civil obligations. In the following year, by the statute 33 Geo. III, c. 44, the severest of the penal restrictions were removed from the Scottish Roman Catholics upon taking a prescribed oath and declaration. The agitation in Ireland caused by these restrictions led to the Irish rebellion of 1798, while the union of 1800 was brought about by means of pledges regarding the removal of the disabilities in question. The agitation upon the subject increased; and at last the duke of Wellington was brought to the conviction that the security of the empire would be imperilled by further resistance of the Roman Catholic claims, and in 1829 a measure was introduced by the duke's ministry for Catholic  emancipation. An act having been first passed for the suppression of the Roman Catholic Association — which had already voted its own dissolution — the celebrated Roman Catholic Relief Bill was introduced by Mr. Peel in the House of Commons on March 5, and, passing both houses, received the royal assent April 13. By this act (10 Geo. IV, c. 7) an oath is substituted for the oaths of allegiance, supremacy, and abjuration, on taking which Roman Catholics may sit or vote in either house of Parliament, and be admitted to most offices from which they were formerly excluded. Restrictions which existed on Roman Catholic bequests were removed by 2 and 3 Will. 4, c. 115, as regards Great Britain, and by 7 and 8 Vict. c. 60, with relation to Ireland. Later acts abolished a few minor disabilities.

## Roman Empire[[@Headword:Roman Empire]]

             the government of the Romans as conducted by the emperors, of whom Augustus was the first. The history of the Roman Empire, properly so called, extends over a period of rather more than five hundred years, viz. from the battle of Actium, B.C. 31, when Augustus became ruler of the Roman world, to the abdication of Augustulus, A.D. 476. The empire, however, in the sense of the dominion of Rome over a large number of conquered nations, was in full force and had reached wide limits some time before the monarchy of Augustus was established. The notices of Roman histora which occur in the Bible are confined to the last century and a half of the commonwealth and the first century of the imperial monarchy. But in order to appreciate these, some particulars of the condition of the Roman state is necessary. We have not, however, the intention of entering into an account of the rise, progress, state, and decline of the Roman power, but merely to set forth a few of the more essential facts, speaking a little less briefly of the relations formed and sustained between the Romans and the Jews. These, although comparatively late, became eventually important to the last degree. For a description of the capital city, SEE ROME.

I. History. — The foundations of Rome lie in an obscurity from which the criticism of Niebuhr has done little more than remove the legendary charm. Three tribes, however, according to the oldest account, formed the earliest population — namely, the Ramnenses (probably Romanenses, still further abbreviated into Ramnes), the Titienses (shortened into Tities, from Titus Tatius, their head), and the Luceres (probably an Etruscan horde, who migrated to Rome from Solonium, under Lucumo). In order to increase his  population, and with a view to that conquest which he afterwards achieved, and which was only a small prelude to the immense dominion subsequently acquired, Romulus opened in Rome an asylum, inviting thereto those who, for whatever cause, fled from the neighboring cities. To Rome accordingly there flocked the discontented, the guilty, the banished, and the aspiring, freemen and slaves. Thus were laid the foundations of the future mistress of the world, according to the ordinary reckoning, B.C. 753, the number of inhabitants at the first not exceeding, it is supposed, four thousand souls. What it arose to in the period of its greatest extent we have not the means of ascertaining. (See below.)

Though the date of the foundation of Rome coincides nearly with the beginning of the reign of Pekah in Israel, it was not till the beginning of the 2d century B.C. that the Romans had leisure to interfere in the affairs of the East. When, however, the power of Carthage had been effectually broken at Zama, B.C. 202, Roman arms and intrigues soon made themselves felt throughout Macedonia, Greece, and Asia Minor. The first historic mention of Rome in the Bible is 1Ma 1:10, where it is stated that there arose “a wicked root, Antiochus, surnamed Epiphanes, son of Antiochus the king, who had been an hostage at Rome.” About the year B.C. 161, when Judas Maccabaeus heard of the defeat of Philip, Perseus, and Antiochus, and of the great fame of the Romans, he sent an embassy to them to solicit an alliance, and to obtain protection against the Syrian government (1Ma 8:1 sq.; comp. 2Ma 11:34; Josephus, Ant. 12, 10, 6; Justin, 36, 3).

The ambassadors were graciously received, and Demetrius was ordered to desist from harassing the Jews; but before the answer arrived Judas was slain, having valiantly engaged the whole army of Bacchides sent by Demetrius into Judaea (1Ma 11:1-18; Josephus, Ant. 12, 11, 1). In B.C. 143, Jonathan renewed the alliance with the Romans (1Ma 12:1-4; 1Ma 12:16; Josephus, Ant. 13, 5, 8), the embassy being admitted before the senate (τὸ βουλευτήριον), and on his death, the same year, his brother Simon, who succeeded him, sent also to Rome to again seek a renewal of friendship. The Romans readily acceded to his request, and the valiant deeds of Simon and his predecessors were engraved on tables of brass. Shortly afterwards, Simon sent Numenius to Rome with a great shield of gold, of a thousand pounds' weight, to confirm the league with them. The senate at once consented to its reestablishment, and recognized him as high priest and prince of Judaea. The tables of brass on which the league was written were set up in the Temple (1Ma 14:17 sq.;  Josephus, Ant. 13, 7, 3). Lucius, the consul of the Romans, wrote to several kings and nations requesting them to assist the Jews (1Ma 15:16-23). See Lycus. Hyrcanus, the successor of Maccabeus, again sent (in B.C. 129) an embassy to Rome, which was favorably received, confirming the alliance already concluded (Josephuis, Ant. 13, 9, 2). In the year B.C. 66, Pompey arrived in the East to take command of the Roman armies, and sent his general, Scaurus, to Syria. While at Damascus, the latter received an offer of 400 talents from Aristobulus and Hyrcanus, who were both fighting for the kingdom, each one wishing to be aided. Scaurus accepted the offer of Aristobulus, and ordered Aretas, who was assisting Hyrcanus, to withdraw his forces, or he would be declared an enemy to the Romans (ibid. 14, 2, 3).

The following year Pompey came into Syria, and deprived Antiochus XIII (Asiaticus) of his kingdom, reducing it to a Roman province. Ambassadors were sent to Pompey from the rival princes, and in B.C. 64, when Pompey returned to Damascus from Asia Minor, their respective causes were heard by him. Notwithstanding the prejudices of the people in favor of Aristobulus, Pompey, perceiving the weakness of character and imbecility of Hyrcanus, seemed to incline towards the latter, knowing that it was better to have a weak man under the Roman control. He, however, left the matter undecided, and Aristobulus, seeing that his case was lost, withdrew to make preparations for defense (ibid. 14, 2, 3). Pompey then occupied himself in reducing the forces of Aretas, and afterwards marched against Aristobulus, who fled to Jerusalem. Aristobulus, on his approach, met him, and offered him a large sum of money, and Pompey sent Gabinius to receive it; but on his arrival at Jerusalem he found the gates closed. Aristobulus was then thrown into prison, and Pompey marched to Jerusalem. Hyrcanus opened the gates to him, while the party of Aristobulus, including the priests, shut themselves up in the Temple and withstood a siege of three months. Pompey, observing that the Jews did not work on the seventh day, gained material advantage, and at last took the place by assault, killing, according to Josephus, as many as 12,000 persons, even desecrating the Temple by entering the holy of holies (comp. Tacitus, Hist. 5, 9), though he did not touch any of the treasures. Hyrcanus was then appointed high priest and governor of the country, but was forbidden to wear a diadem (comp. Josephus, Ant. 20, 10). Tribute was also exacted of him, and Pompey took Aristobulus and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus, prisoners to Rome, whence thev subsequently escaped (ibid. 14, 3, 2; 4, 2; 3, 4; War, 1, 7, 6; Strabo, 16, p. 763).

The restoration of Hyrcanus was, however, merely nominal, as the Idumaean Antipater, an active friend of the Romans, was placed over him as governor of Judaea. “Now began the struggle which was destined to continue with little intermission for nearly two hundred years. It was nourished by feelings of the deadliest animosity on both sides; it was signalized by the most frightful examples of barbarity, in which each of the contending parties strove to outdo the other; but it was directed by a controlling Providence to a beneficial consummation, in the destruction of the Jewish nationality, and the dispersion throughout the world of the Christian communities.” (See Merivale, Romans under the Empire [Lond. 1865, 8 vols. 8vo], vol. 21, ch. 29, where the events of the period are admirably summed up). In the year B.C. 57, Alexander, the eldest son of Aristobulus, escaped from Pompey, and took up arms in Judaea. Hyrcanus upon this applied for assistance to Gabinius, the Roman proconsul of Syria, who thereupon sent Mark Antony with a large force into Judaea. Antony, being joined by Antipater with the forces of Hyrcanus, defeated Alexander, and compelled him to fly to Alexandrium. Gabinius soon after arrived, and, through the mediation of the mother of Alexander, made peace with him and allowed him to depart. After these matters were settled, Gabinius went to Jerusalem, and there committed the care of the Temple to Hyrcanus, thus changing the government from a monarchy to an aristocracy. At the same time, he instituted five councils (συνέδρια) instead of the two sanhedrims which had existed in every city, and he distributed these five among five cities. These were Jerusalem, Gadara, Amathus, Jericho, and Sepphoris, in Galilee (Josephus, Ant. 14, 5, 4). In B.C. 54 Gabinius was superseded in the government of Syria by Crassus, who plundered the Temple of about 10,000 talents, not withstanding that a beam of gold of immense value I had been given him, on condition that he would touch nothing else in the Temple (ibid. 14, 7, 1). All this time Antipater was gaining influence with the Romans; and after the death of Pompey, in B.C. 48, he was very useful to Julius Caesar in his war against Egypt. In return for this, he made Antipater procurator of Judaea, gave him the privilege of a citizen of Rome. and freedom from taxes everywhere.

Hyrcanus also was confirmed in the priesthood and ethnarchy, the claims of Antigonus, the only surviving son of Aristobulus, being set aside, and thus the aristocratical constitution of Gabinius was abolished (ibid. 14). The ascendency and prosperity of Antipater were now insured. At this period he had four sons. Two of them, Phasael and Herod, were holding important posts, the former being governor of Jerusalem, and the latter  governor of Galilee. Finally, Antipater's son, Herod the Great, was made king by Antony's interest, B.C. 40, and confirmed in the kingdom by Augustus, B.C. 30 (ibid. 14, 14; 15, 6). The Jews, however, were all this time tributaries of Rome, and their princes in reality were mere Roman procurators. Julius Ceesar is said to have exacted from them a fourth part of their agricultural produce in addition to the tithe paid to Hyrcanus (ibid. 14, 10, 6). Roman soldiers were quartered at Jerusalem in Herod's time to support him in his authority (ibid. 15, 3, 7). Tribute was paid to Rome, and an oath of allegiance to the emperor as well as to Herod appears to have been taken by the people (ibid. 17,2, 2). On the banishment of Archelaus, A.D. 6, Judsea became a mere appendage of the province of Syria, and was governed by a Roman procurator, who resided at Cesarea. Galilee and the adjoining districts were still left under the government of Herod's sons and other petty princes, whose dominions and titles were changed from time to time by successive emperors. SEE HEROD.

The Jewish people, being at last worn out with the disputes and cruelties of the Herods, sent a mission to Rome, begging that Judaea might be made a Roman province. In the year A.D. 6, Archelaus was banished, and Judaea put under the government of Rome. The first procurator appointed was Coponius, who accompanied Cyrenius (the Greek form of the Roman name Quirinus) into Syria. The latter had been sent to take an account of their substance, and to make a census or ἀπογράφη, SEE CHRONOLOGY; SEE CYRENIUS, of the inhabitants of Judaea (Luke 2, 1; Josephus, Ant. 17, 13, 5; 18, 1, 1; War, 2, 8, 1). In A.D. 9 Coponius was succeeded by Marcus Ambivius, who remained at the head of the government till A.D. 12, and was then replaced by Annius Rufus. On the accession of Tiberius, Valerius Gratus was made procurator, a post he filled for eleven years, and was succeeded (A.D. 26) by Pontius Pilate (Josephus, Ant. 18, 2, 2), who entered Jerusalem with the military ensigns, on which were the effigies of the emperor. The Jewish law forbids the making of images, and a great tumult arose, and shortly Tiberius ordered him to withdraw them (ibid. 18, 3, 1; War, 2, 9, 3). Pilate tyrannically governed the Jews till A.D. 36; and at last, owing to continual complaints, was ordered by Vitellius, the president of Syria, to proceed to Rome to give an account of his administration. Tiberius died before he arrived, and he put an end to his life at the commencement of the reign of Caius (Caligula) (Josephus, Ant. 18, 3, 1-3; 4, 1; War, 2, 9, 2; Euseb. H.E. 2, 7). It was during his administration that our Lord was condemned and crucified (Matthew 27;  Mark 15; Luk 3:1; Luke 23; John 18; John 19). On Pilate's departure, Marullus was appointed over Judaea by Vitellius (Josephus, Ant. 18, 4, 2).

The new emperor, Caius, however, superseded him, and appointed Marcellus procurator of Judaea (ibid. 18, 6, 10). In A.D. 40 Vitellius was recalled, and Petronius sent as president of Syria, with orders from Caius to set up his statue in the Temple. This insult caused the whole nation to rise. The intercession of Agrippa, and ultimately the death of the tyrant, prevented this order from ever being executed (ibid. 18; War, 2, 10; Philo, Leg. ad Caiumn, 26). In the Acts it is recorded that the churches had rest through all Judaea, Galilee, and Samaria (9, 31), doubtless owing to the impious attempt of Caligula (Josephus, Ant. 18, 8, 2-9). Under Claudius, who succeeded to the throne in A.D. 41, the Jews had some peace. Agrippa I was nominally king from that period to A.D. 44, when he died, leaving one son. Claudius wished to allow the young Agrippa to rule his father's kingdom, but, evidently by persuasion, sent a Roman procurator to govern the province (Tacit. Hist. 5, 9). Cuspius Fadus was the first appointed (Josephus, Ant. 19, 9, 2; 20, 5, 1), A.D. 45. It was under his administration that a movement of the whole Jewish people broke forth, in consequence of the sacred vestments being placed under his charge. Longinus, the governor of Syria, interfered, an embassy was sent to Rome, and the matter ended in the Jews being permitted to retain these vestments under their care. Judaea was cleared of robbers by the care and providence of Fadus (ibid. 20, 1, 1, 2). He was succeeded by Tiberius Alexander, a renegade Jew, and nephew of Philo (ibid. 20, 5, 2; War, 2, 11, 6). In A.D. 49 Tiberius was recalled, and Ventidius Cumanus appointed in his stead. During his government a fearful tumult ensued, which would have spread far and wide had not Quadratus, the governor of Syria, interfered. The matter ended in the banishment of Cumanus and the appointment of Felix, the brother of Pallas, the favorite of Claudius, as procurator (Ant. 20, 6; 7, 1; War, 2, 12; comp. Tacit. Ann. 12, 54).

Felix was procurator A.D. 53-55. Of his government Tacitus speaks: “Per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit” (Hist. 5, 9), and his corruptness is shown by his expecting to receive money from St. Paul (Act 24:26). He had induced Drusilla, the daughter of Agrippa I, to live with him. She was with him when Paul preached “of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come” (ver. 25). Felix, however, did some good services while he was in power; for, the country being infested with robbers and impostors, he cleared several parts of it. He also drove out the Egyptian impostor (comp. Act 21:38). These are, doubtless, the very worthy deeds alluded to by  Tertullus (24, 2). Bearing ill will against Jonathan, the high priest, Felix had him barbarously murdered. By treachery, also, he put to death Eleazar, the captain of a company of robbers (Josephus, Ant. 20, 8, 5). At last his misgovernment caused his recall, and Porcius Festus succeeded. His government seems to have been milder (ibid. 21, 8, 9; War, 2, 14, 1). He heard Paul with king Agrippa at Caesarea (Acts 25; Acts 26). Festus died after two years. He was succeeded by Albinus, a bad and cruel man, who, on hearing that Gessius Florus was coming to succeed him, brought out all the prisoners who seemed most worthy of death, and put them to death, and at the same time released many of them, but only on receiving a bribe (Josephus, Ant. 20, 9, 5; War, 2, 14, 1). He was recalled in A.D. 65, and Gessius Florus appointed in his stead. He was the last and the worst of the Roman procurators (Ant. 20, 9, 1; 11, 1; War, 2, 14, 1). Josephus does not hesitate to accuse him of the most flagrant and horrid crimes (Ant. 20, 11, 1; War, loc. cit.); and even Tacitus says that the Jewish patience could endure the yoke no longer — “duravit patientia Judaeis usque ad Gessium Florum” (Hist. 5, 10). In A.D. 66, Cestius Gallus, the praefect of Syria, found it necessary to march a powerful army into Palestine. He was, however, defeated with great loss, and immediately sent word to Nero, laying the whole blame on Florus — Florus, likewise, laying the blame on him. He soon afterwards died, as some have supposed, from chagrin or disappointment (Josephus, War, 2, 19; Sueton. Vesp. 4; Tacit. Hist. 5, 10). SEE GOVERNOR. The following year Nero sent Vespasian into Judaea (Josephus, War, 3, 1, 2). (Accounts of the war and siege of Jerusalem will be found in the article SEE JERUSALEM.) In 68, Nero died; Galba, Otho, and Vitellius followed in quick succession; and Vespasian himself was elected emperor by the legions in Judaea. In A.D. 70, Titus was sent by his father to conduct the war; and after a four months' siege Jerusalem was taken. Josephus states that 1,100,000 were killed during the siege (ibid. 6, 9, 3), that several were allowed to depart, and an immense number sold to the army and carried captive. These numbers are of course exaggerated See Luk 21:24.

Under Trajan the Jews again broke out into open revolt, and the disturbances continued under Hadrian. At last, A.D. 131, one Bar-cocheba, the son of a star, was placed at the head of the Jews. Several times the Roman arms were defeated; but Julius Severus, by reducing their fortresses one by one, finally defeated him in A.D. 135. Dion Cassius says that  580,000 Jewish people were slain in these battles (69, 14). This statement is as extravagant as that of Josephus (ut sup.).

In A.D. 136 the emperor Hadrian founded a new city, under the name of AElia Capitolina, to which he gave the privileges of a colony. None but Christians and pagans were allowed to enter (Dion Cass. 69, 12; comp. Gibbon).

The New Test. history falls within the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, and Nero. Only Augustus (Luk 2:1), Tiberius (3, 1), and Claudius (Act 11:28; Act 18:2) are mentioned; but Nero is alluded to in the Acts from ch. 35 to the end, and in Php 4:22. The Roman emperor in the New Test. is usually called Caesar (Act 25:10-12; Act 25:21), though sometimes Augustus (Σεβαστός, ver. Act 21:25), and once Lord (ὁ κύριος, ver. 26). We thus find many characteristics of the Roman rule constantly before us in the New Test.: we hear of Caesar the sole king (Joh 19:15) of Cyrenius, “governor of Syria” (Luk 2:2); of Pontius Pilate, Felix, and Festus, the “governors,” i.e. procurators, of Judaea; of the “tetrarchs” Herod, Philip, and Lysanias (3:1); of “king Agrippa” (Act 25:13); of Roman soldiers, legions, centurions, publicans; of the tributemoney (Mat 22:19); the taxing of the whole world” (Luk 2:1); Italian and Augustan cohorts (Act 10:15; Act 27:1); the appeal to Caesar (Act 25:11). Several notices of the provincial administration of the Romans and the condition of provincial cities occur in the narrative of Paul's journeys (Act 13:7; Act 18:12; Act 16:12; Act 16:35; Act 16:38; Act 19:38). SEE JUDEA.

II. Extent of the Empire. — Cicero's description of the Greek states and colonies as a “fringe on the skirts of barbarism” (Cicero, De Rep. 2, 4) has been well applied to the Roman dominions before the conquests of Pompey and Caesar (Merivale, Rom. Empire, 4, 409). The Roman empire was still confined to a narrow strip encircling the Mediterranean Sea. Pompey added Asia Minor and Syria; Caesar added Gaul. The generals of Augustus overran the northwest portion of Spain and the country between the Alps and the Danube. The boundaries of the empire were now, the Atlantic on the west; the Euphrates on the east; the deserts of Africa, the cataracts of the Nile, and the Arabian deserts on the south; the British Channel, the Rhine, the Danube, and the Black Sea on the north. The only subsequent  conquests of importance were those of Britain by Claudius, and of Dacia by Trajan. The only independent powers of importance were the Parthians on the east and the Germans on the north.

The population of the empire in the time of Augustus has been calculated at 85,000,000 (Merivale, Rom. Empire, 4, 442-450). Gibbon, speaking of the time of Claudius, puts the population at 120,000,000 (Decline and Fall, ch. 2). Count Franz de Champagny adopts the same number for the reign of Nero (Les Cesars, 2, 428). All these estimates are confessedly somewhat uncertain and conjectural.

This large population was controlled, in the time of Tiberius, by an army of twenty-five legions, exclusive of the praetorian guards and other cohorts in the capital. The soldiers who composed the legions may be reckoned in round numbers at 170,000 men. If we add to these an equal number of auxiliaries (Tacit. Ann. 4, 5), we have a total force of 340,000 men. The praetorian guards may be reckoned at 10, 000 (Dion Cass. 4, 24). The other cohorts would swell the garrison at Rome to 15,000 or 16,000 men. For the number and stations of the legions in the time of Tiberius, comp. Tacit. Ann. 4, 5.

The navy may have contained about 21,000 men (Les Cesars, 2, 429; comp. Merivale, 3, 534). The legion, as appears from what has been said, must have been “more like a brigade than a regiment,” consisting, as it did, of more than 6000 infantry with cavalry attached (Conybeare and Howson, 2, 285).

III. Home Rule. — The Roman government was at first kingly. Romulus, the first monarch, was probably succeeded by six others, during a period of two hundred and forty-four years, till in the year B.C. 509 kingly government was abolished when in the hands of Tarquinius Superbus, in consequence of his arrogant and oppressive despotism. A consular form of government succeeded, which was at the first of an essentially aristocratic character, but was compelled to give way by degrees to popular influence, till men of plebeian origin made their way to the highest offices and first honors in the State, when the government became an oligarchy; then fell into anarchy, from which it was rescued by the strong hand of Octavius Csesar, who became sole master of the world by defeating Antony at Actium on Sept. 2, A.D. 723 (B.C. 31), though it was not till the year 725 that the senate named Octavius Imperator, nor till the year 727 that he received the sacred title of Augustus I. When Augustus became sole ruler  of the Roman world, he was in theory simply the first citizen of the republic, intrusted with temporary powers to settle the disorders of the State. Tacitus says that he was neither king nor dictator, but “prince” (Ann. 1, 9), a title implying no civil authority, but simply the position of chief member of the senate (princeps senatus). The old magistracies were retained, but the various powers and prerogatives of each were conferred upon Augustus, so that while others commonly bore the chief official titles, Augustus had the supreme control of every department of the State — above all, he was the emperor (imperator). This word, used originally to designate any one intrusted with the imperium, or full military authority over a Roman army, acquired a new significance when adopted as a permanent title by Julius Caesar. By his use of it as a constant prefix to his name in the city and in the camp he openly asserted a paramount military authority over the State. Augustus, by resuming it, plainly indicated, in spite of much artful concealment, the real basis on which his power rested — viz. the support of the army (Merivale, Rom. Empire, vol. 3). In the New Test. the emperor is commonly designated by the family name “Caesar, “ or the dignified and almost sacred title “Augustus” (for its meaning, comp. Ovid, Fasti, 1, 609). Tiberius is called by implication ἡγεμών in Luk 3:1, a title applied in the New Test. to Cyrenius, Pilate, and others. Notwithstanding the despotic character of the government, the Romans seem to have shrunk from speaking of their ruler under his military title (see Merivale, Rom. Empire, 3, 452, and note) or any other avowedly despotic appellation. The use of the word ὁ κύριος, dominius, “my lord, “ in Act 25:26, marks the progress of Roman servility between the time of Augustus and Nero. Augustus and Tiberius refused this title. Caligula first bore it (see Alford's note in loc. cit.; Ovid, Fasti, 2, 142). The term βασιλεύς, “king, “ in Joh 19:15; 1Pe 2:17, cannot be closely pressed.

The empire was nominally elective (Tacit. Ann. 13, 4)., but practically it passed by adoption (see Galba's speech in Tacit. Hist. 1, 15); and till Nero's time a sort of hereditary right seemed to be recognized. The dangers inherent in a military government were, on the whole, successfully averted till the death of Pertinax, A.D. 193 (Gibbon, 3, 80); but outbreaks of military violence were not wanting in this earlier period (comp. Wenck's note on Gibbon, loc. cit.). The army was systematically bribed by donatives at the commencement of each reign, and the mob of the capital continually fed and amused at the expense of the provinces. We are reminded of the  insolence and avarice of the soldiers in Luk 3:14. The reigns of Caligula, Nero, and Domitian show that an emperor might shed the noblest blood with impunity, so long as he abstained from offending the soldiery and the populace.

IV. Foreign Dependencies. — The subjugated countries that lay beyond the limits of Italy were designated by the general name of provinces. The first provisions necessary on the conquest of a country by the Roman arms were made with a view to secure the possession by the victorious general, in virtue of the power and authority (imperium) intrusted to him by the government at home. Accordingly the earliest object of attention was the ordering of the military power, and the procuring of suitable resources for subsisting the troops. These arrangements, however, were made not without a regard to the pacific relations into which the conquerors and the conquered had mutually entered. Acting on the principle that all unnecessary evil was gratuitous folly, the general availed himself of the aid afforded by existing institutions, and only ventured to give displeasure by establishing new ones in cases where the laws and customs of a country were insufficient for his purposes. The civil government was, however, recognized, modified, or remodelled by the conqueror, provisionally, and only until the Roman senate had made its behests known. Ordinarily, however, the general who had conquered the province constituted its government, in virtue of a law or decree of the senate in which the constitution (forma provincioe) was set forth and established, or the provisional appointments already made were sanctioned and confirmed. In order to complete these structural arrangements, the general received special aid from ten senators appointed for the purpose, whose counsel he was obliged to make use of. In thus reforming the legal and social life of a province, the conquerors had the good sense to act, in general, with prudence and mildness, having regard in their appointments to local peculiarities and existing institutions, so far as the intended adjunction to the Roman power permitted, in order to avoid giving the provincials provocation for opposing their new masters.

Under ordinary circumstances the government of the provinces was conducted by authorities sent for the purpose from Rome. Sometimes, however, as we have seen, petty sovereigns were left in possession of a nominal independence on the borders, or within the natural limits, of the province. Such a system was  useful for rewarding an ally, for employing a busy ruler, for gradually accustoming a stubborn people to the yoke of dependence. There were differences, too, in the political condition of cities within the provinces. Some were free cities, i.e. were governed by their own magistrates, and were exempted from occupation by a Roman garrison. Such were Tarsus, Antioch in Syria, Athens, Ephesus, Thessalonica. See the notices of the “politarchs” and “demos” at Thessalonica (Act 17:5-8); also the “town-clerk” and the assembly at Ephesus (19:35, 39 [Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1, 357; 2, 79]). Occasionally, but rarely, free cities were exempted from taxation. Other cities were “colonies,” i.e. communities of Roman citizens transplanted, like garrisons of the imperial city, into a foreign land. Such was Philippi (Act 16:12). Such, too, were Corinth, Troas, the Pisidian Antioch. The inhabitants were, for the most part, Romans (ver. 21), and their magistrates delighted in the Roman title of Praetor (στρατηγός), and in the attendance of lictors (ῥαβδουχοί), Act 16:35 (Conybeare and Howson, 1, 315). SEE COLONY.

Augustus divided the provinces into two classes — (1) Imperial; (2) Senatorial — retaining in his own hands, for obvious reasons, those provinces where the presence of a large military force was necessary, and committing the peaceful and unarmed provinces to the senate. The imperial provinces, at first, were Gaul, Lusitania, Syria, Phoenicia, Cilicia, Cyprus, and Egypt. The senatorial provinces were Africa, Numidia, Asia, Achaea and Epirus, Dalmatia, Macedonia, Sicily, Crete and Cyrene, Bithynia and Pontus, Sardinia, Baetica (Dion Cass. 53, 12). Cyprus and Gallia Narbonensis were subsequently given up by Augustus, who in turn received Dalmatia from the senate. Many other changes were made afterwards. The governors of those provinces which were assigned to the senate were called proconsuls (ἀνθύπατοι, deputies; A.V. Act 13:7; Act 18:12; Act 19:38), whatever their previous office may have been (Dion. Cass. 53, 13). The imperial provinces, on the other hand, were governed by a Legatus (πρεσβυτὴς) or propraetor (ἀντιστράτηγος), even if the officer appointed had been consul. The minor districts of the imperial provinces were governed by a procurator (ἐπίτροπος, Dion Cass. 53, 15, “steward, “ Mat 20:8). Augustus brought all the procurators under his control (Dion Cass. 53, 32).

Under the republic they had managed the affairs of private citizens, but under the empire they discharged the duties performed by the quaestors in the senatorial provinces. They controlled the revenue and collected the taxes, and their power extended from these  matters to justice and administration (Tacit. Hist. 1, 11). The procurators of Judaea seem to have been under the control of the proconsul of Syria, as Quadratus condemned the indiscretion of the procurator Cumanus (Josephus, Ant. 20, 6, 3; Tacit. Ann. 12, 54). They are called “governors” (ἡγεμόνες) in the New Test. The verb ἡγεμονεύω is employed in Luk 2:2 to show the nature of the government of Quirinus over Syria. Asia and Achaia were assigned to the senate, and in each case the title of the governor in the Acts is proconsul (ἀνθύπατος, 18:12; 19:38). Dion Cass. (53, 12) informs us that Cyprus was retained by the emperor; but Sergius Panlus is called in the Acts (Act 13:7) “proconsul.” This is quite correct, as Dion adds that Augustus restored Cyprus to the senate in exchange for another district of the empire. Coins and inscriptions of Cyprus also bear the title “proconsul” (comp. Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 1, 173 sq.; Akerman, Num. Ill. of New Test. p. 41). SEE PROCONSUL.

The government of the senatorial provinces lay between the consuls, for whom, after they had completed their consular office, two provinces were appointed; the other provinces were allotted to the praetors. Suetonius adds (Octav. 47) that Augustus sometimes made changes in this arrangement. Quaestors, chosen by lot out of those who were named for the year, went with the proconsuls into the provinces of the senate. Into the provinces of the emperor, legati, or lieutenants, were sent, with proprsetorial power, to act as representatives of their master: they wore the sword as an index of military authority, and had power of life and death over the soldiers — two distinctions which were not granted to the proconsuls, or governors of the senatorial provinces. The imperial lieutenants remained many years in the provinces; until, indeed, it pleased the emperor to recall them. Quaestors were not sent into the imperial provinces, but their place was supplied by “procuratores, “ called at a later period “rationales,” who were generally taken from the equestrian order. They raised the revenue for the imperial treasury, and discharged the office of paymaster of the army. There was also in the senatorial provinces a procurator, who raised the income intended, not for the treasury, but for the emperor's privy purse: the smaller provinces, like Judaea, which belonged to Syria, were altogether governed by such. SEE PROCURATOR.

The proconsuls, propraetors, and propraetorial lieutenants, when about to proceed into their several provinces, received instructions for their  guidance from the emperor; and in cases in which these were found insufficient, they were to apply for special directions to the imperial head of the State. A specimen of such application may be found in Pliny's letter to Trajan, with the emperor's rescript, regarding the conduct which was to be observed towards the already numerous and rapidly growing sect of Christians. The administration of justice, so far as it did not belong to the province itself, was in the governor or lieutenants assembled in a conventus; an appeal lay from this court to the proconsul, and from him to Caesar. Criminal justice was wholly in the hands of the local governor, and extended not only over the provincials, but the Roman citizens as well: in important cases the governors applied for a decision to the emperor. The procurator sometimes had the power of life and death, as in the case of Pontius Pilate (Tacitus, Ann. 15, 44). SEE PROVINCE.

The procurator of Judaea resided principally at Caesarea, and the military forces were generally stationed there (Josephus, Ant. 18, 3, 1). During the Passover the troops were stationed at Jerusalem, in order to prevent any insurrection from the multitude of visitors at that festival (Act 21:31; Act 22:24; Act 23:23; Josephus, Ant. 20, 5, 3). The troops consisted of infantry and cavalry (Act 23:23), and were commanded by tribunes (χιλιάρχοι, ver. 17) and centurions (κεντυρίωνες, Mar 15:39; Mar 15:44-45; ἑκατοντάρχοι, Mat 8:5; Mat 27:54; Act 10:1; Act 10:22). The former were at the head of the cohorts (σπεῖραι), and the latter at the head of the centuria. of which two made a maniple. SEE ARMY.

It was the duty of the soldiers to execute the sentence of death and to keep guard over the prisoners (Mat 27:27 sq.; Joh 19:23 sq.; comp. Act 22:25), and the garments of those who were executed became their perquisite (Joh 19:23). They also guarded the prisoners (Act 23:23; Act 27:31). In Act 10:1 mention is made of the Italian band at Caesarea. This was probably a cohort serving in Syria composed of natives of Italy, and called Ι᾿ταλική to distinguish it from those which consisted of troops raised in Syria (Josephus, Ant. 14, 15, 10; War, 1, 17, 1), as we know from Gruter (Inscr. 334, 1) that Italian cohorts were serving in Syria. The Σπείρη Σεβαστή (Act 27:1) could not well be a cohors Augusta, for no legions were in Syria or Judaea bearing that title, nor could it be the band levied from Samaria (ἵλη ίππέων καλουμένη Σεβαστηνῶν, Josephus, Ant. 19, 9, 2; 20, 6, 1; War, 2, 12, 5). Wieseler suggests that it was the Augustani mentioned by Tacitus (Ann. 14, 15) and Suetonius  (Nero, 20, 25). The first levying of this band by Augustus is recorded by Dion Cassius (45, 12).

The provinces were heavily taxed for the benefit of Rome and her citizens. In old times the Roman revenues were raised mainly from three sources: 1, the domain lands; 2, a direct tax (tributum) levied upon every citizen; 3, from customs, tolls, harbor duties, etc. The agrarian law of Julius Caesar is said to have extinguished the first source of revenue (Cicero, Ad Att. 2, 16; Dureau de la Malle, 2, 430). Roman citizens had ceased to pay direct taxes since the conquest of Macedonia, B.C. 167 (Cicero, De Off. 2, 22; Plutarch, Emil. Paul. 38), except in extraordinary emergencies. The main part of the Roman revenue was now drawn from the provinces by a direct tax (κῆνσος, φόρος, Mat 22:17; Luk 20:22), amounting probably to from five to seven percent on the estimated produce of the soil (Dureau de la Malle, 2, 418). The indirect taxes, too (τέλη, vectigalia, Mat 17:25; Dureau de la Malle, 2, 449), appear to have been very heavy (ibid. 2, 448, 452). Augustus, on coming to the empire, found the regular sources of revenue impaired, while his expenses must have been very great. To say nothing of the pay of the army, he is said to have supported no less than 200,000 citizens in idleness by the miserable system of public gratuities. Hence the necessity of a careful valuation of the property of the whole empire, which appears to have been made more than once in his reign. SEE CENSUS. Augustus appears to have raised both the direct and indirect taxes (ibid. 2, 433, 448).

The provinces are said to have been better governed under the empire than under the commonwealth, and those of the emperor better than those of the senate (Tacitus, Ann. 1, 76; 4, 6; Dion, 53, 14). Two important changes were introduced under the empire. The governors received a fixed pay, and the term of their command was prolonged (Josephus, Ant. 18, 6, 5). But the old mode of levying taxes seems to have been continued. The companies who farmed the taxes, consisting generally of knights, paid a certain sum into the Roman treasury, and proceeded to wring what they could from the provincials, often with the connivance and support of the provincial governor. The work was done chiefly by underlings of the lowest class (portitores). These are the publicans (q.v.) of the New Test.

On the whole, it seems doubtful whether the wrongs of the provinces can have been materially alleviated under the imperial government. It is not likely that such rulers as Caligula and Nero would be scrupulous about the  means used for replenishing their treasury. The stories related even of the reign of Augustus show how slight were the checks on the tyranny of provincial governors. See the story of Licinius in Gaul (Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Romans Biog. s.v.), and that of the Dalmatian chief (Dion, 55). The sufferings of Paul, protected as he was, to a certain extent, by his Roman citizenship, show plainly how little a provincial had to hope from the justice of a Roman governor.

V. Roman Citizenship. — Seeing how great the privileges of a Roman citizen were, the eagerness with which it was sought, and the earnestness with which it was pleaded in case of any unjust treatment, is not to be wondered at. The freedom of Rome was often obtained by purchase for great sums (Act 22:28), though at the time of Claudius it is said that it became so cheap that it might be bought for a little broken glass (Dion Cass. 55, 17). A citizen under the republic could in criminal cases, if he were so minded, appeal from the magistrates to the people, for without the acquiescence of the whole Roman people no man could be put to death (Cicero, Tusc. Quoest. 4, 1; In Verr. 54, 57). At the commencement of the imperial period it was, however, necessary that the appeal should be made to the emperor, who had assumed the privilege of final adjudication. It was thus that Paul, when being tried before Festus, “appealed unto Caesar” (Act 25:11; Act 26:32), fulfilling our Lord's words that he should “bear witness also at Rome” (Act 23:11; Act 27:23; Act 28:14; Act 28:16-17; 2Ti 1:17; 2Ti 4:17). The scourging of a Roman citizen was contrary to the law, and Paul, by the assertion of his Roman citizenship, prevented Claudius Lysias from ordering him to be scourged (Act 22:26-29; Act 23:27). At an earlier period Paul and Silas had been scourged (16:37), and two Roman laws thereby violated (Lex Valeria, B.C. 508; Lex Porcia, B.C. 300). They were also illegally treated, being “uncondemned” (Cicero, Verr. 1, 9; Tacitus, Hist. 1, 6). See Sigonius, De Antiquo Jure Civ. Romans (Paris, 1572); also in Graevii Thesaurus, vol. 1; Spanheim, Orbis Romans (Lond. 1703); Cellarii Dissertatt. p. 715 sq.; Fabricius, Bibliograph. Antiq. p. 724 sq. SEE CITIZENSHIP.

VI. Religious Toleration. — The treatment that the Jews received at the hands of the Romans was at times very moderate. Under Julius Caesar they were not forbidden to live according to their customs even in Rome itself (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 8), and Augustus ordered that they should have full freedom of worship, hold their assemblies, and make gifts to their Temple;  they were even admitted with the citizens to a share in the largesses of corn (Philo, Ad Cai. p. 1015; comp. Horace, Sat. 1, 9, 69); and when it fell upon the Sabbath day, Augustus allowed it to be put off to the next day. They were also exempted from military service on account of their religious prejudices (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 11-19; 16, 6; comp. 19, 5, 3). Suetonius (Coes. 84) records that the Jews were in great grief at the death of Augustus. Tiberius and Claudius banished them from Rome, the latter on account of tumults caused by a certain Chrestus (Tacitus, Ann. 2, 85; Suetonius, Tib. 36; comp. Josephus, Ant. 18, 3, 5; Suetonius, Claud. 25; Act 18:2); but the expulsion by Claudius is contradicted by Dion Cassius (55, 6), and a few years after the Jews were again at Rome in great numbers (Act 28:17 sq.). The interference of the Roman government was confined to keeping peace at the great festivals at Jerusalem; for which purpose a guard was stationed in the fortress of Antonia, overlooking the city (Act 22:24). The administration of religious ceremonies was committed to the high priest and Sanhedrim; civil and criminal jurisprudence was retained by them, and they were allowed to pass the sentence of condemnation, but its execution depended upon the procurator (Josephus, Ant. 20, 9, 1; Mar 14:53-55; Mar 14:62-65). They were also permitted to inflict lesser punishments, especially for infractions of the Mosaic law; but the power of life and death was taken from them (Joh 18:31). (See Alford's note on this passage, and Biscoe On the Acts, p. 134- 167.) The stoning of Stephen probably took place during a tumult, and not with the sanction of the procurator (Act 7:28). Even beyond the borders of Palestine the Jews exercised among themselves the civil jurisdiction according to their laws. Josephus (Ant. 14, 10, 17) gives a Roman decree to the city of Sardis sanctioning this privilege.

The Romans could not remain masters of the country so long without leaving many traces of their occupation: the Latin language became known, the imperial weights and measures as well as modes of reckoning time were adopted, many Latinisms passed into common use (occasionally met with in the New Test.), and judicial proceedings were conducted in that language. Yet Latin literature never exercised the same influence on the Jewish mind which the Greek philosophy did, of which we have the most remarkable example in the Jewish school of Alexandria. Indeed, the Romans carefully abstained from forcing their own language upon the inhabitants of the countries they conquered, though the strictness with which every official act, even to the farthest limits of the empire, was  carried out in the Roman language was never relaxed, but the edicts were generally translated into Greek (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 2). The better educated Romans undoubtedly spoke Greek. The inscription on the cross was written in Hebrew, Roman, and Greek (Luk 23:38; Joh 19:20); the Hebrew for the common people, the Latin, the official language, and the Greek, that usually spoken (Alford, ad loc.). All the official inscriptions put up by the Romans were called tituli (comp. Suetonius, In Calig. 34; In Dom. 10); and John (loc. cit.) uses the same expression (ἔγραψε τίτλον).

The freedom of religious worship enjoyed by the nations subject to Rome was remarkably great, though foreign religions were not allowed to be introduced among the Romans (Livy 39, 16); and it is recorded by Dion Cassius (52, 36) that Maecenas advised Augustus not to permit such innovations, as they would only tend to destroy the monarchy. This rule was strictly maintained by all his successors. Judaism was an exception, though, as we have seen, the Jews were sometimes expelled from Rome.

VII. The condition of the Roman empire at the time when Christianity appeared has often been dwelt upon, as affording obvious illustrations of Paul's expression that the “fulness of time had come” (Gal 4:4). The general peace within the limits of the empire, the formation of military roads, the suppression of piracy, the march of the legions, the voyages of the corn fleets, the general increase of traffic, the spread of the Latin language in the West as Greek had already spread in the East, the external unity of the empire, offered facilities hitherto unknown for the spread of a worldwide religion. The tendency, too, of a despotism like that of the Roman empire to reduce all its subjects to a dead level was a powerful instrument in breaking down the pride of privileged races and national religions, and familiarizing men with the truth that “God hath made of one blood all nations on the face of the earth” (Act 17:24; Act 17:26). But still more striking than this outward preparation for the diffusion of the Gospel was the appearance of a deep and wide spread corruption which seemed to defy any human remedy. It would be easy to accumulate proofs of the moral and political degradation of the Romans under the empire. It is needless to do more than allude to the corruption, the cruelty, the sensuality, the monstrous and unnatural wickedness of the period as revealed in the heathen historians and satirists. “Viewed as a national or political history,” says the great historian of Rome, “the history of the Roman empire is sad and discouraging in the last degree. We see that  things had come to a point at which no earthly power could afford any help; we now have the development of dead powers instead of that of a vital energy” (Niebuhr, Lect. 5, 194). Notwithstanding the outward appearance of peace, unity, and reviving prosperity, the general condition of the people must have been one of great misery. To say nothing of the fact that probably one half of the population consisted of slaves, the great inequality of wealth at a time when a whole province could be owned by six landowners, the absence of any middle class, the utter want of any institutions for alleviating distress, such as are found in all Christian countries, the inhuman tone of feeling and practice generally prevailing, forbid us to think favorably of the happiness of the world in the famous Augustan age. We must remember that “there were no public hospitals, no institutions for the relief of the infirm and poor, no societies for the improvement of the condition of mankind from motives of charity. Nothing was done to promote the instruction of the lower classes, nothing to mitigate the miseries of domestic slavery. Charity and general philanthropy were so little regarded as duties that it requires a very extensive acquaintance with the literature of the times to find any allusion to them” (Arnold, Later Roman Commonwealth, 2, 398). If we add to this that there was probably not a single religion, except the Jewish, which was felt by the more enlightened part of its professors to be real, we may form some notion of the world which Christianity had to reform and purify.

Notwithstanding the attempts of Augustus to stop all tendencies to corruption by punishing immorality, it was chiefly immorality that undermined the empire. With a high civilization, a flourishing commerce, and general outward refinement was associated a terrible depravity of morals. Yet the prosperous state of the empire was confessed by the provinces as well as the Romans. “They acknowledged that the true principles of social life, laws, agriculture, and science, which had been first invented by the wisdom of Athens, were now firmly established by the power of Rome, under whose auspicious influence the fiercest barbarians were united by an equal government and common language” (Gibbon, ch. 2). The cruelties and exactions of the provincial magistrates were suppressed by Augustus and Tiberius (Tacitus, Ann. 4, 6). Roads were constructed and commerce increased, but all of no avail. Society would not be reformed, and Paul draws a striking picture of the corruption of the age (Rom 1:14-23). But the spirit of Christianity was floating in the atmosphere, and “the wisdom of providence was preparing a knowledge  which struck root as deeply as the literature of the Augustan age had been scattered superficially” (Arnold, loc. cit.).

The Roman empire terminated with the anarchy which followed the murder of Justinian II, the last sovereign of the family of Heraclius; and Leo III, or the Isaurian, must be ranked as the first Byzantine monarch (Finlay, Greece under the Romans, p. 433).

The chief prophetic notices of the Roman empire are found in the book of Daniel, especially in Dan 11:30-40, and in Dan 2:40; Dan 7:7; Dan 7:17-19, according to the common interpretation of the “fourth kingdom” (comp. 2Es 11:1). SEE DANIEL. According to some interpreters the Romans are intended in Deu 28:49-57. For the mystical notices of Rome in the Revelation, comp. SEE ROME.

On the general subject of this article, consult Eschenberg, Classical Manual, § “Roman Antiquities” (Lond. 1844); Ruperti, Handbuch der romisch. Alterthumer (Hanover, 1841, 2 vols. 8vo); Maillott and Martin, Recherches sur les Costumes, les Maurs, etc., des Anciens Peuples. See also Unger, Sitten und Gebrauche der Romer (Vienna, 1805); Arnold, Hist. of Rome. Much information may be found by the English reader on the state of manners in the first centuries after Christ in the following fictions: Lockhart, Valerius; Bulwer, Pompeii; Ware, Palmyra; and in Milman, Hist. of Latin Christianity. But especially consult Merivale, Hist. of the Roman Empire (Lond. 1864, 8vo).

## Roman Empire, The Holy[[@Headword:Roman Empire, The Holy]]

             is the designation familiarly given to the mediaeval and modern Roman Empire of the West, and especially to that empire after the imperial sceptre had passed into the hands of German sovereigns. For a whole millennium — from the coronation of Charlemagne to the abdication of Francis of Austria — the Roman empire occupied in Western Europe the first place, in dignity and prestige, of all secular governments. Though its actual power had continually fluctuated, and its influence on the affairs of the world had rapidly waned after the retirement of Charles V, it remained an imposing memorial of ancient grandeur and dominion, and was honored as a “clarum et venerabile nomen.” “Heir of the universal sway of Rome, the holder of it claimed to be the suzerain of all earthly kings. First and oldest of European dignities, its very name had a sound of dignity.”

Passing over the widely extended and thoroughly organized empire of Charlemagne, and the rapid decay of eminence and power, under his successors of the Carlovingian line, and confining attention to the Germanic dynasties, the Holy Roman Empire maintained a lofty and potent ascendency over all kings and temporal rulers in the West for three centuries, extending from the first Otho, the Great, to the death of that “stupor mundi,” the dazzling, energetic, and lordly Frederick II. During this long and agitated period, the empire and the papacy marched abreast in constant discord and furious contention; the one acknowledged to be supreme in the secular order, the other reverenced as supreme in the spiritual order. The rivalries, the jealousies, the animosities, the virulent antagonisms, of these transcendent sovereignties — each endeavoring to secure its own position and predominancy by the depression of the otherfilled the centuries with strife, with acrimonies, and with perplexities worse than the bloody warfare which they engendered. For one brief interval in the subsequent ages, after long and dreary eclipse, the Holy Roman Empire, under an emperor of the house of Hapsburg, threatened to regain a more arrogant control, a vaster domain, a more solitary domination, than it had possessed under the first Caesars or had claimed under the first Constantine. But Charles V, the most powerful of emperors since Charlemagne, was the last of emperors crowned in Italy. He was frustrated of the dreams that had been nursed for him by both his grandfathers, and that had been eagerly cherished by himself throughout a long and busy reign. His energies were engrossed and wasted, his enormous resources consumed, and his authority paralyzed by discords in  his numerous scattered kingdoms and principalities, and by the divisions and civil wars produced by the Protestant Reformation, and favoring its extension. Worn out and baffled, he renounced his thrones in despair. He retired shattered in health, in spirit, and in confidence, to fritter away the last months of a grand existence — amid the lovely scenery around the monastery of Juste. Thenceforward the empire continued to wane and shrivel up, till finally extinguished by the conquests and confederations of the emperor Napoleon.

An institution of such long duration, of such splendid pretensions, of such intimate association with the ecclesiastical system of Christendom, of such profound influence upon both the temporal and the spiritual fortunes of humanity — an institution which transmitted the consummate result of all ancient civilization almost to our own day — merits careful appreciation, and requires it the more urgently because its name has already ceased to be familiar, and because its fortunes and vicissitudes are often slighted as the vanished “phantoms of forgotten rule.”

I. Origin of the Name. — The name of The Holy Roman Empire cannot be distinctly traced in either its origin or its application. It is obscurely involved in the institution of the empire throughout all the phases of its existence. It may readily be discerned in pagan Rome. It is implied in the constitution of the reanimated Empire of the West. In more modern times it frequently appears in treaties and imperial documents, in diplomatic papers, and in the official transactions of the imperial chancery. But it was never of obligatory or habitual employment. It does not occur in the Act of Abdication of Francis I in 1806, nor in the earlier Pragmatic, which paved the way for the abdication and prescribed his official titles as emperor elect. It has not been found in any of the numerous chronicles, specially examined for the present inquiry, which record the coronations from Charlemagne to Rodolph of Hapsburg. It has not been detected by us in the capitularies and edicts, nor in the Libri Feudorum. There is nothing on the subject in Pfeffel's Abrege Chronologique, notwithstanding the well-merited commendations bestowed by Gibbon upon that painstaking and useful treatise. There is no explanation in Muratori nor in Gibbon. It would be vain, of course, to expect the solution of any real difficulty from The Middle Ages of the superficial and blundering Hallam. It is strange, however, that no elucidation of its origin and use is given by Bryce in his work specifically entitled The Holy Roman Empire. All these European  writers had ready access to authentic sources of information which are usually beyond the reach of inquirers in America.

The interpretation of the name is not far to seek, though a long, elaborate, and dubious research would be required to determine the times, conditions, and circumstances of its ordinary employment, if there ever was any fixed rule on the subject. The city of Rome and the imnperium Romanum were always regarded as sacrosanct, even under the republic. The argumentation of Augustine, in his memorable treatise De Civitate Dei, revolves mainly upon the pagan allegation of the intimate dependence of Rome on the guidance of her gods. Under the empire, the city was fervently adored as diva Roma, urbs divina, and the sacred fire was kept ever burning in her honor. Such a perpetual fire was maintained in the imperial palace. Julius Caesar was Pontifex Maximus, holding the holiest of offices at the time of his assassination, and had been chief of the religion many years previously. On his murder, he was deified, and became Divus Julius. On the death of Lepidus, Augustus united the office of Pontifex Maximus to his other titles. He, too, was deified. Subsequent emperors retained the pontificate, and many were worshipped as Divi while still alive. The pontificate was held even by Christian princes; and the epithet “sacred” was applied in both the Latin and the Greek vocabulary of the court to their persons, their families, their functions, their ministers, and all their surroundings. This practice was not weakened by the establishment of Christianity as the religion of the state. Comes sacri cubiculi, sacri fisci, sacrarum largitionum, sacri palatii, etc., were regular offices under the constitution of Constantine. We find even “the sacred inkstand” and “the sacred ink.” It should be remembered, too, that the “tribunicia potestas, “ which was one of the principal constituents of imperial authority, had always been “sacrosanct” (Liv. 4, 3, 6, et Not. Vat. ad 27, 38, 3, ed. Drakenborch).

The organization and ceremonial of the old Roman empire were habitually adopted or travestied by the barbarian kingdoms (see Cassiodor. Epp. Var.) before they were repeated by the Western emperors. In the attestation of the Acta de Pace Constantioe, 1183, of Frederick Barbarossa, the notary signs himself, “Ego Odelinus, sacri palatii notarius, “ in exact correspondence with the language of Justinian in the confirmation of the code: “Vir gloriosissimus, quaestor sacri palatii nostri....” Hence it is not surprising to find in the West, as in the East, the phrase “sanctus Imperator,” though it does not become one of the formal titles.  When Charlemagne received the imperial crown at Rome on Christmas day, 800, he received it with all the attributes of the imperial sovereignty of Rome. The sanctity of the office, derived from the several confluent tendencies which have been specified, was not the least marked of these attributes. This sanctity was further heightened by the circumstances and the purposes of his appointment, and by the relations of himself and his family to the orthodox Christianity of the West. One of his highest duties and honors was to be the “advocatus ecclesiae,” the protector of the pope against domestic and foreign enemies — the temporal sovereign of the Christian faith and of Christendom. He was solemnly anointed. It is stated by a late chronicler that he was hailed, in the acclamations of the people, as “a Deo coronato.” So Justinian had declared: “Deo auctore nostrum gubernante imperium” (De Concept. Dig. § 1). When Otho I was crowned in 962, the pope conveyed the dignity “benedictione et consecratione.” It is a mistake to suppose that when Charles merged the patriciate in the empire, he took merely a title of higher dignity. It is an equal mistake to suppose that he only revived or renewed the long dormant Empire of the West. He was crowned sole emperor of the Roman world at the time of a supposed vacancy of the imperial throne, which had always been deemed elective, and of exclusively masculine tenure: “Quia muller excoecato imperatore Constantino filio suo imperabat” (Sigebert Gemblacensis, ad ann.; comp. Palgrave, English Commonwealth, p. 489493, who long preceded Fustel de Coulanges [Rev. des Deux Mondes, Jan. 1, 1870]).

The expediency, the propriety, or the necessity of this transference of the empire from the East to the West, though in three years restricted to the revival of the Western Empire, sufficed for the resurrection of the latter empire and for the distinct constitution of the Christendom (Christi dominium) of Western Europe. The epithet of “holy” does not seem to have been attached formally to either empire at this time, though probably in use. The title of the emperor, in the West as in the East, continued to be “Imperator Romanus, semper Augustus.” But the idea of sanctity under the setting, as under the rising, sun seems to have been ever present to the minds of men. Hence the designation “Imperator sanctus” is found in the Edict of Verona, Oct. 29, 967, of Otho I, Imp.; and his son Otho II, Rex (Pertz, Mon. Hist. Germ. 4, 33). It was not until after the thorough feudalization of the empire under the Germanic successors of the Carlovingians, and the bitter conflicts and inveterate rivalries of emperors and popes, that the sanctity of the empire needed to be prominently  asserted as the counterpart and counterpoise of the sanctity of the papal throne. But pagan and Christian, Eastern and Western, habits and associations had combined to invest emperor and empire with an air of recognized holiness. These influences and tendencies were preserved and augmented by the circumstances attendant on Charlemagne's coronation, and were increased by the ideal character which the empire subsequently assumed.

II. Theory of the Holy Roman Empire. — There would be manifest impropriety in entering here into the consideration of the constitution or the history of the second Western empire. But the theory of the empire, its great contention with the papacy, and the grave consequences thence resulting to the ecclesiastical and religious fortunes of Europe are apposite, and even indispensable, to the present Cyclopoedia . The notices, however, must inevitably be both brief and jejune.

The significance of great historical events and institutions does not reveal itself till they have passed away or declined. It must be gathered by retrospection from the consequences — not expected from contemporaneous appreciation. Charlemagne was constituted emperor by the implied election of the Roman people, and by the consecration of the pope, as the ruler of the Christian world; as the official defender of the Church; as the upholder of orthodox Christianity against heresy and schism; as the champion of the faith and of the faithful against the infidel and the barbarian; as the patron, promoter, and guardian of missionary enterprise for the conversion of the heathen. In this character he was not merely the first among temporal princes, but supreme over them all. He was clothed with a religious character in order to act as the carnal instrument of the spiritual and ecclesiastical authority. He was chief of Christendom to preserve the Christian society from intestine disorders and external perils. He was head of the temporal order, but with distinct spiritual attributions. The pope was head of the spiritual order, but with some temporal jurisdiction, by the grant of Pepin and the confirmation of Charlemagne. Each, in his sphere, was the vicegerent of Heaven for the government and guidance of the world. This is very cogently presented by Bryce: “Thus does the emperor answer in every point to his antitype, the pope, his power being yet of a lower rank, created on the analogy of the papal, as the papal itself had been modelled after the empire. The parallel holds good even in its details; for just as we have seen the churchman assuming the crown and robes of the secular prince, so now did he array  the emperor in his own ecclesiastical vestments the stole and the dalmatic; gave him a clerical as well as a sacred character; removed his office from all narrow associations of birth and country; inaugurated him by rites, every one of which was meant to symbolize and enjoin duties in their essence religious” (The Holy Roman Empire, 7, 106-116).

It must, indeed, have been very evident, or must have been recognized by an instinct more profound than evidence, that the preservation of civilization; the protection of society against Saracen, Saxon, etc.; the perpetuation of Christian faith; the maintenance of religious order and civil discipline, of morality and culture among the nations, of unity in the brotherhood of faith, of tranquillity throughout the Christian realm required, amid the still rampant paganism and the internal and external dangers of the time, that there should be consolidation of Christian government; that there should also be union between the temporal and spiritual authorities; and that agreement and harmony should prevail between the two orders of rule. This was exemplified by the coronation of the emperor in Rome by the pope, by the assent of the emperor to the election of the pope. It is equally evident that these two powers — each in some sort supreme, yet each, also, in some sort subordinate to the other — would decline into jealousies and discords and furious antagonisms when the great dangers which enforced their union had been mitigated or removed, and when causes of difference, which were sure to arise, should eventually arise.

The splendid dreams of humanity are visions of the night which are dissipated by the realities of the day. It was a magnificent, but never realized, conception that as there should be “one Lord, one faith, one baptism,” so there should be a single Christendom, with one administrator of spiritual interests and one governor of temporal society, that all nations might be one realm of Christianity and all Christians might be secured by the combined might of all, under the guidance and disposition of one secular control. It was a brilliant dream. It has left but the cloud behind. It may afford a hope or a promise of accomplishment in very dissimilar form in future centuries. For brief periods there was a remote approximation to its achievement. For long periods it was frustrated and often, perhaps, forgotten (“breves et infaustos populi Romani armores”).

III. Relations of the “Holy Roman Empire” to the “Holy Roman Church.” — The Holy Roman Empire lasted for more than a thousand years. Its  eminence and its relations to the papacy changed variously and greatly during this long lapse of time. Pfeffel, who is occupied with the history of Germany rather than with that of the empire, divides the former into nine periods, beginning with Sigovesus A.D. 600, and ending with the extinction of the male line of Hapsburg in 1740. Six of these periods must be left unnoticed for various reasons, which there is not room to state. The fourth, or Carlovingian, period has, indeed, been considered more fully than our space would justify. The great struggle between the emperor and the pope took place during the fifth, sixth, and seventh periods, under the Saxon, Franconian, and Suabian houses (962-1254); and from this struggle issued the religious and political complications of modern Europe and of the modern world. To these periods, then, attention will have to be confined, and to them it can be but inadequately directed.

When Otho I was crowned at Rome in 962, he was in a position which permitted, and almost necessitated, the revival of the imperial pretensions, which had long been dormant, while that supreme dignity was squabbled over by Burgundian or other princes. There was occasion for the coercion of a strong hand, external to Rome and free from papal affiliations. For three quarters of a century the papacy had been the spoil of factions, and had been held by the nominees, tools, or scions of turbulent nobles and depraved women. It was the age of Alberic and Marozia, and of that late fiction papissa Joanna. The interposition of some foreign control was imperatively required. The treachery of John VIII necessitated the assumption by Otho of the right to regulate papal elections, and the imposition of an oath upon the cardinals and the Roman people to admit the imperial supremacy. This was manifestly a usurpation by the secular authority, but the state of affairs demanded it. Naturally, as good order increased in the Church and the sense of spiritual duties and responsibilities revived, this subordination was impatiently borne; and a steady effort, ultimately successful under Gregory VII, was made to render the Church independent of the empire, and superior to it in dignity as in sanctity. Here, then, was a wager of battle, not likely to be forgotten or neglected by either party, which led to the humiliation of Henry IV at Canossa, and to the exile of Gregory VII.

While Henry was yet a child, and after Hildebrand had acquired predominance in the Roman curia, though not yet pope, Alexander II had been induced to issue a decree against the lay investiture of clerical beneficiaries. The decree was renewed by Hildebrand as pope, and became  the chief ground of controversy with the empire after Gregory's death. The quarrel was not closed in Germany till the Diet of Worms in 1122, and in England till after the assassination of Thomas a Becket. It broke out afresh between Germany and the pope, but was merged in other contentions. The principles involved in the question merited the zeal and energy displayed on either side, but did not justify the spiritual or secular pretensions advanced or the procedures employed. Ambition, jealousy, and passion soon dominated over the war of parties.

The question, simply stated, was whether the Church or the empire — the ecclesiastical or the secular authority — should have the right of conferring ecclesiastical benefices. It would require an extended exposition of the political, social, and religious constitution of those times to furnish any satisfactory exhibition of the significance and bearings of this dispute. Such knowledge must be sought in the pontifical and imperial histories; the leading topics alone can be indicated here. The feudal system was in full vigor. Even the Church was feudalized. Society was molded into a regular hierarchy of gradations from the lowest vassal to emperor and pope. The political and the ecclesiastical organizations were arranged on parallel lines. The political and the social system would be broken and rendered impotent by permitting the interference of an extrinsic power, in the bestowal of dignities, honors, and commands. If these were conferred by the pope or by his deputies, the occupants would be withdrawn from their allegiance to their temporal head and from their obligations to the State. But the experience of the age proved that if these appointments were received from the empire or secular government, they would be granted and sought for worldly motives and selfish considerations; would be lavished upon feudal nobles and their relatives; would be used for private feuds and temporal purposes; and would be severed from the due services of religion. Archbishoprics and bishoprics, abbacies and canonries, with their rich domains, would be grasped by warlike, rapacious, corrupt, and truculent barons who would scorn their religious vocation and the cure of souls. This is proved by the aspect of the Church in every country, and even in Rome, under the later Carlovingians and the earlier Germanic emperors. Neither of the coordinate powers could yield the point in issue without grave peril to itself and graver peril to society. The basis of settlement, which afforded a temporary or apparent solution of the problem, was very plausible, but could not be satisfactory in practice to either contestant. The settlement was that ecclesiastical dignities and offices should be conferred by the  Church by delivery of the ring and crosier, and that the temporalities attached thereto should be bestowed by the sovereign per sceptrum. That this arrangement could not secure peace is demonstrated by the quarrel between Henry II and Thomas a Becket.

The vast importance of the dispute will appear more manifest if it be presented in its most abstract form: Should the clergy be dependent upon the State? In the condition of society at that time — still semi-pagan and more than semi-barbarous — morality, religion, civilization, and Christianity would have been ruined by being sacrificed to the worldly appetencies of princes and subjects; the reign of violence and blood would have been unchecked; the heathen invaders of the empire had been with patient effort brought into subjection to a higher law than force; the work of centuries would have been undone by the subjugation of the spiritual authority which alone enforced moral restraints. Should Church dignitaries be released from all subordination to the State and depend solely upon the head of the Church? Then would ensue chronic discord between the supreme regulators of society; utter impotence of the secular authority for the protection of the nations or for the maintenance of order; the most unrestrained license in the high places of the Church; neglect of Christian sentiment, precepts, duties; luxury, sensuality, and rottenness; with arrogant tyranny over thought and feeling on the part of the ruling caste; and with the abject servility of superstition and ignorance on the part of the laity, who would be lewd in every sense of the word. The question, in its ultimate tendency, was whether Christendom should be subjected to the tyranny of the sword or to the tyranny of the crosier. This was the dilemma. Its character is illustrated by the whole history of Europe from the 9th century to the 15th. SEE INVESTITURES.

The war between the two supreme powers was inevitable; it was even necessary. The question could not be settled without war; it could not be settled by war; but the bitter and long-continued contention prevented either power from becoming absolute, and finally paralyzed both. The conflict about investitures broke out afresh, as has been said, but soon changed its form. Under the Suabian emperors it was complicated with the resistance of the Lombard League to the empire; still later, with the effort of the popes to exclude the imperial supremacy from Italy, or, at least, to restrict it to the valley of the Po. Hence sprang the savage strife of Guelphs and Ghibellines, which extended its pernicious influence beyond the period (f the Renaissance. But the second act of the great drama ended with the  Council of Lyons in 1245, and with the death of Frederick II in 1250, leaving the papacy ostensibly possessed of resistless dominion, the empire crushed, shattered, mangled; introducing, at the same time, chronic wars into Italy, and anarchy and divisions into Germany, from which that great country has not yet recovered. Into the instructive details of these mighty and ominous transactions there is no time to enter. A few words on the effects of the struggle must terminate these summary and inadequate remarks.

IV. Consequences of the Strife between the Church and the Empire. — The disastrous issues of this unseemly contention were immediate, continuous, and progressive. None but the most prominent can be specified now, and they must be noted without being discussed. The deadly duel was ruinous to both combatants. It weakened fatally both the papacy and the empire; but it prevented the permanent predominance of either. It frustrated any harmonious agreement for the joint direction of the growing Christian community. It precluded the establishment of wholesome reciprocal restraint over the spiritual and the temporal authority. The imperial supremacy over the nations ceased to be anything more than a hollow pretence. The imperial control even over the Germanic principalities and municipalities was almost annihilated. There was neither unity nor union. The capacity of the empire to shield Christendom from attack was sacrificed. The proof of this was given by the great Mongol invasion, by the Ottoman conquest of Constantinople, by the fearful ravage and encroachment of the Turkish sultans. Germany was thrown into chronic convulsions and feudal anarchy till the accession of Rodolph of Hapsburg. These discords, which consumed the strength and divided the energies of the country, descended to the field of Sadowa. They have not been buried by the coronation at Versailles. Italy was lacerated and corroded by unceasing wars, under Hohenstauffen, Angevin, Arragonese, and Bourbon princes. City was arrayed against city, family against family, kinsman against kinsman. Lawlessness, rapine, murder, treachery, and the licentious usurpations and tyrannies of chiefs of Condottieri were domesticated throughout the beautiful peninsula.

The Church, though triumphant, was more disastrously injured: it was smitten in the house of its friends. There was a separate life in the bruised and dissevered members of the imperial system. They might recombine in altered relations, or be refashioned as distinct entities. Such change was incompatible with ecclesiastical unity or pontifical supremacy.  The papacy seemed to have asserted and assured its absolute dominion at the Council of Lyons. It was deluded. It lost, with the excommunication and death of its imperial opponent, prestige, influence, and respect. It fell into imbecility and corruption. The flight of Innocent IV from Rome was the prelude to the Babylonish captivity, and to the French pontificate at Avignon. This, again, generated the Great Schism. with the consequent alienation of the nations, especially of England and Germany, which had little share in the ecclesiastical spoils. As early as 1137, the emperor Lothaire II had overawed pope Innocent II by declaring that in case of the pope's continued opposition, “Imperium ab illo die et deinceps scissum a pontificio omnibus modis sciret.” Twenty-four years afterwards — at the Council of Toulouse, held to decide between Alexander III and the anti- pope Victor — a party, favorable to neither, boldly proposed to “avail themselves of the present opportunity to shake off the yoke of the Roman Church.” The great councils of the 15th century — Pisa, Constance, Basle, Ferrara, Florence — still further undermined the pontifical supremacy; and the last resulted in the final severance of the Greek and Latin churches, which rendered ecclesiastical unity impossible; and in the overthrow of Constantinople and the Byzantine empire.

During the two centuries of imperial impotence, avarice, vice, crime, tyranny, extortion, sensuality, had permeated the ecclesiastical hierarchy in all lands, rendering certain and necessary the religious reformation so often demanded, so earnestly required by the Council of Constance, so hopelessly sought within the pontifical fold.

The great revolutions of society are never due to a single cause, nor to a brief catalogue of causes. Many tendencies combine, in most complex and shifting modes, to determine the result; yet, certainly, the conflict between the Holy Roman Empire and the Holy Roman Church contributed most potently to the disintegration of both, to the dissipation of the wondrous medieval dream, and to the religious and political constitution of our modern civilization.

V. Literature. — It would be absurd to present any apparatus bibliographicus for a subject such as The Holy Roman Empire, the literature of which embraces all the chronicles, all the secular and ecclesiastical historians, all the scholastic and diplomatic documents relative to the constitution and relation of Church and State for many centuries. It may suffice to mention some of the lighter and more accessible  treatises which discuss important parts of the subject: Pfeffel, Abrege Chronologique de l'Histoire et du Droit Public d'Allemagne (Paris, 1776, 2 vols. 4to); Putter, Dissertationes de Instauratione Romans Imperii; Butler, Notes on the Chief Revolutions of the States composing the Empire of Charlemagne (Lond. 1807, 8vo); Lehueron, Inst. Mirov. et Carlovingiennes (Paris, 1843, 2 vols.); Milman, Hist. Latin Christianity; Greenwood, Cathedra Petri; Bryce, The Holy Roman Empire (4th ed. Lond. 1873); Waitz, Deutsche Kaiser von Karl dem Grossen, etc.; Döllinger, Das Kaiserthum Karls des Grossen, etc.; Höfler, Kaiserthum und Papstthum; Moser, Romische Kayser. (G.F.H.)

## Roman Manner[[@Headword:Roman Manner]]

             the custom of building churches of stone, spoken of in 675, when Benedict Biscop, abbot of Wearmouth, went to France to engage masons. It was about the same time called the Gallican mode.

## Romanelli, Giovanni Francesco[[@Headword:Romanelli, Giovanni Francesco]]

             a painter of the Roman school, was born at Viterbo in 1617. His first master was Domenichino, but his style was chiefly gained from Pietro di Cortona, under whom he afterwards studied. Later he adopted a manner more his own and less imposing, but more soft and pleasant. It is in this style that his best works are executed, as The Descent from the Cross in St. Ambrose's at Rome. Romanelli was employed by cardinal Barberini in the decoration of his palace, and also by Mazarin. He died in 1663. His works are very numerous in Rome, and are all on religious or mythological subjects.

## Romanes, Francis[[@Headword:Romanes, Francis]]

             a convert from Romanism, was a native of Spain, but afterwards became a resident of Bremen, where he transacted business for Antwerp merchants. When convinced of the errors of papacy, he resigned his agency, informed his employers of the change in his religious belief, and devoted himself to the service of religion. While in Spain laboring for the conversion of his parents, he was informed against by his former employers, arrested, and after imprisonment was burned. In this torture, as long as he was able to speak, he continued to repeat the 7th Psalm. See Fox, Book of Martyrs.

## Romanese (Romonsch, Or Upper And Lower Engadine) Version Of The Scriptures[[@Headword:Romanese (Romonsch, Or Upper And Lower Engadine) Version Of The Scriptures]]

             This version is used in the Grisons, anciently a part of Rhaetia, and constituting the southeastern angle of Switzerland. The mountainous parts of this canton are inhabited by the little Romanese nation. The Engadine, or valley of the Inn, on the borders of the Tyrol, is inhabited by a section of this people, to whom a Romanese dialect called Churwelsche is the vernacular. The other Romanese dialect is called Ladiniche, and is spoken in the valley of the Rhine, on the confines of Italy. Both these dialects being derived from the Latin tongue, they preserve to this day the most striking characteristics of the Romance languages. The New Testament was printed in the former of these dialects in 1560 in the translation of Jacob Biffrun, and the whole Bible in 1679, prepared by Jac. Ant.Vulpio and others. In the latter, the Bible was published in 1718 under the title La S. Bibla quei ei: Tut la Soinchia Scartira, ner tuts ils Cudischs d' ilg Veder a Nief Testament, cum ils Cudischs Apocryphs Messa giu Ent ilg Languaig Rumonsch da la Ligia Grischa Tras Anschins survients d' ilg Plaid da Deus d' ils venerands Colloquis sua-a sut il Guault. cum Privilegio (illustrissimorum D.D. Rhaetorum. Asquitschada en Coira tras Andrea Pfeffer, stampadur, En ilg On da Christi MDCCXVIII, fol. Coire, 1718).

These editions, including an earlier one, by J. Gritti, of 1640, were all printed in the Grisons; but they were soon exhausted, and at the beginning of the present century a copy was scarcely attainable. A company of Christians at Basle, therefore, projected an edition for the use of these mountaineers, and under the auspices of the Basle Bible Society, and with the aid of the British and Foreign Bible Society, the New Testament in Churwelsche left the press in 1810. But when the poor Ladins heard what a treasure their neighbors on the Tyrolese frontier had got, they expressed a very strong desire to have the same in their dialect. The Bible societies of London and Basle promptly consented to grant them this boon, and in 1812 an edition of two thousand copies of the New Testament in Ladiniche had left the press under the title Il Nouf Testament da nos Segner Jesu Christo (tradut in Rumansch d' Engadina Bassa. Stampa in Basel da F. Schneider, 1812). Several subsequent editions of the New and Old Testament have been issued by the Basle Society, aided by the English Society, in both dialects. Thus, Biblia o vero la Soinchia Scritura del velg Testament (Sun cuosti dellas beneficentas Societas Biblicas da London et Basel e tras Directiun della Societa Biblica in Coira promovuda all stampa.  Coira, 1815. Stampa da Bernard Otto); Ilg nieo Testament. Editiun nova, revedida a corregida, tont esco pusseivel, suenter ilg original Grec (da Otto Carisch, a squitschada a cust da las Societads Biblicas da Quera a da Basel. Qera, Stamparia da Pargatzi a Felix. 1856); Il nouv Testamaint, tradut nel dialect Roumauntsch d'Engiadina (ota tres J. Menni. Coira, 1861). See Reuss, in Herzog's Real-Encyklop. s.v. “Romanische Bibelubersetzungen;” id. Geschichte der Heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments (Brunswick, 1874), § 489; Theologisches Universal Lexikon, s.v. “Romanische Bibelubersetzungen;” The Bible of Every Land, p. 287 sq.; Bibliotheca Biblica (Braunschw. 1752), p. 174; Zuchold, Bibliotheca Theologica, 1, 139; 2, 1310, 1315. (B.P.)

## Romanesque Art[[@Headword:Romanesque Art]]

             Some writers apply the term “Romanesque” to the period of Christian art in Italy and Western Europe which extended from the 3d to the 10th century; but it is more usually applied to the period extending from the 9th to the 12th or 13th century. Until the 9th century Christian art, especially architecture, had flowed in two main streams, which in locality and in characteristics were quite distinct from each other. The one is usually called the Basilican style, SEE BASILICA, which had its origin in Rome; the other is called the Byzantine style, which had its origin in Constantinople. SEE ARCHITECTURE.

In the very active period of church erection which existed in Central and Western Europe from the 9th to the 12th century, the basilican and Byzantine styles were in a sense forced into a new style, which took on certain characteristics of these former styles, but which had many very marked original features.

The general ground plan of the later basilicas, that of the Latin cross, was retained. For the convenience of the officiating clergy, a semicircular apsis, or choir, was placed at the farther end of the main nave and at the end of each arm of the transept. From this general typical ground plan there were many variations, which were chiefly caused by the disconnected times and plans by which the different parts of the edifices were erected.

The round arch is a distinctive feature of the Romanesque style, which is termed, indeed, by many writers the Round Arch style, in distinction from  its successor the Pointed Arch, or Gothic, style. SEE GOTHIC ARCHITECTURE. The round arch was inherited from both the basilican and the Byzantine style. During the latter part of the Romanesque period, the pointed arch began to be used in parts of the openings, and, indeed, in a few cases was almost entirely adopted; but the other features of these edifices mark them as distinctively Romanesque. The method of covering enclosed spaces by vaulting differed greatly from that in the preceding styles, and forms one of the most prominent features in this style.

During the early Romanesque period, especially in Italy, the campanile, or bell tower, was built separate from the church, as in the leaning tower of Pisa; but later it was attached to the church edifice. Indeed, the single tower was expanded into a system of towers surmounted by spires, producing a balancing of parts around the entire structure. The towers were in many cases flanked by small turrets, which produced beautiful and picturesque effects. In many cases a lofty tower with turrets rose over the intersection of the transept and the nave. In the Cathedral of Bamberg four lofty towers rose, two on each side of the nave.

One of the most attractive features of the Romanesque architecture is the introduction of delicately formed arcades in various places on the exterior, where they produce pleasing effects, as under the cornices of the choirs, or apsides, or on the main facade. These arcades sometimes rose, like steps, up along the lines of the roof. Sometimes they were placed in successive tiers up the entire height of the facade, or even up the entire height of the campanile, as in the cathedrals of Lucca and Pisa.

The portals of churches were often flanked by greatly variegated and deeply set clusters of columns. These were surmounted by capitals, and the same or similar clustered lines were carried in an arch over the doorway. In a few cases the inner lines over the doorway were thrown in round arches, while the arches gradually changed to pointed ones. These clustered arches were, in the Gothic style, replaced by rows of angels. The courts of cloisters were frequently surrounded by arcades of exquisite beauty, the columns usually being double, no two being alike, and more frequently one column being twisted. Clustered columns were also introduced in the interiors of churches. Indeed, the entire Romanesque architecture is marked by a rather too exuberant fancy, variety being considered necessary or desirable, even when more harmony could be secured by less varied types of decoration.  The capitals of pillars were manifestly modelled upon the type of the late Roman Corinthian or the Composite capital; but independence of motive was soon manifested, and great variety was introduced in the capitals, which were generally managed in excellent harmony with the lines of the new style. Many new plant forms were conventionalized, and the foundation was laid for the subsequent luxurious Gothic foliation. Animal forms, both realistic and imaginary, were frequently introduced in the midst of plant forms or alone, in the capitals of pillars and elsewhere. These not unfrequently represented ogres and other hideous beasts, which were to frighten hypocrites and the wicked from entering the house of God, the precursors of the gargoyles of the Gothic. Not unfrequently the chief columns of portals rested on the backs of lions or massive dogs, typifying the strength and defenses of the Church.

In truth and consistency of architectural character, the Romanesque style, in its best examples, takes very high rank among the historic styles. It is the only one of the great styles in history which did not pass into decadence through the perversion of architectural features or principles. It was cut off in the height of its career by its successor the Gothic — the pointed displacing the round arch, with all its entire new type of decoration. The finest examples of the Romanesque style are: in Italy, the cathedrals of Pisa, Lucca, Parma, Vercelli; in France, those of Avignon, Toulouse, Bayeux, Clermont, Perigueux, St. Itienne, and other churches in Caen; in Germany, those of Worms, Bonn, Speyer, Treves, Hildesheim, and Bamberg; in England, those of Peterborough, Waltham, and Winchester. Many of the finest effects in this style are found in detached fragments, which were made in churches that were not finished until this style had been superseded by the Gothic.

During the Romanesque period there was some activity in sculpture. The chief works in this branch of art were in ivory. Many of them are extremely interesting from the fact that they show an earnest spirit, though with much naiveness and almost crudeness of execution. In painting, the chief works were in miniature, in the decoration of missals, and other MS. books of devotion. In France, more especially, many important compositions were executed in fresco, after the style current in the Orient, and probably done by Byzantine artists. See Lübke, Hist. of Art; Kugler, Gesch. der Baukunst; id. Gesch. der Malerei; Schnaase, Gesch. der Kunste; Fergusson, Hist. of Architecture; Rosengarten, Hand-book of Architectural Styles. (G.F.C.)

## Romanic Versions Of The Holy Scriptures[[@Headword:Romanic Versions Of The Holy Scriptures]]

             Under this head we mention —

1. The French Versions. — As these versions have already been treated in this Cyclopoedia s.v. FRENCH VERSIONS, we add the following as supplement. Arthur Dinaux has the merit of having pointed towards the first translator of the Bible, viz. Herman de Valenciennes, born about 1100. He was a priest and canon, and his version, free as it is for the greater part, was of the greatest importance for that time. He undertook it under the protection of the empress Mathilde, wife of the German emperor Henry V, and daughter of Henry I of England. His Genesis is preserved in the Harleian Library, MS. 222, and his Livre de la Bible, or Histoire de Ancien et du Nouveau Testament en Vers, in the Imperial Library, MS. 7986. The assertion made by A. Paulin Paris, in his Manuscrits Francais de la Bibliotheque du Roi, that before the year 1170 no translation of any note had been made, and that Etienne de Hansa, or d'Ansa, of Lyons, was the first who undertook a work of this kind, has been proved erroneous by Arthur Dinaux; yet Paulin refers to Le Long and to a letter written by pope Innocent III to the bishop of Metz, published by Baluze, and translated into French by Le Roux de Lincy in his Introduction to the Ancienne Traduction des Quatre Livres de Roi (Paris, 1841). Although Herman de Valenciennes must be regarded as the first translator, the merits of itienne de Hansa, who undertook a translation at the request of Peter Valdo, are not diminished thereby in the least. Stienne's translation, preserved in MS. 7268 2.2, and belonging to the first half of the 13th century, is a work of great value concerning the language and the letters. A. Paulin Paris saw many copies of that MS., which in part must be regarded as a revision. A version of this kind belongs to the beginning of the 14th century, and to judge from its style, it must have been made in England. This version we find in MS. 6701, and the following specimen will best illustrate the difference between the translation of 1170 (7268 2.2.) and the version from the beginning of the 14th century (6701):

MS. 7268 2.2.

Mes li serpenz estoit li plus voiseus de toutes les choses qui ont ame et que Dame Dex\* avoir fet. Et il dist a la feme: Por quoi vous a Dex commande que vos ne mengiez pas de tous les fuz de paradis (Gen 3:1).  MS. 6701.

Mes le serpent estoit plus coiut de tottes choses te terre que Dieu fist, lequel dit a la femme: Por quei vous comaunda Dieu que vous ne mengeasses de cheicun fust de paradis.

\* Dame Dex means “Lord God.” Dame is from the Latin dominus, and Dex (deus) is the ancient form for Dieu.

With regard to the translation of 1170, we only mention that Innocent III, not knowing its source, subjected it about the year 1200 to the censor, and many writers of the 13th century believed it to be a pernicious book. Its language bears the original Romanic stamp, and reminds one of the modern French. But it is striking that the translator, Etienne de Hansa, should be from Lyons. We may suppose that the northern French stamp of the translation of 1170, as we find it in the MS. 7268 2.2., for the greater part belongs to the copyist. A. Paulin Paris conjectures that the language of the MS. is the same as that which was used at Rheims or Sens in the 13th century. The translation of 1170 is known as that of the “Bible des Pauvres.” Le Roux de Lincy pronounces the translation of the MS. 7268 2.2. an excellent one, although he believes it to have been made in the 13th century at the request of Louis the Saint. Etienne de Hansa's work is the more remarkable as it can be called with certainty the first which gives a correct and literal translation of the whole Bible. The MS. 6818 2 contains a second literal translation, the author of which, according to the investigations of scholars, especially of Aime Champollion, is said to have been Raoul de Presles. Le Roux de Lincy acquaints us also with translations of single parts of the Bible, the redaction of which he puts in the 12th century, while the MSS. belong to the 13th century. As such he mentions:

1. Les Quatres Litres du Rois; a MS. of which is in the Biblotheque Mazarin.

2. Les Psaumes; MS. 1152 bis Supplement Francais, 278 Latin, 7887 fonds Francais.

3. L'Apocalypse; MS. 7013.

An ancient French translation of single psalms is given by Karl Bartsch in his Chrestomathie de l‘Ancient Francais (1872), according to Fr. Michel's Libri Psalmorum Versio Antiqua Gallica.  The catalogue of A. Paulin Paris, Manuscrits Franc. de la Bibl. du Roi, contains also the following list of translations and comments:

1. Histoire de l'Ancien et du Nouveau Testament, en Vers Monorimes; MS. 7268 2.

2. Traduction en Vers de la Bible; MS. 7268 3.3.

3. Histoire de l'Ancien Testament; MS. 7268 4.A.

4. Traduction en Vers du Psaume Latin “Domine, ne in furore.”

5. Traduction des Psaumes; MS. 7295 5.5.

6. Commentaires sur les Psaumes, trad. d'un Ancien Texts Latin; MS. 7295 3.

7. Raisons de la Composition de Chacun des Psaumes; par Jehan de Blois:; MS. 7295 5.5.

8. Commentaire Perpetuel sur les Psaumes; MS. 7295 6.6.

9. Exposition du Psaume Latin “Miserere mei Deus.”

According to Grässe, two Augustinian monks, Julien Macho and Pierre Farget, translated a Latin Bible into the Romanic. A poetical version of the Bible, belonging to the 14th century, was left by Mace of Charite-sur- Loire, and in MS. 6818 3 an original copy of the Bible des Pauvres is preserved.

We give on the following page some specimens of different translations. The MSS. 72682-2- and 68183 are copies of one text, which differ only in non-essentials, while the MS. 6818 2 forms the basis of a separate version. In this supplementary article we have largely depended on Striimpell's Erssten Bibeliibersetzungen der Franzosen (Brunswick, 1872), who also gives the following specimens; for the rest belonging to the French versions we refer to the art. in loco.

In conclusion, we will only mention, from the seven- ty-third annual report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1877), that “several new versions of the Scriptures in French have been urged on the committee, but they did not see their way to the adoption of any of them; they hope, however, that  the present activity in Bible translating and revision may lead to the production of a version more accurate, and more acceptable to the French than any which they now possess.”

2. Italian Versions. — See that art. in this Cyclopoedia . We will only add an edition of the Hebrew Pentateuch with an Italian translation by S.D. Luzzatto, Il Pentateucho colle Haftarot volgarizzato (Trieste, 1858-60, 5 vols.): — Job (with an Italian translation) (Livorno, 1844); and Il Profeta Isaia volgarizzato e commentato ad uso degl' Israeliti (Padova, 1855-67).

3. Portuguese Versions (q.v.).

4. Spanish Versions. — It is very difficult to decide at what time the first Spanish version was made. If we may believe tradition, the oldest version would belong to the 13th century, made at the request of Alphonso of Castile and John of Leon. But as there is no confirmation of this statement, we must depend on the different data which we find in the printed editions themselves; and it is a remarkable fact that the versions were made either by Jews or Protestants.

(a) First in chronological order we mention El Nuevo Testamento de nuestro Redemptor y Saluador Jesu Christo, traduzido de Grigo en lengua Castellana por Francisco de Enzinas, dedicado a la Cesarea Magestad (En Anberes [i.e. Antwerp], Anno 1543, 8vo). Of this edition, which is also published by the British and Foreign Bible Society, we have no notice except what we find in Simon's Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte et les Versions du Nouveau Testament, 2, 151, where we are told that, in the dedication, different reasons are given for and against the usefulness of translations of the Bible. “I do not, “ says the translator, “condemn those who are of another opinion, but I believe such versions, when made by judicious and conscientious men, to be useful.” He then speaks of the cause for this translation. Gamaliel, he says, pronounced that if Christianity be of God, men cannot overthrow it; but if it be of men, it will soon come to naught; and addressing the emperor Charles V, he says, “The controversy about the translations of the Bible has already lasted for about twenty years. All measures to prevent them are in vain; on the contrary, their number has increased among the Christians, and Gamaliel's judgment seems to be fulfilled.”

The version of Enzinas is made from the Greek. Such words as “gospel, “ “scribe,” “testament,” etc., are retained. For the greater part he follows  Erasmus's translation, e.g. Joh 1:1 : En el principio era la palabra, y la palabra estava con Dios, y Dios era la palabra. Where a word is ambiguous he puts the Greek in the margin; thus he puts the word λόγος three times to palabra. He has no annotations excepting such as explain measures, coins, etc., thus: Mat 18:24, Diez mille talentos (Note: “Cada talendo vale 600 ducados,” i.e. each talent is worth 600 ducats); ibid. Mat 18:28, cient dineros (Note: “Cada dinero vale casi 30 maravedis,” i.e. each denarius is worth 30 maravedis). Very seldom he has an addition, and yet his translation is intelligible even to the unlearned. Sometimes, in spite of all care, he translates rather according to the sense than to the word of the text; e.g. Rom 1:28, παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς ὁ θεός, Vulg. tradidit illos Deus; the translation of παρέδωκεν is “permitio caer, “ i.e. he suffered them to fall.

(b) Next in chronological order is Biblia en Lengua Espanola, traduzida palabra por palabra de la verdad Hebrayca, por muy excelentes Letrados. Vista y examinada por el officio de la Inquisicion. Con Privilegio del Illustrissimo Senor Duque de Ferrara (En Ferrara, 5313 [i.e. 1553]). At the end we read, “A gloria y loor de nuestro Sennor se acabo la presente Biblia en lengua Espannola traduzida de la verdadera origen Hebrayca por muy excellentes letrados: con yndustria y diligentia de Abraham Usque, Portugues: Estampata en Ferrara a costa y despesa de Yom Tob Atias, hijo de Levi Atias Espannol: en 14. de Adar de 5313.” In some copies we read at the end, “Con yndustria y diligencia de Duarto Pinel, Portugues: estampata en Ferrara a costa y despesa de Geronymo de Vargas, Espannol, en primero de Marzo de 1553.” These copies were made for the use of Christians. That the Spanish translation of the Pentateuch is the same as that printed six years before in the so called “Constantinople Polyglot Pentateuch” has been proved beyond a shadow of doubt by Le Long, who also supposes that the Spanish translation, of which the Pentateuch only was printed at Constantinople, while the whole was published at Ferrara, had been in use before the expulsion of the Jews from Spain in 1492, and that the Jewish exiles brought it to Constantinople. The title is followed by

(1) an index of Haphtarhas;

(2) an index of the order of books among Jews and Christians;

(3) an index and short synopsis of the chapters of the Old Test.;

(4) an index of the judges, prophets, and high priests of the Jewish people, together with a short chronology from Adam to the 452d year after the destruction of the Temple according to the Seder Olam (a Jewish chronology);

(5) a lectionary for each day, in order to read the Old Test. in one year. The translation in the Ferrara edition is in two columns, and the editors or publishers were so conscientious as to indicate passages concerning which they were doubtful as to the correct translation by a star (\*). Where the Hebrew reads Jehovah, an .A. with two dots is placed. The verses are not given in the text, but at the end of each book their number is given. The order of the book is, the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea to Malachi, Psalms (divided into five books), Proverbs, Job, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther. The translation, which follows the Hebrew very closely, is in that ancient Spanish which was used at that time in the synagogue.

A reprint of this translation was published at Amsterdam in the year 1611, also in folio, then in 1630, with the only change that the stars of the first edition are omitted in many places. According to the Catalogue des Livres Imprimes de la Bibliotheque du Roi de France, 1, 14, No. 201, this edition was edited by Manasseh ben-Israel, as can also be seen from some copies, where we read, A loor y gloria del Dio fue reformada por Menasseh ben- Israel (a. 15. de Sebath 1630).

Another somewhat revised and altered edition is the Biblia en lengua Espannola. Traduzida palabra por palabra de la verdad Hebrayca, por muy excelentes Letrados. Vista e examinada por el officio de la Inquisicion. Con Privilegio del Illustrissimo Sennor Duque de Ferrara, y aora de nuevo corregida en casa di Joseph Athias, y por su orden impressa (En Amsterdam, Anno 5421 [1661], large 8vo, 1325 pp.). This edition is indeed an improvement upon the former; many corrections are made, obsolete expressions are removed and more intelligible ones introduced; besides, it is more convenient for use than the former editions in folio. The verses are numbered in the margin.

(c) El Testamento Nuevo de Nuestro Senor Salvador Jesu Christo nueva e fielmento traduzido del Original Griego en Romance Castellano. En Venecia, en casa de Juan (Philadelpho. M.D.LVI. 8vo). The anonymous  translator follows the original Greek; here and there words are added for the better understanding.

(d) A Spanish Translation of the Prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah (Thessalonica, 1569), by Joseph ben-Isaac ben-Joseph Jabetz. From the lengthy title (which we do not give in full) we see that the editor intended to translate the whole of the Old Test., and that he commenced with the later prophets. But only Isaiah and Jeremiah were translated, as can be seen from Wolf (Bibl. Beb. 4, 137), who had a copy of this translation, which mostly follows that of Ferrara.

(e) La Biblia, que es, los Sacros Libros del Viejo y Nuevo Testamento, Trasladada en Espannol. יקי ם לעול דבר אלהי םLa Palabra del Dios nostro permanece para siempre, Isaiah 40. M.D.LXIX. On the last page we read “Anno del Sennor M.D.LXIX. en Septembre, “ large 4to. No name of the translator and no place of publication is given. It was probably published at Basle by Thomas Guarinus, which is not only evident from the signs of that printer found in the title page, but also from a written postscript in the copy of this translation preserved in the library of the Basle University. From this notice we also see that Cassiodoro de Reyna, of Seville, was the translator of this Bible, and this is also corroborated by another copy of this translation found in the library at Frankfort-on-the- Main (Clement, Biblioth. Curieuse, 3, 453). The translation is preceded by 30 pages containing the principles which guided the translator — that, although he held the Vulgate in high esteem, yet he could not always follow it, but perused as many translations as he could find, especially that of Pagninus, which he followed for the most part. The Apocryphal books of the Old Test. are also translated: sometimes additions are inserted in the text and put in brackets for a better understanding, and short glosses are found in the margin. The New Test. of this translation was also republished by Hutter in his Polyglot (1599). Another edition with some slight changes was published by Ricardo del Campo (1596, 8vo), and an entirely revised edition of Reyna's translation is La Biblia: que es, los Sacros Libros del Viejo y Nuevo Testamento; segunda edicion, revista y conferida con los Textos Hebreos y Griegos, y con diversas translaciones, per Cypriano de Valera. En Amsterdam, en casa de Lorenco Jacobi (1602, fol.). The title is followed by two prefaces, one of Valera, the other of Reyna. In the first preface the editor tells us that of Reyna's edition 2600 copies were printed, and all were sold. This was the reason for a new revision and edition. Valera's edition is also published by the British and Foreign Bible Society.  The New Test. of Valera's translation was also published separately in the year 1625, with the title, El Nuevo Testamento, que es los Escriptos Evangelicos y Apostolicos, revisto y conferido con el Texto Griego por Cypriano de Valera: en Amsterdam (1625, 8vo).

(f) Humas de Parasioth y Aftharoth, traduzido palabra por palabra de la verdad Hebraica en Espannhol (1627). This is Manasseh ben-Israel's translation of the Pentateuch, of which a second enlarged and revised edition was published in 1655.

(g) קדש הלולי ם Las Alabancas de Santidad. Traducion de los Psalmos de David.... Por el Haham Yahacob Yehuda, Leon Hebreo.... En Amsterdam (1671). This is Judah Leon's translation of the Psalms, with notes and introductions.

(h) Franco Serrano's translation of the Pentateuch, or Los cinco Libros de la sacra Ley, interpretados en Lengua Espannola.... En Amsterdam, en casa de Mosseh ben-Dias (1695, 4to). The translator was Joseph Franco Serrano, teacher of Hebrew at the school of the Spanish Jews in Amsterdam. The translation is made with great diligence and care.

(i) Acosta's translation of the historical books, or Conjecturas sagradas sobre los Prophetas primores, colegidos de los mas celebres expositores. ... En Leyden, en casa de Thomas van Geel (Anno 1711, 4to). This translation contains Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. To each verse a paraphrase is added in place of a commentary.

(k) Biblia en dos Colunas Hebr. y Espan. Amsterdam, en casa y a costa de Joseph Jacob, y Abraham de Salmon Proops (Anno 1762, fol.). This is, according to Le Long, an “editio optima, splendida et aestimata.” It was not until the end of the 18th century that a Roman Catholic divine undertook to give his Spanish countrymen a new translation, together with the Latin and a commentary. The author of this Bible work (which was published at Madrid, 1794, in 19 parts) was Phil. Scio de S. Miguel. The translation of Scio has also been adopted by the British and Foreign Bible Society, which prints it since 1828. The latest translation of the New Test. is that by the bishop of Astorga, Fel. de Torres Amat (Madrid, 1837).

5. Besides these translations, we may also mention, under the head of Romanic versions, the New Test., the Pentateuch and Psalms in Catalan, published by the British and Foreign Bible Society for the provinces of  Catalonia and Valencia. See Rosenmüller, Handbuch der biblischen Literatur, 4, 268 sq.; Le Long, Bibl. Sac. 1, 180 sq.; Simon [Richard], Hist. Crit. du V.T. 54, 2, ch. 19, p. 311; Wolf, Bibl. Heb. 4, 137; Baumgarten, Nachrichten von merkwurdigen Buchern, 9, 204 sq.; the art. “Romanische Bibelubersetzungen” in Herzog's Real Encyklop.; Reuss, Gesch. der heil. Schriften des N. Test. (5th ed. Brunswick, 1874), p. 217, 229; Biblioth. Bib. (ibid. 1752), p. 161 sq.; Index Bibliorum (Hale), p. 41. (B.P.)

## Romanism[[@Headword:Romanism]]

             is the system of Church government which makes the pope the one head and center of Christendom, with those doctrines and practices which are erroneously maintained as subsidiary to that headship. Thus the dogmas of papal infallibility, of temporal sovereignty, of the immaculate conception of the Blessed Virgin, of the seven sacraments, the celibacy of the clergy, and the system of indulgences are peculiar to the Church of Rome, and are known as supports of the papal power. They are therefore considered as parts of Romanism.

Again, Romanism may be used to describe the character of Latin Christianity, as distinguished from Teutonic Christianity. The former has a stricter sacerdotalism, more direction to the conscience, and in its subjects more implicit obedience, greater trustfulness, less of private judgment and of freedom, an inferior sense of personal responsibility, and (perhaps it must be added) a less keen sense of truth. There are also a more rigid ecclesiasticism, maintained by a celibate clergy subject to a foreign spiritual head; a fuller ritual; and a statelier ceremonial. This assumption of power, upon the one hand, and submission to it, on the other, necessitate the keeping of the people in a state of ignorance, and we therefore find Romanism to be the foe of intelligence, of free thought, free speech, and free action. It is a system craftily devised for the usurpation by the few of the rights of the many. See Bib. Sacra, 1, 139; 2, 451, 757; 8, 64; 19, 432; Blunt, Theol. Dict.; Elliott, Delineation of Romanisms; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Marriott, Testimony of the Catacombs; Meth. Quar. Rev. Oct. 1854; April, 1855, 1856; Jan. 1877; Palmer, Errors of Romanism; Whately, Essays on Romanism. SEE POPERY.

## Romann, Albrecht Nathanael[[@Headword:Romann, Albrecht Nathanael]]

             a convert from Judaism and missionary among the Jews, was born Nov. 3, 1819, at Kobylin, in the grand-duchy of Posen, He was educated in the school at Rawicz, afterwards al Lissa, and then at Breslau, where he also had the advantage of attending the lectures at the university. In the latter place he fell in with the so called Reform party, and became a most zealous pupil of the late celebrated rabbi Dr. Geiger, who was then flourishing al Breslau. At the age of twenty-four he was appointed teacher in a Jewish industrial school in that city. Having exchanged his strict rabbinical orthodoxy for the hollowness of Reform Judaism, he was in a state-- unsatisfied, perplexed, and longing for something better and more substantial — from which he was relievet through the acquaintance with Teichler and Caro, missionaries of the Berlin Society, and especially with Mr. Cerf, of the Scotch Society. Although at first vehemently opposing them, he finally submitted to his conviction, and on Nov. 28, 1847, he was baptized in the Reformed Church by the Rev. Consistorialrath Wachler, Mr. Cerf, Prof. Dr. Oehler, and the general superintendent Dr. Hahn being his sponsors. He now resolved to qualify himself as a Christian schoolmaster, and to effect this the Rev. C. Richter kindly received him into his own house at Rankam; and after having passed his examination at the seminary in Breslau, he obtained a situation as schoolmaster in Ziegenhals, near Neisse, in Silesia. In the year 1851 he was appointed assistant to the Rev. J.C. Hartmann, senior missionary of the London Society at Breslau. His time of probation being over, he was admitted to the society's college at London for further instruction in divinity and the English language, and returned in 1854 as a missionary to Breslau. In 1868 he was removed to Berlin to take charge of the mission there by the side of Prof. Dr. Cassel. For three years he was allowed to carry on the work of his Master in that city, and died Aug. 15, 1871. See Jewish Intelligencer, 1871, p. 247 sq.; Dibre Emeth, oder Stimmen der Wahrheit, 1871, p. 161 sq. (B.P.)

## Romano, Giovanni Battista[[@Headword:Romano, Giovanni Battista]]

             a convert from Judaism, was a native of Alexandria, and flourished in the 16th century. His grandfather was the famous Elias Levita (q.v.), who instructed him while in Germany. He then went to Italy, and in Venice he tried to bring his brother back into the fold of the synagogue, in which he did not succeed; on the contrary, he became himself a convert to  Christianity, and was baptized in 1551. For a long time he was professor of Hebrew and Arabic in Rome. In 1561. pope Pius IV sent him to the patriarch of the Copts, together with Roderich, a member of his order. He translated Giov. Bruno's catechism, which was written against the Oriental heretics, into three Shemitic languages, and translated into Arabic the decrees of the Council of Trent, for the sake of having them circulated in the East. He died at Rome, March 3, 1580. See Delitzsch, Kunst, Wissenschaft u. Judenthum, p. 291 sq.; Phil. Alegambe, De Scriptor. Soc. Jesu, p. 225 sq.; R. Simon, Bibl. Selecta, 1, 148; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9, 356. (B.P.)

## Romano, Jehudah Leone, Ben-Moses[[@Headword:Romano, Jehudah Leone, Ben-Moses]]

             of Rome, was born about the year 1292. He was the teacher of king Robert of Naples, whom he instructed in the languages of the Bible. He was very well acquainted with scholastic literature, and translated the philosophical writings of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, and others for his coreligionists. He also wrote Elucidations on passages of the Bible from a philosophical standpoint, excerpts of which have been published in Immanuel of Rome's Commentary on Proverbs (Naples, 1486). The date of Romano's death is not known. Most of his writings are still in MS. in Rome, Florence, Paris, Munich, Oxford, and London. See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 165 sq.; Delitzsch, Kunst, Wissenschaft u. Judenthum, p. 257; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 277 (Germ. transl.); Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden (Leips. 1873), 7, 298 sq.; more especially Zunz, Jehuda b.-Moses Romano, reprinted in Geiger's Wissenschaftl. Zeitschr. fur jud. Theologie (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1836), 2, 321-330; and Steinschneider, Giuda Romano, Notizia estratta del giorn. Romano Il Buonarotti, Gennaio, 1870 (Roma, 1870), mentioned in Kayserling's Bibliothek juidischer Kanzelredner, 2, Beilage, p. 14 sq. (B.P.)

## Romans, Epistle To The[[@Headword:Romans, Epistle To The]]

             This is naturally placed first among the epistles in the New Test., both on account of its comparative length and its importance. It claims our interest more than the other didactic epistles of Paul, because it is more systematic, and because it explains especially that truth which subsequently became the principle of the Reformation, viz. righteousness through faith. It has, however, been greatly misunderstood in modern times, as it seems to have been very early ( 2Pe 3:15-16).

I. Authorship. — Internal evidence is so strongly in favor of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans that it has never been seriously questioned. Even the sweeping criticism of Baur did not go beyond condemning the last two chapters as spurious. But while the epistle bears in itself the strongest proofs of its Pauline authorship, the external testimony in its favor is not inconsiderable. The reference to Rom 2:4 in 2Pe 3:15 is indeed more than doubtful. In the Epistle of James, again (Jam 2:14), there is an allusion to perversions of Paul's language and doctrine which has several points of contact with the Epistle to the Romans; but this may perhaps be explained by the oral rather than the written teaching of the apostle, as the dates seem to require. It is not the practice of the apostolic fathers to cite the New Test. writers by name, but marked passages from the Romans are found imbedded in the epistles of Clement and Polycarp (Rom 1:29-32 in Clem. Corinthians 35, and Rom 14:10; Rom 14:12, in Polyc. Phil. 6). It seems also to have been directly cited by the elder quoted in Irenaeus (4, 27, 2, “ideo Paulum dixisse;” comp. Rom 11:21; Rom 11:17), and is alluded to by the writer of the Epistle to Diognetus (c. 9; comp. Rom 3:21 fol.; 5:20), and by Justin Martyr (Dial. c. 23; comp. Rom 4:10-11, and in other passages). The title of Melito's treatise On the Hearing of Faith seems to be an allusion to this epistle (see, however, Gal 3:2-3). It has a place, moreover, in the Muratorian Canon and in the Syriac and Old Latin versions. Nor have we the testimony of orthodox writers alone. The epistle was commonly quoted as an authority by the heretics of the subapostolic age: by the Ophites (Hippol. Adv. Hoer. p. 99; comp. Rom 1:20-26), by Basilides (ibid. p. 238; comp. Rom 8:19; Rom 8:22; Rom 5:13-14), by Valentinus (ibid. p. 195; comp. Rom 8:11), by the Valentinians Heracleon and Ptolemaeus (Westcott, On the Canon, p. 335, 340), and perhaps also by Tatian (Orat. c. 4; comp. Rom 1:20), besides being included in Marcion's Canon. In the latter part of the 2d century the evidence in its favor is still fuller. It is obviously alluded to in the letter of the churches of Vienne and Lyons (Euseb. H.E. 5, 1; comp. Rom 8:18), and by Athenagoras (p. 13; comp. Rom 12:1; p. 37; comp. Romans 1, 24) and Theophilus of Antioch (Ad Autol. p. 79; comp. Rom 2:6 fol.; p. 126; comp. Rom 13:7-8); and is quoted frequently and by name by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria (see Kirchhofer, Quellen, p. 198, and especially Westcott, On the Canon, passim).

II. Integrity. — This has not been so unanimously admitted as the genuineness. With the exception of Marcion's authorities, indeed, who probably tampered with the manuscripts of the epistles as he did with those of the gospels, and who considered the last two chapters of this epistle spurious, all the manuscripts and versions contain the epistle as we have it: it is in modern times that doubts have been thrown upon the authenticity of the concluding portion. By Heumann the epistle was considered to have originally ended with ch. 11; ch. 12-15 being a distinct production, though likewise addressed to the Romans, and ch. 16 a sort of postscript to the two. Semler (1762) confined his doubts to ch. 15 and 16, the former of which he regarded as a private encyclical for the use of the brethren whom the bearers of the larger epistle should meet on their way to Rome, the latter as a catalogue of persons to be saluted on the same journey. Schulz (1829) supposed that ch. 16 was addressed to the Ephesians from Rome, and Schott that it is made up of fragments from a short epistle written by Paul when at Corinth to an Asiatic Church. Baur has more recently (1836) followed on the same side; but, as usual, on merely internal grounds, and in favor of his peculiar theory of the relation of the parties of Paul and Peter in the apostolic age. These various hypotheses have long passed into oblivion; and by all recent critics of note the last two chapters have been restored to their place as an integral part of the epistle.

With greater semblance of reason has the genuineness of the doxology at the end of the epistle been questioned. Schmidt and Reiche consider it not to be genuine. In this doxology the anacolouthical and unconnected style causes some surprise, and the whole has been deemed to be out of its place (Rom 16:26-27). The arguments against its genuineness on the ground of style, advanced by Reiche, are met and refuted by Fritzsche (Romans vol. 1, p. 35). Such defects of style may easily be explained from the circumstance that the apostle hastened to the conclusion, but would be quite inexplicable in additions of a copyist who had time for calm consideration. The same words occur in different passages of the epistle, and it must be granted that such a fluctuation sometimes indicates an interpolation. In the Codex I, in most of the Codices Minusculi, as well as in Chrysostom, the words occur at the conclusion of ch. 14. In the codices B, C, D, E, and in the Syrian translation, this doxology occurs at the conclusion of ch. 16. In Codex A it occurs in both places; while in Codex D\*\* the words are wanting entirely, and they seem not to fit into either of the two places. If the doxology be put at the conclusion of ch. 14, Paul  seems to promise to those Christians weak in faith, of whom he had spoken, a confirmation of their belief. But it seems unfit in this connection to call the Gospel an eternal mystery, and the doxology seems here to interrupt the connection between ch. 14 and 15; and at the conclusion of ch. 16 it seems to be superfluous, since the blessing had been pronounced already in Rom 16:24. We, however, say that this latter circumstance need not have prevented the apostle from allowing his animated feelings to burst forth in a doxology, especially at the conclusion of an epistle which treated amply on the mystery of redemption. We find an analogous instance in Eph. 23:27, where a doxology occurs after the mystery of salvation had been mentioned. We are therefore of opinion that the doxology is rightly placed at the conclusion of ch. 16, and that it was in some codices erroneously transposed to the conclusion of ch. 14, because the copyist considered the blessing in 16:24 to be the real conclusion of the epistle. In confirmation of this remark, we observe that the same codices in which the doxology occurs in ch. 16 either omit the blessing altogether or place it after the doxology. (See § 4:7 below.)

III. Time and Place of Writing. — The date of this epistle is fixed with more absolute certainty and within narrower limits than that of any other of Paul's epistles. The following considerations determine the time of writing. First. Certain names in the salutations point to Corinth as the place from which the letter was sent.

(1.) Phoebe, a deaconess of Cenchreae, one of the port towns of Corinth, is commended to the Romans (Rom 16:1-2).

(2.) Gaius, in whose house Paul was lodged at the time (Rom 16:23), is probably the person mentioned as one of the chief members of the Corinthian Church in 1Co 1:14, though the name was very common.

(3.) Erastus, here designated “the treasurer of the city” (οἰκονόμος, 1Co 1:23, A.V. “chamberlain”), is elsewhere mentioned in connection with Corinth (2Ti 4:20; see also Act 19:22).

Secondly. Having thus determined the place of writing to be Corinth, we have no hesitation in fixing upon the visit recorded in Act 20:3, during the winter and spring following the apostle's long residence at Ephesus, as the occasion on which the epistle was written. For Paul, when he wrote the letter, was on the point of carrying the contributions of Macedonia and  Achaia to Jerusalem (15:25-27), and a comparison with Act 20:22; Act 24:17; and also 1Co 16:4; 2Co 8:1-2; 2Co 9:1 sq., shows that he was so engaged at this period of his life. (See Paley, Horoe Paulinoe, ch. 2, § 1.) Moreover, in this epistle he declares his intention of visiting the Romans after he has been at Jerusalem (1Co 15:23-25), and that such was his design at this particular time appears from a casual notice in Act 19:21.

The epistle, then, was written from Corinth during Paul's third missionary journey, on the occasion of the second of the two visits recorded in the Acts. On this occasion he remained three months in Greece (Act 20:3). When he left, the sea was already navigable, for he was on the point of sailing for Jerusalem when he was obliged to change his plans. On the other hand, it cannot have been late in the spring, because, after passing through Macedonia and visiting several places on the coast of Asia Minor, he still hoped to reach Jerusalem by Pentecost (Act 20:16). It was therefore in the winter or early spring of the year that the Epistle to the Romans was written. According to the most probable system of chronology, this would be the winter of A.D. 54-55.

The Epistle to the Romans is thus placed in chronological connection with the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians, which appear to have been written within the twelve months preceding. The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written before Paul left Ephesus, the Second from Macedonia when he was on his way to Corinth, and the Epistle to the Galatians most probably either in Macedonia or after his arrival at Corinth, i.e. after the epistles to the Corinthians, though the date of the Galatian epistle is not absolutely certain. SEE GALATIANS, EPISTLE TO THE. We shall have to notice the relations existing between these contemporaneous epistles hereafter. At present it will be sufficient to say that they present a remarkable resemblance to each other in style and matter — a much greater resemblance than can be traced to any other of Paul's epistles. They are at once the most intense and most varied in feeling and expression — if we may so say, the most Pauline of all Paul's epistles. When Baur excepts these four epistles alone from his sweeping condemnation of the genuineness of all the letters bearing Paul's name (Paulus, der Apostel), this is a mere caricature of sober criticism; but underlying this erroneous exaggeration is the fact that the epistles of this period — Paul's third missionary journey — have a character and an intensity peculiarly their own, corresponding to the circumstances of the apostle's outward and  inward life at the time when they were written. For the special characteristics of this group of epistles, see a paper on the Epistle to the Galatians in the Journal of Class. and Sacr. Phil. 3, 289.

IV. Occasion and Object of Writing. — These evidently grew out of the position and character of the persons addressed, and therefore involve a consideration of the Church at Rome and of the apostle's purposes with relation to it.

1. The opinions concerning the general design of this letter differ according to the various suppositions of those who think that the object of the letter was supplied by the occasion, or the supposition that the apostle selected his subject only after an opportunity for writing was offered. In earlier times the latter opinion prevailed, as, for instance, in the writings of Thomas Aquinas, Luther, Melancthon, Calvin. In more recent times the other opinion has generally been advocated, as, for instance, by Hug, Eichhorn, and Flatt. Many writers suppose that the debates mentioned in ch. 14 and 15 called forth this epistle. Hug, therefore, is of opinion that the object of the whole epistle was to set forth the following proposition: Jews and Gentiles have equal claim to the kingdom of God. According to Eichhorn, the Roman Jews, being exasperated against the disciples of Paul, endeavored to demonstrate that Judaism was sufficient for the salvation of mankind; consequently Eichhorn supposes that the polemics of Paul were not directed against Judaizing converts to Christianity, as in the Epistle to the Galatians, but rather against Judaism itself. This opinion is also maintained by De Wette (Einleitung ins Neue Testament, 4th ed. § 138). According to Credner (Einleitung, § 141), the intention of the apostle was to render the Roman congregation favorably disposed before his arrival in the chief metropolis, and he therefore endeavored to show that the evil reports spread concerning himself by zealously Judaizing Christians were erroneous. This opinion is nearly related to that of Baur, who supposes that the real object of this letter is mentioned only in ch. 9-11. According to Baur, the Judaizing zealots were displeased that by the instrumentality of Paul such numbers of Gentiles entered the kingdom of God that the Jews ceased to appear as the Messianic people. Baur supposes that these Judaizers are more especially refuted in ch. 9-11, after it has been shown in the first eight chapters that it was in general incorrect to consider one people better than another, and that all had equal claims to be justified by faith. Against the opinion that the apostle, in writing the Epistle to the Romans, had this particular polemical aim, it has been justly observed by  Ruckert (in the 2d ed. of his Commentar), Olshausen, and De Wette that the apostle himself states that his epistle had a general scope. Paul says in the introduction that he had long entertained the wish of visiting the metropolis, in order to confirm the faith of the Church, and to be himself comforted by that faith (Rom 1:12). He adds (Rom 1:16) that he was prevented from preaching in the chief city by external obstacles only. He says that he had written to the Roman Christians in fulfilment of his vocation as apostle to the Gentiles. The journey of Phoebe to Rome seems to have been the external occasion of the epistle. Paul made use of this opportunity by sending the sum and substance of the Christian doctrine in writing, having been prevented from preaching in Rome. Paul had many friends in Rome who communicated with him; consequently he was the more induced to address the Romans, although he manifested some hesitation in doing so (Rom 15:15). These circumstances exercised some influence as well on the form as on the contents of the letter; so that, for instance, its contents differ considerably from the Epistle to the Ephesians, although this also has a general scope.

2. The immediate circumstances under which the epistle was written were these. Paul had long purposed visiting Rome, and still retained this purpose, wishing also to extend his journey to Spain (Rom 1:9-13; Rom 15:22-29). For the time, however, he was prevented from carrying out his design, as he was bound for Jerusalem with the alms of the Gentile Christians, and meanwhile he addressed this letter to the Romans, to supply the lack of his personal teaching. Phoebe, a deaconess of the neighboring Church of Cenchrese, was on the point of starting for Rome (Rom 16:1-2), and probably conveyed the letter. The body of the epistle was written at the apostle's dictation by Tertius (Rom 16:22); but perhaps we may infer from the abruptness of the final doxology that it was added by the apostle himself, more especially as we gather from other epistles that it was his practice to conclude with a few striking words in his own handwriting, to vouch for the authorship of the letter, and frequently also to impress some important truth more strongly on his readers.

3. The Origin of the Roman Church is involved in obscurity (see Mangold, Die Anfange der romischen Gemeinde [Marb. 1866]). If it had been founded by Peter, according to a later tradition, the absence of any allusion to him both in this epistle and in the letters written by Paul from Rome would admit of no explanation. It is equally clear that no other apostle was the founder. In this very epistle, and in close connection with the mention  of his proposed visit to Rome, the apostle declares that it was his rule not to build on another man's foundation (Rom 15:20), and we cannot suppose that he violated it in this instance. Again, he speaks of the Romans as especially falling to his share as the apostle of the Gentiles (Rom 1:13), with an evident reference to the partition of the field of labor between himself and Peter, mentioned in Gal 2:7-9. Moreover, when he declares his wish to impart some spiritual gift (χάρισμα) to them, “that they might be established” (Rom 1:11), this implies that they had not yet been visited by an apostle, and that Paul contemplated supplying the defect, as was done by Peter and John in the analogous case of the churches founded by Philip in Samaria (Act 8:14-17). SEE PETER (the Apostle).

The statement in the Clementines (Horn. 1, § 6) that the first tidings of the Gospel reached Rome during the lifetime of our Lord is evidently a fiction for the purposes of the romance. On the other hand, it is clear that the foundation of this Church dates very far back. Paul in this epistle salutes certain believers resident in Rome — Andronicus and Junia (or Junianus?) — adding that they were distinguished among the apostles, and that they were converted to Christ before himself (Rom 16:7), for such seems to be the meaning of the passage, rendered somewhat ambiguous by the position of the relative pronouns. It may be that some of those Romans, “both Jews and proselytes,” present on the day of Pentecost (οἱ ἐπιδημοῦντες ῾Ρωμαῖοι, Ι᾿ουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι, Act 2:10), carried back the earliest tidings of the new doctrine, or the Gospel may have first reached the imperial city through those who were scattered abroad to escape the persecution which followed on the death of Stephen (Act 8:4; Act 11:19). At all events, a close and constant communication was kept up between the Jewish residents in Rome and their fellow countrymen in Palestine by the exigencies of commerce, in which they became more and more engrossed as their national hopes declined, and by the custom of repairing regularly to their sacred festivals at Jerusalem. Again, the imperial edicts alternately banishing and recalling the Jews (comp. e.g. in the case of Claudius, Josephus, Ant. 19, 5, 3, with Suetonius, Claud. 25) must have kept up a constant ebb and flow of migration between Rome and the East, and the case of Aquila and Priscilla (Act 18:2; see Paley, Hor. Paul. c. 2, § 2) probably represents a numerous class through whose means the opinions and doctrines promulgated in Palestine might reach the metropolis. At first we may  suppose that the Gospel was preached there in a confused and imperfect form, scarcely more than a phase of Judaism, as in the case of Apollos at Corinth (Act 18:25), or the disciples at Ephesus (Act 19:1-3). As time advanced and better instructed teachers arrived, the clouds would gradually clear away, till at length the appearance of the great apostle himself at Rome dispersed the mists of Judaism which still hung about the Roman Church. Long after Christianity had taken up a position of direct antagonism to Judaism in Rome, heathen statesmen and writers still persisted in confounding the one with the other (see Merivale, Hist. of Rome, 6, 278, etc.).

4. A question next arises as to the composition of the Roman Church at the time when Paul wrote. Did the apostle address a Jewish or a Gentile community, or, if the two elements were combined, was one or other predominant so as to give a character to the whole Church? Either extreme has been vigorously maintained, Baur, for instance, asserting that Paul was writing to Jewish Christians, Olshausen arguing that the Roman Church consisted almost solely of Gentiles. We are naturally led to seek the truth in some intermediate position. Jowett finds a solution of the difficulty in the supposition that the members of the Roman Church, though Gentiles, had passed through a phase of Jewish proselytism. This will explain some of the phenomena of the epistle, but not all. It is more probable that Paul addressed a mixed Church of Jews and Gentiles, the latter perhaps being the more numerous.

There are certainly passages which imply the presence of a large number of Jewish converts to Christianity. The use of the second person in addressing the Jews (ch. 2 and 3) is clearly not assumed merely for argumentative purposes, but applies to a portion at least of those into whose hands the letter would fall. The constant appeals to the authority of “the law” may in many cases be accounted for by the Jewish education of the Gentile believers (so Jowett, 2, 22), but sometimes they seem too direct and positive to admit of this explanation (Rom 3:19; Rom 7:1). In ch. 7 Paul appears to be addressing Jews, as those who, like himself, had once been under the dominion of the law, but had been delivered from it in Christ (see especially Rom 7:4; Rom 7:6). And when in Rom 11:13 he says, “I am speaking to you — the Gentiles,” this very limiting expression “the Gentiles” implies that the letter was addressed to not a few to whom the term would not apply.  Again, if we analyze the list of names in ch. 16, and assume that this list approximately represents the proportion of Jew and Gentile in the Roman Church (an assumption at least not improbable), we arrive at the same result. It is true that Mary, or rather Mariam (Rom 16:6), is the only strictly Jewish name. But this fact is not worth the stress apparently laid on it by Mr. Jowett (2:27); for Aquila and Priscilla (Rom 16:3) were Jews (Act 18:2; Act 18:26), and the Church which met in their house was probably of the same nation. Andronicus and Junia (or Junias? Act 18:7) are called Paul's kinsmen. The same term is applied to Herodion (Act 18:11). These persons, then, must have been Jews, whether “kinsmen” is taken in the wider or the more restricted sense. The name Apelles (Act 18:10), though a heathen name also, was most commonly borne by Jews, as appears from Horace (Sat. 1, 5, 100). If the Aristobulus of Act 18:10 was one of the princes of the Herodian house, as seems probable, we have also in “the household of Aristobulus” several Jewish converts. Altogether it appears that a very large fraction of the Christian believers mentioned in these salutations were Jews, even supposing that the others, bearing Greek and Latin names, of whom we know nothing, were heathens.

Nor does the existence of a large Jewish element in the Roman Church present any difficulty. The captives carried to Rome by Pompey formed the nucleus of the Jewish population in the metropolis. SEE ROME. Since that time they had largely increased. During the reign of Augustus we hear of above 8000 resident Jews attaching themselves to a Jewish embassy which appealed to this emperor (Josephus, Ant. 17, 11, 1). The same emperor gave them a quarter beyond the Tiber, and allowed them the free exercise of their religion (Philo, Leg. ad Catium, p. 568 M.). About the time when Paul wrote, Seneca, speaking of the influence of Judaism, echoes the famous expression of Horace (Ep. 2, 1, 156) respecting the Greeks — “Victi victoribus leges dederunt” (Seneca, in Augustine, De Civ. Dei, 6, 11). The bitter satire of Juvenal and indignant complaints of Tacitus of the spread of the infection through Roman society are well known (Tacitus, Ann. 15, 44; Juvenal, Sat. 14, 96). These converts to Judaism were mostly women. Such proselytes formed at that period the point of coalescence for the conversion of the Gentiles.

Among the converts from Judaism to Christianity there existed in the days of Paul two parties. The congregated apostles had decreed, according to Acts 15 that the converts from paganism were not bound to keep the ritual laws of Moses. There were, however, many converts from Judaism  who were disinclined to renounce the authority of the Mosaic law, and appealed erroneously to the authority of James (Gal 2:9; comp. Act 21:25); they claimed also the authority of Peter in their favor. Such converts from Judaism, mentioned in the other epistles, who continued to observe the ritual laws of Moses were not prevalent in Rome. Baur, however, supposes that this Ebionitic tendency prevailed at that time in all Christian congregations, Rome not excepted. He thinks that the converts from Judaism were then so numerous that all were compelled to submit to the Judaizing opinions of the majority (comp. Baur, Abhandlung uber Zweck und Veranlassung des Romerbriefs, in the Tubinger Zeitschrift, 1836). However, Neander has also shown that the Judaizing tendency did not prevail in the Roman Church (comp. Neander, Panzung der christlichen Kirche [3d ed.], p. 388). This opinion is confirmed by the circumstance that, according to ch. 16 Paul had many friends at Rome. Baur removes this objection only by declaring ch. 16 to be spurious. He appeals to ch. xiv in order to prove that there were Ebionitic Christians at Rome: it appears, however, that the persons mentioned in ch. 14 were by no means strictly Judaizing zealots, wishing to overrule the Church, but, on the contrary, some scrupulous converts from Judaism, upon whom the others looked down contemptuously. There were, indeed, some disagreements between the Christians in Rome. This is evident from Rom 15:6-9, and Rom 11:17-18, these debates, however, were not of so obstinate a kind as among the Galatians; otherwise the apostle could scarcely have praised the congregation at Rome as he does in ch. Rom 1:8; Rom 1:12, and Rom 15:14. From ch. Rom 16:17-20 we infer that the Judaizers had endeavored to find admittance, but with little success.

On the other hand, situated in the metropolis of the great empire of heathendom, the Roman Church must necessarily have been in great measure a Gentile Church; and the language of the epistle bears out this supposition. It is professedly as the apostle of the Gentiles that Paul writes to the Romans (Rom 1:5). He hopes to have some fruit among them, as he had among the other Gentiles (Rom 1:13). Later on in the epistle he speaks of the Jews in the third person, as if addressing Gentiles: “I could wish that myself were accursed for my brethren, my kinsmen after the flesh, who are Israelites, “etc. (Rom 9:3-4). Again: “my heart's desire and prayer to God for them is that they might be saved” (Rom 10:1; the right reading is ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, not ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ι᾿σραήλ, as in the  Received Text). Comp. also Rom 11:23; Rom 11:25, and especially Rom 11:30, “For as ye in times past did not believe God,... so did these also (i.e. the Jews) now not believe,” etc. In all these passages Paul clearly addresses himself to Gentile readers.

These Gentile converts, however, were not, for the most part, native Romans. Strange as the paradox appears, nothing is more certain than that the Church of Rome was at this time a Greek, and not a Latin, Church. It is clearly established that the early Latin versions of the New Test. were made not for the use of Rome, but for the provinces, especially Africa (Westcott, Canon, p. 269). All the literature of the early Roman Church was written in the Greek tongue. The names of the bishops of Rome during the first two centuries are, with but few exceptions, Greek (see Milman, Latin Christianity, 1, 27). In accordance with these facts, we find that a very large proportion of the names in the salutations of this epistle are Greek names; while of the exceptions, Priscilla, Aquila, and Junia (or Junias), were certainly Jews; and the same is true of Rufus, if, as is not improbable, he is the same mentioned in Mar 15:21. Julia was probably a dependent of the imperial household, and derived her name accordingly. The only Roman names remaining are Amplias (i.e. Ampliatus) and Urbanus, of whom nothing is known, but their names are of late growth, and certainly do not point to an old Roman stock. It was therefore from the Greek population of Rome, pure or mixed, that the Gentile portion of the Church was almost entirely drawn. The Greeks formed a very considerable fraction of the whole people of Rome. They were the most busy and adventurous, and also the most intelligent of the middle and lower classes of society. The influence which they were acquiring by their numbers and versatility is a constant theme of reproach in the Roman philosopher and satirist (Juvenal, 3, 60-80; 6, 184; Tacitus, De Orat. 29). They complain that the national character is undermined, that the whole city has become Greek, Speaking the language of international intercourse, and brought by their restless habits into contact with foreign religions, the Greeks had larger opportunities than others of acquainting themselves with the truths of the Gospel; while, at the same time, holding more loosely to traditional beliefs, and with minds naturally more inquiring, they would be more ready to welcome these truths when they came in their way. At all events, for whatever reason, the Gentile converts at Rome were Greeks, not Romans; and it was an unfortunate conjecture on the part of the transcriber of the Syriac Peshito that this  letter was written “in the Latin tongue” (רומאית). Every line in the epistle bespeaks an original.

When we inquire into the probable rank and station of the Roman believers, an analysis of the names in the list of salutations again gives an approximate answer. These names belong for the most part to the middle and lower grades of society. Many of them are found in the columbaria of the freedmen and slaves of the early Roman emperors (see Journal of Class. and Sacr. Phil. 4, 57). It would be too much to assume that they were the same persons; but, at all events, the identity of names points to the same social rank. Among the less wealthy merchants and tradesmen, among the petty officers of the army, among the slaves and freedmen of the imperial palace, whether Jews or Greeks, the Gospel would first find a firm footing. To this last class allusion is made in Php 4:22, “they that are of Caesar's household.” From these it would gradually work upwards and downwards; but we may be sure that in respect of rank the Church of Rome was no exception to the general rule, that “not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble,” were called (1Co 1:26).

It seems probable, from what has been said above, that the Roman Church at this time was composed of Jews and Gentiles in nearly equal portions. This fact finds expression in the account, whether true or false, which represents Peter and Paul as presiding at the same time over the Church at Rome (Dionys. Cor. ap. Euseb. H.E. 2, 25; Irenaeus, 3, 3). Possibly, also, the discrepancies in the lists of the early bishops of Rome may find a solution (Pearson, Minor Theol. Works, 2, 449; Bunsen, Hippolytus, 1, 44) in the joint episcopate of Linus and Cletus — the one ruling over the Jewish, the other over the Gentile, congregation of the metropolis. If this conjecture be accepted, it is an important testimony to the view here maintained, though we cannot suppose that in Paul's time the two elements of the Roman Church had distinct organizations.

5. The heterogeneous composition of this Church explains the general character of the Epistle to the Romans. In an assemblage so various, we should expect to find not the exclusive predominance of a single form of error, but the coincidence of different and opposing forms. The Gospel had here to contend not specially with Judaism, nor specially with heathenism, but with both together. It was therefore the business of the Christian teacher to reconcile the opposing difficulties and to hold out a meeting point in the Gospel. This is exactly what Paul does in the Epistle to the  Romans, and what, from the circumstances of the case, he was well enabled to do. He was addressing a large and varied community which had not been founded by himself, and with which he had had no direct intercourse. Again, it does not appear that the letter was specially written to answer any doubts, or settle any controversies, then rife in the Roman Church. There were therefore no disturbing influences, such as arise out of personal relations, or peculiar circumstances, to derange a general and systematic exposition of the nature and working of the Gospel. At the same time, the vast importance of the metropolitan Church, which could not have been overlooked even by an uninspired teacher, naturally pointed it out to the apostle as the fittest body to whom to address such an exposition. Thus the Epistle to the Romans is more of a treatise than of a letter. If we remove the personal allusions in the opening verses, and the salutations at the close, it seems not more particularly addressed to the Church of Rome than to any other Church of Christendom. In this respect it differs widely from the Epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians, with which, as being written about the same time, it may most fairly be compared, and which are full of personal and direct allusions. In one instance alone we seem to trace a special reference to the Church of the metropolis. The injunction of obedience to temporal rulers (Rom 13:1) would most fitly be addressed to a congregation brought face to face with the imperial government, and the more so as Rome had recently been the scene of frequent disturbances, on the part of either Jews or Christians, arising out of a feverish and restless anticipation of the Messiah's coming (Sueton. Claud. 25). Other apparent exceptions admit of a different explanation.

6. This explanation is, in fact, to be sought in its relation to the contemporaneous epistles. The letter to the Romans closes the group of epistles written during the second missionary journey. This group contains, besides, as already mentioned, the letters to the Corinthians and Galatians, written probably within the few months preceding. At Corinth, the capital of Achaia and the stronghold of heathendom, the Gospel would encounter its severest struggle with Gentile vices and prejudices. In Galatia, which, either from natural sympathy or from close contact, seems to have been more exposed to Jewish influence than any other Church within Paul's sphere of labor, it had a sharp contest with Judaism. In the epistles to these two churches we study the attitude of the Gospel towards the Gentile and Jewish world respectively. These letters are direct and special. They are  evoked by present emergencies, are directed against actual evils, are full of personal applications. The Epistle to the Romans is the summary of what he had written before, the result of his dealing with the two antagonistic forms of error, the gathering together of the fragmentary teaching in the Corinthian and Galatian letters. What is there immediate, irregular, and of partial application is here arranged and completed and thrown into a general form. Thus, on the one hand, his treatment of the Mosaic law points to the difficulties he encountered in dealing with the Galatian Church; while, on the other, his cautions against antinomian excesses (Rom 6:15, etc.), and his precepts against giving offense in the matter of meats and the observance of days (ch. 14), remind us of the errors which he had to correct in his Corinthian converts (comp. 1Co 6:12 sq.; 1Co 8:1 sq.). Those injunctions, then, which seem at first sight special, appear not to be directed against any actual known failings in the Roman Church, but to be suggested by the possibility of those irregularities occurring in Rome which he had already encountered elsewhere.

7. Viewing this epistle, then, rather in the light of a treatise than of a letter, we are enabled to explain certain phenomena in the text above alluded to (§ 2). In the received text a doxology stands at the close of the epistle (Rom 16:25-27). The preponderance of evidence is in favor of this position, but there is respectable authority for placing it at the end of ch. 14. In some texts, again, it is found in both places, while others omit it entirely. The phenomena of the MSS. seem best explained by supposing that the letter was circulated at an early date (whether during the apostle's lifetime or not it is idle to inquire) in two forms, both with and without the two last chapters. In the shorter form it was divested, as far as possible, of its epistolary character by abstracting the personal matter addressed especially to the Romans, the doxology being retained at the close. A still further attempt to strip this epistle of any special references is found in MS. G, which omits ἐν ῾Ρώμῃ (Rom 1:7) and τοῖς ἐν ῾Ρώμῃ (Rom 16:15) for it is to be observed, at the same time, that this MS. omits the doxology entirely, and leaves a space after ch. 14. This view is somewhat confirmed by the parallel case of the opening of the Ephesian epistle, in which there is very high authority for omitting the words ἐν Ε᾿φέσῳ, and which bears strong marks of having been intended for a circular letter.

V. Scope, Contents, and Characteristics. — The elaborate argument and logical order observed in this epistle give it a very systematic character.  Nevertheless, the bearing of many of its parts has often been greatly obscured or imperfectly understood, especially under the influence of polemical bias. On this account, as well as because of the great interest always attached to the fundamental doctrines so formally treated in it, we give an unusually full outline of its contents, even at the risk of some repetition.

1. In describing the general purport of this epistle we may start from Paul's own words, which, standing at the beginning of the doctrinal portion, may be taken as giving a summary of the contents: “The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first and also to the Greek; for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith” (Rom 1:16-17). Accordingly the epistle has been described as comprising “the religious philosophy of the world's history.” The world in its religious aspect is divided into Jew and Gentile. The different positions of the two, as regards their past and present relation to God and their future prospects, are explained. The atonement of Christ is the center of religious history. The doctrine of justification by faith is the key which unlocks the hidden mysteries of the divine dispensation.

It belongs to the characteristic type of Paul's teaching to exhibit the Gospel in its historical relation to the human race. In the Epistle to the Romans, also, we find that peculiar character of Paul's teaching which induced Schelling to call Paul's doctrine a philosophy of the history of man. The real purpose of the human race is in a sublime manner stated by Paul in his speech in Act 17:26-27; and he shows at the same time how God had, by various historical means, promoted the attainment of his purpose. Paul exhibits the Old Test. dispensation under the form of an institution for the education of the whole human race, which should enable men to terminate their spiritual minority and become truly of age (Gal 3:24; Gal 4:1-4). In the Epistle to the Romans, also, the apostle commences by describing the two great divisions of the human race, viz. those who underwent the preparatory spiritual education of the Jews. and those who did not undergo such a preparatory education. We find a similar division indicated by Christ himself (Joh 10:16), where he speaks of one flock separated by hurdles. The chief aim of all nations, according to Paul, should be the righteousness before the face of God, or absolute realization of the moral law. According to Paul the heathen also have their νόμος, law, as well religious as moral internal revelation (Rom 1:19; Rom 1:32; Rom 2:15). The heathen have, however, not fulfilled that law which they knew, and are in  this respect like the Jews, who also disregarded their own law (ch. 2). Both Jews and Gentiles are transgressors, or, by the law, separated from the grace and sonship of God (Rom 2:12; Rom 3:20); consequently, if blessedness could only be obtained by fulfilling the demands of God, no man could be blessed. God, however, has gratuitously given righteousness and blessedness to all who believe in Christ (Rom 2:21-29). The Old Test. also recognizes the value of religious faith (ch. 4). Thus we freely attain to peace and sonship of God presently, and have before us still greater things, viz. the future development of the kingdom of God (Rom 5:1-11). The human race has gained in Christ much more than it lost in Adam (Rom 5:12; Rom 5:21). This doctrine by no means encourages sin (ch. 6); on the contrary, men who are conscious of divine grace fulfill the law much more energetically than they were able to do before having attained to this knowledge, because the law alone is even apt to sharpen the appetite for sin and leads finally to despair (ch. 7); but now we fulfill the law by means of that new spirit which is given unto us, and the full development of our salvation is still before us (Rom 8:1-27). The sufferings of the present time cannot prevent this development, and must rather work for good to those whom God from eternity has viewed as faithful believers; and nothing can separate such believers from the eternal love of God (Rom 8:28-39). It causes pain to behold the Israelites themselves shut out from salvation; but they themselves are the cause of this seclusion, because they wished to attain salvation by their own resources and exertions, by their descent from Abraham, and by their fulfilment of the law. Thus, however, the Jews have not obtained that salvation which God has freely offered under the sole condition of faith in Christ (ch. 9); the Jews have not entered upon the way of faith, therefore the Gentiles were preferred, which was predicted by the prophets. However, the Jewish race, as such, has not been rejected; some of them obtain salvation by a selection made not according to their works, but according to the grace of God. If some of the Jews are left to their own obduracy, even their temporary fall serves the plans of God, viz. the vocation of the Gentiles. After the mass of the Gentiles shall have entered in, the people of Israel, also, in their collective capacity, shall be received into the Church (ch. 11).

2. The following is a more detailed analysis of the epistle:

SALUTATION (Rom 1:1-7). The apostle at the outset strikes the keynote of the epistle in the expressions “called as an apostle, ““called as saints.” Divine grace is everything, human merit nothing.

I. PERSONAL explanations. Purposed visit to Rome (Rom 1:5-15).

II. DOCTRINAT, discussion (Rom 1:16; Rom 11:36).

The general proposition. The Gospel is the salvation of Jew and Gentile alike. This salvation comes by faith (Rom 1:16-17).

The rest of this section is taken up in establishing this thesis, and drawing deductions from it, or correcting misapprehensions.

(a.) All alike were under condemnation before the Gospel: The heathen (Rom 1:18-32). The Jew (Rom 2:1-29). Objections to this statement answered (Rom 3:1-8). The position itself established from Scripture (Rom 3:9-20).

(b.) A righteousness (justification) is revealed under the Gospel, which being of faith, not of law, is also universal (Rom 3:21-26).

Boasting is thereby excluded (Rom 3:27-31). Of this justification by faith Abraham is an example (Rom 4:1-25). Thus, then, we are justified in Christ, in whom alone we glory (Rom 5:1-11). This acceptance in Christ is as universal as was the condemnation in Adam (Rom 5:12-19).

(c.) The moral consequences of our deliverance.

The law was given to multiply sin (Rom 5:20-21). When we died to the law, we died to sin (Rom 6:1-14). The abolition of the law, however, is not a signal for moral license (Rom 6:15-23). On the contrary, as the law has passed away, so must sin, for sin and the law are correlative; at the same time, this is no disparagement of the law, but rather a proof of human weakness (Rom 7:1-25). So henceforth in Christ we are free from sin, we have the Spirit, and look forward in hope, triumphing over our present afflictions (Rom 8:1-39).

(d.) The rejection of the Jews is a matter of deep sorrow (Rom 9:1-5).

Yet we must remember

(1.) That the promise was not to the whole people, but only to a select seed (Rom 9:6-13). And the absolute purpose of God in so ordaining is not to be canvassed by man (Rom 9:14-19).

(2.) That the Jews did not seek justification aright, and so missed it. This justification was promised by faith, and is offered to all alike, the preaching to the Gentiles being implied therein. The character and results of the Gospel dispensation are foreshadowed in Scripture (Rom 10:1-21).

(3.) That the rejection of the Jews is not final. This rejection has been the means of gathering in the Gentiles, and through the Gentiles they themselves will ultimately be brought to Christ (Rom 11:1-36).

III. PRACTICAL exhortations (Rom 12:1; Rom 15:13).

(a.) To holiness of life and to charity in general, the duty of obedience to rulers being inculcated by the way (Rom 12:1; Rom 13:14).

(b.) More particularly against giving offense to weaker brethren (Rom 14:1; Rom 15:13).

IV. PERSONAL matters.

(a.) The apostle's motive in writing the letter, and his intention of visiting the Romans (Rom 15:14-33).

(b.) Greetings (Rom 16:1-23).

Conclusion. The letter ends with a benediction and doxology (Rom 16:24-27).

3. While this epistle contains the fullest and most systematic exposition of the apostle's teaching, it is at the same time a very striking expression of his character. Nowhere do his earnest and affectionate nature, and his tact and delicacy in handling unwelcome topics, appear more strongly than when he is dealing with the rejection of his fellow countrymen the Jews. SEE PAUL.

VI. The Commentaries on this epistle are very numerous, as might be expected from its importance. For convenience, we divide them chronologically into two classes.

1. Of the many patristic expositions, but few are now extant. The work of Origen is preserved entire only in a loose Latin translation of Rufinus  (Orig. [ed. De la Rue] 4, 458); but some fragments of the original are found in the Philocalia, and more in Cramer's Catena. The commentary on Paul's epistles printed among the works of Ambrose (ed. Ben. 2, App. p. 21), and hence bearing the name Ambrosiaster. is probably to be attributed to Hilary the deacon. Chrysostom is the most important among the fathers who attempted to interpret this epistle. He enters deeply and with psychological acumen into the thoughts of the apostle, and expounds them with sublime animation (ed. Montf. 9, 425, edited separately by Field, and transl. in the Library of the Fathers [Oxf. 1841], vol. 7). Besides these are the expositions of Paul's epistles by Pelagius (printed among Jerome's works [ed. Vallarsi], vol. 11, pt. 3, p. 135), by Primasius (Magn. Bibl. Vet. Patr. vol. 6, pt. 2, p. 30), and by Theodoret (ed. Schulze, 3, 1). Augustine commenced a work, but broke off at 1, 4. It bears the name Inchoata Expositio Epistoloe ad Rom. (ed. Ben. 3, 925). Later he wrote Expositio quarundam Propositionum Epistoloe ad Rom., also extant (ed. Ben. 3, 903). To these should be added the later Catena of Ecumenius (10th century), and the notes of Theophylact (11th century), the former containing valuable extracts from Photius. Portions of a commentary of Cyril of Alexandria were published by Mai (Nov. Patr. Bibl. 3, 1). The Catena edited by Cramer (1844) comprises two collections of Variorum notes, the one extending from 1, 1 to 9, 1, the other from 7, 7 to the end. Besides passages from extant commentaries, they contain important extracts from Apollinarius, Theodorus of Mopsuestia, Severianus, Gennadius, Photius, and others. There are also the Greek Scholia, edited by Matthai, in his large Greek Test. (Riga, 1782), from Moscow MSS. The commentary of Euthymius Zigabenus (Tholuck, Einl. § 6) exists in MS., but has never been printed. Abelard wrote annotations on this epistle (in Opp. p. 489), likewise Hugo Victor (in Opp. 1), and Aquinas (in Opp. 6). SEE COMMENTARY.

2. Modern exegetical helps (from the Reformation to the present time) on the entire epistle separately are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Titelmann, Collectiones (Antw. 1520, 8vo); Melancthon, Adnotationes (Vitemb. 1522, and often, 4to); Bugenhagen, Interpretatio (Hag. 1523, 1527, 8vo); OEcolampadius, Adnotationes (Basil. 1526, 8vo); Sadoleto [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Lugd. 1535, fol.); Haresche [Rom. Cath.], Commentarii (Par. 1536, 8vo); \*Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp.; in English by Sihon, Lond. 1834, 8vo; by Rodsell and Beveridge, Edinb. 1844, 8vo; by Owen, ibid. 1849, 8vo; in  German, Frankf. 1836-38, 2 vols. 8vo); Sarcer, Scholia (Francf. 1541, 8vo); Grandis [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Par. 1546, 8vo); Soto [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Antw. 1550; Salm. 1551, fol.); Hales, Disputationes (Vitemb. 1553, 8vo); Musculus, Commentarius (Basil. 1555, 1572, fol.); Valdes [Socinian], Commentaria (Ven. 1556, 8vo); Naclanti [Rom. Cath.], Enarrationes (ibid. 1557, 4to); Martyr, Commentarius (Basil. 1558, fol., and later; in English, Lond. 1568, fol.); Viguer [Rom. Cath.], Commentaria (Par. 1558, fol., and later); Ferus [Rom. Cath.], Exegesis (ibid. 1559, 8vo, and later); Bucer, Metaphrasis (Basil. 1562, fol.); Malthisius [Rom. Cath. ], Commentarius (Colon. 1562, fol.); Cruciger, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1567, 8vo); Brent, Commentarius (Tub. 1571, 8vo); Hesch, Commentarius (Jen. 1572, 8vo; also [with other epistles] Lips. 1605, fol.); Hemming, Commentarius (ibid. 1572, 8vo); Olevian, Notoe (Genev. 1579, 8vo); Wigand, Adnotationes (Francf. 1580, 8vo); Comer, Commentarius (Heidelb. 1583, 8vo); De la Cerda [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Mussi 1583. fol.); Mussi [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Ven. 1588, 4to); Pollock, Analysis (Edinb. 1594; Genev. 1596, 1608, 8vo); Pantusa [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Ven. 1596, 8vo); Hunn, Expositio (Marp. 1587; Francf. 1596; Vitemb. 1607, 8vo); Pasqual (R.) [Rom. Cath.], Commentaria (Barc. 1597, fol.); Chytraeus, Explicatio (s. l. 1599, 8vo); Feuardent [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Par. 1599, 8vo); Toletus [Rom. Cath.], Adnotationes (Rom. 1602, 4to, and later); Pererius, Disputationes (Ingolst. 1603, 4to); Rung, Disputationes [includ. 1 Cor.] (Vitemb. 1603, 4to); Fay, Commentarius (Genev. 1608, 8vo); Pareus, Commentarius (Francf. 1608, 4to, and later); Mann, Notationes (ibid. 1614, 8vo); Wilson, Commentary (Lond. 1614, 4to; 1627, 1653, fol.); \*Willet, Commentaria (Lond. 1620, fol.); Coutzen [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (Colon. 1629, fol.); Parr, Exposition [on parts] (Lond. 1632, fol. ); Crell [Socinian], Commentarius (Racov. 1636, 8vo); Heger, Exegesis (Francf. 1645, 8vo; 1651, 4to); Cundis, Exercitationes (Jen. 1646, 4to), De Dieu, Animadversiones [includ. other epistles] (L.B. 1646, 4to); Rudbeck, Disputationes (Aros. 1648, 4to); Brown (Sr.), Explanation (Edinb. 1651, 1759, 4to); Ferma, Analysis (ibid. 1651, 12mo; in English, ibid. 1849, 8vo); Elton, Treatises [on portions] (Lond. 1653, fol.), Weller, Adnotationes (Brunsw. 1654, 4to); Wandalin (Sr.), Paraphrasis (Slesw. 1656, 4to); Feurborn, Commentarius (Giess. 1661, 4to); Hipsted, Collationes (Brem. 1665, 4to); Gerhard, Adnotationes (Jen. 1666, 1676, 4to); De Brais, Notoe (Salm. 1670; Lips. 1726, 4to); Groenwegen, Vytlegginge (Gor. 1671, 4to); Mommas, Meditationes [includ. Gal.] (Hag.  1678, 8vo); Wittich, Investigatio (L. B. 1685, 4to); Alting, Commentarius (in Opp. vol. 3, iv; Amst. 1686, fol.); Van Leeuwen, Verhandeling (ibid. 1688, 1699, 4to); Schmid, Paraphrasis [in portions] (Hamb. 1691-94, 4to); Van Peene, Nasporing (Leyd. 1695, 4to; in German, Fr.-a.-M. 1697, 4to); Varen, Exegesis (Hamb. 1696, 8vo); Possalt, Erklärung (Zittau, 1696, 4to); Fibus [Rom. Cath.], Interpretatio (Col. Ag. 1696, fol.); Zierold, Exegesis (Starg. 1701, 1719, 4to); Locke, Notes (Lond. 1707, 4to); Dannhauer, Disputationes (Gryph. 1708, 4to); Fischbeck, Explanatio (Goth. 1720, 8vo); Streso, Meditatien (Amst. 1721, 4to); Van Til, Verklaring [includ. Phil.] (Haarlem, 1721, 4to); Wirth, Erklärung (Nuremb. 1724, 8vo); Hasevoert, Verklaring (Leyd. 1725, 4to); Vitringa, Verklaringe (Franeck. 1729, 4to); Rambach, Erklärung (Brem. 1738, 4to); also Introductio (Hal. 1727, 8vo); Turretin, Proelectiones [on 1-11] (Lausan. 1741, 4to); Wandalin (Jr.), Proelectiones (Haf. 1744, 4to); Taylor [Unitarian], Notes (Load. 1745, 1747, 1754, 1769, 4to; in German, Zur. 1774, 4to); Anton, Anmerkungen (Frankf. 1746, 8vo); Baumgarten, Auslegung (Hal 1749, 4to ); Carpzov, Stricturoe (Helmst. 1750, 1758, 8vo); Edwards, Annotations [includ. Gal.] (Lond. 1752, 4to); Semler, Notoe (Hal. 1767, 8vo); Mosheim, Einleitung (ed. Boysen, Quedlinb. 1771, 4to); Moldenhauer, Erläuterung (Hamb. 1775, 8vo); Richter, Erklärung (Frankf. 1775, 8vo); Cramer, Auslegung (Leips. 1784, 8vo); Schoder, Anmerk. (Frankf. 1785, 4to); Fuchs, Erläuterung (Steud. 1789, 8vo); Herzog, Erläuterung (Halle, 1791, 8vo); Reuss, Anmerk. (Giess. 1792, 8vo); Wunibald, Annotationes (Heidelb. 1792, 8vo); Francke, Anmerk. (Gotha, 1793, 8vo); Morus, Proelectiones (Lips. 1794, 8vo); Jones [Unitarian], Analysis (Lond. 1801, 8vo); Mobius, Bemerk. (Jen. 1804, 8vo); Bohme, Commentarius (Lips. 1806, 8vo); Stock, Lectures (Dubl. 1806, 8vo); Weingart, Commentarius (Goth. 1816, 8vo); Fry, Lectures (Lond. 1816, 8vo); \*Tholuck, Auslegung (Berl. 1824, 1828, 1831, 1836, 1856, 8vo; in English, Edinb. 1842, 2 vols. 8vo; Phila. 1844, 8vo); Horneman, Commentar (Copenh. 1824, 8vo); Cox, Notes (Lond. 1824, 8vo); Flat, Vorlesungen (Tub. 1825, 8vo); Bowles, Sermons (Bath, 1826, 12mo); Terrot, Notes (Lond. 1828, 8vo); Stenerson, Commentarius (Lips. 1829, 8vo); Klee [Rom. Cath.], Commentar (Mainz, 1830, 8vo); Maitland, Discourses (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Moysey, Lectures (ibid. 1830, 8vo); \*Ruckert, Commentar (Leips. 1831, 1839, 2 vols. 8vo); Benecke, Erläuterung (Heidelb. 1831, 8vo; in English, Lond. 1854, 8vo); Paulus, Erläuterung (Heidelb. 1831, 8vo); Ritchie, Lectures (Edinb. 1831, 2 vols. 8vo); Geissler, Erläuterung (Nuremb. 1831-33, 2 vols. 8vo); \*Stuart,  Commentary (Andover, 1832, 1835; Lond. 1857, 8vo); Parry, Lectures (ibid. 1832, 12mo ); Reiche, Erklärung (Gott. 1833-34, 2 vols. 8vo); Glockler, Erklärung (Frankf. 1834, 8vo); Kollner, Commentar (Darmst. 1834, 8vo); \*Hodge, Commentary (Phila. 1835, 1864, 8vo; also abridged, ibid. 1836); \*De Wette, Erklärung (Leips. 1835, 1838, 1840, 1847, 8vo); Wirth, Erläuterung (Regensb. 1836, 8vo); Lossius, Erklärung (Hamb. 1836, 8vo); Stengel [Rom. Cath.], Commentar (Freib. 1836, 8vo); \*Fritzsche, Commentarius (Hal. 1836-43, 3 vols. 8vo); Chalmers, Lectures (Glasg. 1837, 4 vols. 8vo, and later; N.Y. 1840, 8vo); Anderson, Exposition (Lond. 1837, 12mo); Bosanquet, Paraphrase (ibid. 1840, 8vo); Haldane, Exposition (ibid. 1842, 1852, 3 vols. 12mo; N.Y. 1857, 8vo; in German, Hamb. 1839-43, 3 vols. 8vo); Sumner, Exposition [includ. 1 Cor.] (Lond. 1843, 8vo); Allies, Sermons (Oxf. 1844, 8vo); Reithmayr [Rom. Cath.], Commentar (Regensb. 1845, 8vo); Walford, Notes (Lond. 1846, 8vo); \*Philippi, Commentar (Frankf. 1848, 1852, 3 vols. 8vo; Erlang. 1855, 1867, 2 vols. 8vo); Vinke, Verklaring (Utr. 1848, 1860. 8vo); Whitwell, Notes (Lond. 1848, 8vo); Krehl. Auslegung (Leips. 1849, 8vo); Marriott, Reflections (Lond. 1849, 12mo); Ewbank, Commentary (ibid. 1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo); Steinhofer, Erklärung (Nördl. 1851, 8vo); Pridham, Notes (Bath, 1851, 12mo); \*Turner, Commentary (N.Y. 1853, 8vo); Knight, Commentary (Lond. 1854, 8vo); Beelen [Rom. Cath.], Commentarius (ibid. 1854, 8vo); \*Hengl, Interpretatio (Lips. 1854-59, 2 vols. 8vo); Jowett, Notes [includ. Gal. and Thess.] (Lond. 1855, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo); Livermore [Unitarian], Commentary (Bost. 1855, 12mo); Purdue, Commentary (Dubl. 1855, 8vo); Umbreit, Auslegung (Goth. 1856, 8vo); Ewald, Erläuterung (Gott. 1857, 8vo); Brown (J., Jr.), Exposition (Edinb. and N.Y. 1857, 8vo); Bromehead, Notes (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Stephen, Lectures (Aberdeen, 1857, 12mo); Five Clergymen, Revision (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Cumming, Readings (ibid. 1857, 12mo); Mehring, Erklärung (Stet. 1858-59, 2 vols. 8vo); Vaughan, Notes, (Lond. 1859, 1861, 8vo); Crawford, Translation (ibid. 1860. 4to); Brown (D.), Commentary (ibid. 1860, 8vo); Wardlaw, Lectures (ibid. 1861, 3 vols. 8vo); Colenso, Notes (ibid. 1861, 8vo); Ford, Illustration (ibid. 1862, 8vo); Hinton, Exposition (ibid. 1865, 8vo); Marsh, Exposition (ibid. 1865, 12mo); Wangemann, Erklärung (Berl. 1866, 8vo); Ortloph, Auslegung (Erlang. 1866, 8vo); Prichard, Commentary (Lond. 1866, 8vo); Forbes, Commentary [on parallelisms] (ibid. 1868, 8vo); Horton, Lectures (ibid. 1868 sq., 2 vols. 8vo); \*Delitzsch, Erläuterung (Leips. 1870, 8vo); Chamberlain, Notes (Lond. 1870, 12mo); Plumer, Commentary (N.Y. and  Edinb. 1871, 8vo); Best, Commentary (Lond. 1871, 8vo); O'Connor, Commentary (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Robinson, Notes (ibid. 1871, 2 vols. 8vo); Phallis, Notes (ibid. 1871, 8vo); Gartner, Erklärung (Stuttg. 1872, 8vo); Colet, Notes (Lond. 1873, 8vo); Strong, Analysis (N.Y. 1873, 8vo); Neil, Notes (Lond. 1877, 8vo). SEE EPISTLES.

## Romanticists, The[[@Headword:Romanticists, The]]

             A class of thinkers whose chief object was to introduce a new religion of humanity and art. They were the advocates of the ideal, in opposition to the real, seeking to resolve religion into poetry, and morality into aesthetics. Rousseau was the first author to set forth the romantic view of life with any degree of consistency and decisiveness. He found two disciples in Germany, Lavater (1741-1801) and Pestalozzi (1746-1826), and at about the same time (1724-1804) Kant lent his influence to this school. The principle of the Romanticists was life, and they represented ideas lyrically, as they ring in the raptures or agonies of the human heart. They represented the passions picturesquely, as they may burn in an individual character belonging to a certain age, race, stage of life, etc. The decay of this school was a simple consequence of its artistic principle. Life is not the highest principle of art; the highest principle is truth. When this was seen, the question arose, What is truth? The Romanticists attempted a double answer, but failed in both. In Germany they said, Truth is only a symbol, and the highest symbols mankind possess are a Roman Catholic Church and the absolute monarchy. They despised the Reformation on esthetic grounds as unromantic. Hence followed political reaction, conversion to Romanism, extravagances, insanity, and suicide. In England they said, There is no truth outside of the individual; take away all those abstract generalities which enslave the individuality, and the unbound Prometheus will show himself the truth. The result was disgust at life, despair at all. This branch of the Romantic school soon withered. In Germany the favorite philosopher of the Romanticists was Schelling, and their favorite divine Schleiermacher. The book which most fitly represents their school in England is the Sartor Resartus of Carlyle.

Romanus, the name of a number of saints of the Roman Catholic Church.

1. ROMANUS THAUMATURGUS, said to have lived at Antioch in the 5th century, to have led a very abstemious life in a cave — partaking of only bread, salt, and water, and never kindling a fire — and to have wrought many wonders. His day is Feb. 9.

2. An archbishop of Rheims (530), a reputed relative of pope Vigilius, said to have been at first a monk and to have built a monastery in the neighborhood of Troyes, which was confirmed by Clodowig I. His death took place in 533 or 534. His anniversary is Feb. 28.

3. An abbot of the convent of Jaux, in Burgundy, who is said to have been born near the end of the 4th century and to have been consecrated priest by Hilary, the bishop of Aries. It is related that he retired into solitude at the age of thirty-five; that he introduced the hermit life into France, built cells and convents, and healed the sick through prayer and the kiss. He died in 460, and his day is also Feb. 28.

4. ALBERT and DOMITIAN, said to have been martyred at Rome. Their alleged remains were exhumed in Rome in 1659 and placed in the Jesuit church at Antwerp. They are commemorated March 14.

5. A monk in the diocese of Auxerre and Sens in the 6th century. who was divinely instructed to go from devastated Italy to France, and there built monasteries, converted many people to a monastic life, and wrought miracles. His relics are preserved at Sens. His day is May 22.

6. An archbishop of Rouen (622) said to belong to the royal family of France, of whom the legend relates that when a monster which devoured man and beast ravaged the city of Rouen, he provided a criminal who was awaiting death with the symbol of the cross and commanded him to remove the monster. The result was that the monster followed like a tame animal, and was burned. Romanus is said to have died in 639, and is commemorated on the reported date of his death, Oct. 23, and also on May 30.

7. A martyr, alleged to have been baptized by St. Laurent and to have been beheaded under Decius, A.D. 255. Commemorated Aug. 9.

8. A deacon of Caesarea, martyred under Diocletian, to whom Nov. 18 is assigned.

9. A reputed priest of Bordeaux whose death is fixed in 318, of whom the legend states that many wonders were wrought through his prayers, particularly that of rescuing shipwrecked persons. His day is Nov. 24.

See Ausfuhrl. Heiligen-Lex., with Calendar (Cologne and Frankf. 1719), p. 1928 sq.; Les Vies d. Saints, etc. (Par. 1734), 1, 243; 2, 101.

## Romanus, Pope[[@Headword:Romanus, Pope]]

             in A.D. 897, reigned only four months and twenty-three days. A single letter is all that history has preserved of his remains, and the only remarkable event of his pontificate was his disapproval of the indignities inflicted by his predecessor, Stephen VI, on the lifeless body of Formosus I (891-896). See the article. Romanus abrogated the unjust decrees of his predecessor, by which all the acts of Formosus had been declared void, and confirmed the consecrations and other pontifical acts which had been so nullified. See Bower, Lives of the Popes, 5, 71-73; Baronius, Annales, A.D. 891-896.

## Rombouts, Dirck[[@Headword:Rombouts, Dirck]]

             a Flemish historical painter, was born at Antwerp July 1, 1597. A pupil of Jansen's, he inherited the hatred of his master for Rubens, and opened a rival school. In 1617 he went to Italy, where his reputation was soon established, and he was called to the court or the grand-duke Cosmo II. He returned to Antwerp, where he spent the rest of his life. He was master of the Guild of St. Luke and held municipal offices. He died in 1637. The Taking-down from the Cross, St. Francis Receiving the Stigmata, and Themis with the Attributes of Justice show him to have possessed the qualities of a great master.

## Rome[[@Headword:Rome]]

             ( ῾Ρώμη [in Greek, strength; but probably from Romulus, the founder], expressly mentioned in the Bible only in the books of the Maccabees, and in Act 18:2, etc.; Rom 1:7; Rom 1:15; 2Ti 1:17; see also “Babylon, “Revelations 14:8, etc.), the ancient capital of the Western world, and the present residence of the pope and capital of Italy. In the following brief account, we treat only of its ancient, and especially its Biblical, relations. SEE ROMAN EMPIRE.

I. General Description. — Rome lies on the river Tiber, about fifteen miles from its mouth, in the plain of what is now called the Campagna (Felix illa Campania, Pliny, Hist. Nat. 3, 6), in lat. 41° 54' N., long. 12° 28' E. The country around the city, however, is not altogether a plain, but a sort of undulating table land, crossed by hills, while it sinks towards the southwest to the marshes of Maremma, which coast the Mediterranean. In ancient geography, the country in the midst of which Rome lay was termed  Latium, which, in the earliest times, comprised within a space of about four geographical square miles the country lying between the Tiber and the Numicius, extending from the Alban Hills to the sea, having for its chief city Laurentum. The “seven hills” (Revelations 17:9) which formed the nucleus of the ancient city stand on the left (eastern) bank. On the opposite side of the river rises the far higher ridge of the Janiculum. Here from very early times was a fortress, with a suburb beneath it extending to the river. Modern Rome lies to the north of the ancient city, covering with its principal portion the plain to the north of the seven hills, once known as the Campus Martius, and on the opposite bank extending over the low ground beneath the Vatican to the north of the ancient Janiculum.

The city of Rome was founded (B.C. 753) by Romulus and Remus, grandsons of Numitor, and sons of Rhea Sylvia, to whom, as the originators of the city, mythology ascribed a divine parentage. At first the city had three gates, according to a sacred usage. Founded on the Palatine Hill, it was extended, by degrees, so as to take in six other hills, at the foot of which ran deep valleys that in early times were in part overflowed with water, while the hillsides were covered with trees. In the course of the many years during which Rome was acquiring to herself the empire of the world, the city underwent great, numerous, and important changes. Under its first kings it must have presented a very different aspect from what it did after it had been beautified by Tarquint. The destruction of the city by the Gauls (A.U.C. 365) caused a thorough alteration in it; nor could the troubled times which ensued have been favorable to its being well restored. It was not till riches and artistic skill came into the city on the conquest of Philip of Macedon and Antiochus of Syria (A.U.C. 565) that there arose in Rome large, handsome stone houses.

The capture of Corinth conduced much to the adorning of the city, many fine specimens of art being transferred thence to the abode of the conquerors. As the power of Rome extended over the world, and her chief citizens went into the colonies to enrich themselves, so did the masterpieces of Grecian art flow towards the capital, together with some of the taste and skill to which they owed their birth. Augustus, however, it was who did most for embellishing the capital of the world, though there may be some sacrifice of truth in the pointed saying that he found Rome built of brick and left it marble. Subsequent emperors followed his example, till the place became the greatest repository of architectural, pictorial, and sculptural skill that the world has  ever seen — a result to which even Nero's incendiarism indirectly conduced, as affording an occasion for the city's being rebuilt under the higher scientific influences of the times. The site occupied by modern Rome is not precisely the same as that which was at any period covered by the ancient city: the change of locality being towards the northwest, the city has partially retired from the celebrated hills. About two thirds of the area within the walls (traced by Aurelian) are now desolate, consisting of ruins, gardens, and fields, with some churches, convents, and other scattered habitations. Originally the city was four miles in circumference. In the time of Pliny the walls were nearly twenty miles in circuit; now they are from fourteen to fifteen miles around. Its original gates, three in number, had increased in the time of the elder Pliny to thirty-seven. Modern Rome has sixteen gates, some of which are, however, built up. Thirty-one great roads centered in Rome, which, issuing from the Forum, traversed Italy, ran through the provinces, and were terminated only by the boundary of the empire.

As a starting point, a gilt pillar (Milliarium Aureum) was set up by Augustus in the middle of the Forum. This curious monument, from which distances were reckoned, was discovered in 1823. Eight principal bridges led over the Tiber; of these three are still relics. The four districts into which Rome was divided in early times, Augustus increased to fourteen. Large open spaces were set apart in the city, called Campi, for assemblies of the people and martial exercises, as well as for games. Of nineteen which are mentioned, the Campus Martius was the principal. It was near the Tiber, whence it was called Tiberius. The epithet “Martins” was derived from the plain being consecrated to Mars, the god of war. In the later ages it was surrounded by several magnificent structures, and porticos were erected, under which, in bad weather, the citizens could go through their usual exercises. It was also adorned with statues and arches. The name of Forum was given to places where the people assembled for the transaction of business. The Fora were of two kinds fora venalia, “markets;” fora cicilia, “law-courts,” etc. Until the time of Julius Caesar there was but one of the latter kind, termed by way of distinction Forum Romanum, or simply Forum. It lay between the Capitoline and Palatine Hills; it was eight hundred feet wide, and adorned on all sides with porticos, shops, and other edifices, on the erection of which large sums had been expended, and the appearance of which was very imposing, especially as it was much enhanced by numerous statues. In the center of the Forum was the plain called the Curtian Lake, where Curtius is said to have cast himself into a chasm or gulf, which closed on him, and so he saved his  country. On one side were the elevated seats, or suggestus, a sort of pulpit from which magistrates and orators addressed the people usually called rostra, because adorned with the beaks of ships which had been taken in a sea fight from the inhabitants of Antium. Near by was the part of the Forum called the Comitium, where were held the assemblies of the people called Comitia Curiata. The celebrated temple bearing the name of Capitol (of which there remain only a few vestiges) stood on the Capitoline Hill, the highest of the seven; it was square in form, each side extending about two hundred feet, and the ascent to it was by a flight of one hundred steps.

It was one of the oldest, largest, and grandest edifices in the city. Founded by Tarquinius Priscus, it was several times enlarged and embellished. Its gates were of brass, and it was adorned with costly gildings; whence it is termed “golden” and “glittering,” aurea, fulgens. It enclosed three structures, the Temple of Jupiter Capitolinus in the center, the Temple of Minerva on the right, and the Temple of Juno on the left. The Capitol also comprehended some minor temples or chapels, and the Casa Romuli, or cottage of Romulus, covered with straw. Near the ascent to the Capitol was the asylum. We also mention the Basilicae, since some of them were afterwards turned to the purposes of Christian worship. They were originally buildings of great splendor, being appropriated to meetings of the senate, and to judicial purposes. Here counselors received their clients, and bankers transacted their business. The earliest churches, bearing the name of Basilicae, were erected under Constantine. He gave his own palace on the Coelian Hill as a site for a Christian temple. Next in antiquity was the Church of St. Peter, on the Vatican Hill, built A.D. 324, on the site and with the ruins of temples consecrated to Apollo and Mars. It stood about twelve centuries, at the end of which it was superseded by the modern church bearing the same name. The Circi were buildings oblong in shape, used for public games, races, and beast fights. The Theatra were edifices designed for dramatic exhibitions; the Amphitheatra (double theaters, buildings in an oval form) served for gladiatorial shows and the fighting of wild animals. That which was erected by the emperor Titus, and of which there still exists a splendid ruin, was called the Coliseum, from a colossal statue of Nero that stood near it.. With an excess of luxury, perfumed liquids were conveyed in secret tubes around these immense structures, and diffused over the spectators, sometimes from the statues which adorned the interior. In the arena which formed the center of the amphitheaters, the early Christians often endured martyrdom by being exposed to ravenous beasts.  See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.; Parker, Archoeology of Rome (Lond. 1877, 6 vols. 8vo); Wood, Guide to Rome (Lond. 1875); Cokesly, Map of Anc. Rome (Lond. 1852).

II. Judaism in Rome. — The connection of the Romans with Palestine caused Jews to settle at Rome in considerable numbers. The Jewish king Aristobulus and his son formed part of Pompey's triumph, and many Jewish captives and emigrants were brought to Rome at that time. A special district was assigned to them (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 8), not on the site of the modern “Ghetto,” between the Capitol and the island of the Tiber, but across the Tiber (Philo, Leg. ad Caium, p. 568, ed. Mangey). From Philo also it appears that the Jews in Rome were allowed the free use of their national worship, and generally the observance of their ancestral customs. With a zeal for which the nation had been some time distinguished, they applied themselves with success to proselytizing (Dion Cass. 37, 17). Many of these Jews were made freedmen (Philo, loc. cit.). Julius Caesar showed them some kindness (Josephus, Ant. 14, 10, 8; Sueton. Caesar, 84). They were favored also by Augustus, and by Tiberius during the latter part of his reign (Philo, loc. cit.). On one occasion, in the reign of Tiberius, when the Jews were banished from the city by the emperor for the misconduct of some members of their body, not fewer than four thousand enlisted in the Roman army which was then stationed in Sardinia (Sueton. Tib. 36; Josephus, Ant. 18, 3, 4). Claudius “commanded all Jews to depart from Rome” (Act 18:2), on account of tumults connected, possibly, with the preaching of Christianity at Rome (Sueton. Claud. 25, “Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit”). This banishment cannot have been of long duration, for we find Jews residing at Rome apparently in considerable numbers at the time of Paul's visit (Act 28:17). The Roman biographer does not give the date of the expulsion by Claudius, but Orosius (7:6) mentions the ninth year of that emperor's reign (A.D. 50).

The precise occasion of this expulsion history does not afford us the means of determining. The cause here assigned for their expulsion is that they raised disturbances, an allegation which at first view does not seem to point to a religious, still less to a Christian, influence. Yet we must remember that the words bear the coloring of the mind of a heathen historian, who might easily be led to regard activity for the diffusion of Christian truth, and the debates to which  that activity necessarily led, as a noxious disturbance of the peace of society. The Epicurean view of life could scarcely avoid describing religious agitations by terms ordinarily appropriated to martial pursuits. It must equally be borne in mind that the diffusion of the Gospel in Rome — then the very center and citadel of idolatry was no holiday task, but would call forth on the part of the disciples all the fiery energy of the Jewish character, and on the part of the pagans all the vehemence of passion which ensues from pride, arrogance, and hatred. Had the ordinary name of our Lord been employed by Suetonius, we should, for ourselves, have found little difficulty in understanding the words as intended to be applied to Jewish Christians. But the biographer uses the word Chrestus. The us is a mere Latin termination; but what are we to make of the root of the word — Chrest for Christ? Yet the change is in only one vowel, and Chrest might easily be used for Christ by a pagan writer. A slight difference in the pronunciation of the word as vocalized by a Roman and a Jew would easily cause the error.

We know that the Romans often did make the mispronunciation, calling Christ “Chrest” (Tertull. Apol. c. 3; Lactant. Inst. 4, 17; Just. Mart. Apol. c. 2). The point is important, and we therefore give a few details, the rather that Lardner has, under Claudius (1, 259), left the question undetermined. Now, in Tacitus (Annal. 15, 44) Jesus is unquestionably called Chrest in a passage where his followers are termed Christians. Lucian, too, in his Philopatris, so designates our Lord, playing on the word Chrestus (Χρηστός), which, in Greek, signifies “good.” These are his words: “since a Chrest [a good man] is found among the Gentiles also.” Tertullian (ut sup.) treats the difference as a case of ignorant mispronunciation, Christianus being wrongly pronounced Chrestianus. The mistake may have been the more readily introduced from the fact that, while Christ was a foreign word, Chrest was customary. Lips that had been used to Chrest would, therefore, rather continue the sound than change the vocalization. The term Chrest occurs on inscriptions (Heumann, Sylloge. diss. 1. 536), and epigrams in which the name appears may be found in Martial (7, 55; 9, 28). In the same author (11, 91) a diminutive from the word, namely, Chrestillus, may be found. The word assumed, also, a feminine form, Chresta, as found in an ancient inscription. Comp. also Martial (7, 55). There can therefore be little risk in asserting that Suetonius intended to indicate Jesus Christ by Chrestus; and we have already seen that the terms which he employs to describe the cause of the expulsion, though peculiar, are not irreconcilable with a reference on the part of the writer to Christians. The terms which Suetonius employs are accounted  for, though they may not be altogether justified, by those passages in the Acts of the Apostles in which the collision between the Jews who had become Christians and those who adhered to the national faith is found to have occasioned serious disturbances (Kuinol, Act 18:2; Rorsal, De Christoper Errorum in Chrest. Comm. [Groning. 1717]). Both Suetonius and Luke, in mentioning the expulsion of the Jews, seem to have used the official term employed in the decree. The Jews were know to the Roman magistrate; and Christians, as being at first Jewish converts, would be confounded under the general name of Jews. But that the Christians as well as the Jews strictly so called were banished by Claudius appears certain from the book of Acts; and, independently of this evidence, seems very probable from the other authorities of which mention has been made. SEE CHRESTUS; SEE ROME, JEWS IN.

III. Christianity at Rome. — Nothing is known of the first founder of the Christian Church at Rome. Roman Catholics assign the honor to Peter, and on this ground an argument in favor of the claims of the papacy. There is, however, no sufficient reason for believing that Peter was ever even so much as within the walls of Rome (Ellendorf, Ist Petrus in Rom und Bischof der romischen Kirche gewesen? [Darmstadt, 1843]). SEE PETER. Christianity may, perhaps, have been introduced into the city, not long after the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost, by the “strangers of Rome” who were then at Jerusalem (Act 2:10). It is clear that there were many Christians at Rome before Paul visited the city (Rom 1:8; Rom 1:13; Rom 1:15; Rom 15:20). The names of twenty-four Christians at Rome are given in the salutations at the end of the Epistle to the Romans. For the difficult question whether the Roman Church consisted mainly of Jews or Gentiles, see Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 2, 157; Alford, Proleg.; and especially Prof. Jowett, Epistles of St. Paul to the Romans, Galatians, and Thessalonians, 2:7-26. The view there adopted, that they were a Gentile Church, but with many Jewish converts, seems most in harmony with such passages as 1:5, 13; 11:13, and with the general tone of the epistle. SEE ROMANS, EPISTLE TO.

It may be useful to give some account of Rome in the time of Nero, the “Caesar” to whom Paul appealed, and in whose reign he suffered martyrdom (Eusebius, H.E. 2, 25).

1. The city at that time must be imagined as a large and irregular mass of buildings unprotected by an outer wall. It had long outgrown the old Servian wall (Dionys. Hal. Ant. Hom. 4, 13; ap. Merivale, Rom. Hist. 4, 497); but the limits of the suburbs cannot be exactly defined. Neither the nature of the buildings nor the configuration of the ground was such as to give a striking appearance to the city viewed from without. “Ancient Rome had neither cupola nor campanile” (Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 2, 371; Merivale, Rom. Emp. 4, 512), and the hills, never lofty or imposing, would present, when covered with the buildings and streets of a huge city, a confused appearance like the hills of modern London, to which they have sometimes been compared. The visit of Paul lies between two famous epochs in the history of the city, viz. its restoration by Augustus and its restoration by Nero (Conybeare and Howson, 1, 13). Some parts of the city, especially the Forum and Campus Martius, must now have presented a magnificent appearance; but many of the principal buildings which attract the attention of modern travelers in ancient Rome were not vet built. The streets were generally narrow and winding, flanked by densely crowded lodging-houses (insuloe) of enormous height. Augustus found it necessary to limit their height to seventy feet (Strabo, 5, 235). Paul's first visit to Rome took place before the Neronian conflagration, but even after the restoration of the city, which followed upon that event, many of the old evils continued (Tacitus, Hist. 3, 71; Juvenal, Sat. 3, 193, 269). One half of the population consisted, in all probability, of slaves. The larger part of the remainder consisted of pauper citizens supported in idleness by the miserable system of public gratuities. There appears to have been no middle class and no free industrial population. Side by side with the wretched classes just mentioned was the comparatively small body of the wealthy nobility, of whose luxury and profligacy we hear so much in the heathen writers of the time. (See for calculations and proofs the works cited.)

Such was the population which Paul would find at Rome at the time of his visit. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles that he was detained at Rome for “two whole years,” “dwelling in his own hired house with a soldier that kept him” (Act 28:16; Act 28:30), to whom apparently, according to Roman custom (Seneca, Ephesians 5; Act 12:6, quoted by Brotier, Ad Tac. Ann. 3, 22), he was bound with, a chain (Act 28:20; Eph 6:20; Php 1:13). Here he preached to all that came to him, no man forbidding him (Act 28:30-31). It is generally believed that on his  “appeal, to Caesar” he was acquitted, and, after some time spent in freedom, was a second time imprisoned at Rome (for proofs, see Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, ch. 27, and Alford, Gr. Test. vol. 3, ch. 7). Five of his epistles, viz. those to the Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, that to Philemon, and the Second Epistle to Timothy, were, in all probability, written from Rome, the latter shortly before his death (2Ti 4:6), the others during his first imprisonment. SEE HEBREWS, EPISTLE TO THE. It is universally believed that he suffered martyrdom at Rome.

2. The localities in and about Rome especially connected with the life of Paul are —

(1) The Appian Way, by which he approached Rome (Act 28:15). SEE APPII FORUM.

(2) “The palace,” or “Cesar's court” (τὸ πραιτώριον, Php 1:13). This may mean either the great camp of the Praetorian guards which Tiberius established outside the walls on the northeast of the city (Tacitus, Ann. 4, 2; Suetonius, Tib. 37), or, as seems more probable, a barrack attached to the imperial residence on the Palatine (Wieseler, as quoted by Conybeare and Howson, Life of St. Paul, 2, 423). There is no sufficient proof that the word “praetorium” was ever used to designate the emperor's palace, though it is used for the official residence of a Roman governor (Joh 18:28; Act 23:35). The mention of “Caesar's household” (Php 4:22) confirms the notion that Paul's residence was in the immediate neighborhood of the emperor's house on the Palatine.

3. The connection of other localities at Rome with Paul's name rests only on traditions of more or less probability. We may mention especially —

(1) The Mamertine prison, or Tullianum, built by Ancus Marcius near the Forum (Liv. 1, 33), described by Sallust (Cat. 55). It still exists beneath the Church of San Giuseppe dei Falegnami. Here it is said that Peter and Paul were fellow prisoners for nine months. This is not the place to discuss the question whether Peter was ever at Rome. It may be sufficient to state that though there is no evidence of such a visit in the New Test., unless Babylon in 1Pe 5:13 be a mystical name for Rome, yet early testimony (Dionysius, ap. Euseb. 2, 25) and the universal belief of the early Church seem sufficient to establish the fact of his having suffered  martyrdom there. The story, however, of the imprisonment in the Mamertine prison seems inconsistent with 2 Timothy, especially 4:11.

(2) The chapel on the Ostian Roan which marks the spot where the two apostles are said to have separated on their way to martyrdom.

(3) The supposed scene of Paul's martyrdom, viz. the Church of San Paolo alle tre Fontane, on the Ostian Road. (See the notice of the Ostian Road in Caius, ap. Enseb. H.E. 2, 25.) To these may be added,

(4) The supposed scene of Peter's martyrdom, viz. the Church of San Pietro in Montorio, on the Janiculum.

(5) The chapel “Domine quo Vadis,” on the Appian Road, the scene of the beautiful legend of our Lord's appearance to Peter as he was escaping from martyrdom (Ambrose, Ep. 33).

(6) The places where the bodies of the two apostles, after having been deposited first in the Catacombs (κοιμητήρια) (Euseb. H.E. 2, 25), are supposed to have been finally buried — that of Paul by the Ostian Road, that of Peter beneath the dome of the famous basilica which bears his name (see Caius, ap. Euseb. H.E. 2, 25). All these and many other traditions will be found in the Annals of Baronius, under the last year of Nero. “Valueless as may be the historical testimony of each of these traditions singly, yet collectively they are of some importance as expressing the consciousness of the 3d and 4th centuries that there had been an early contest, or at least contrast, between the two apostles, which in the end was completely reconciled; and it is this feeling which gives a real interest to the outward forms in which it is brought before us — more or less, indeed, in all the south of Europe, but especially in Rome itself” (Stanley, Sermons and Essays, p. 101).

4. We must add, as sites unquestionably connected with the Roman Christians of the apostolic age

(1) The gardens of Nero in the Vatican, not far from the spot where St. Peter's now stands. Here Christians, wrapped in the skins of beasts, were

serve as torches during the midnight games. Others were crucified (Tacitus, 15, 44).

(2) The Catacombs. These subterranean galleries, commonly from eight to ten feet in height, and from four to six in width, and extending for miles, especially in the neighborhood of the old Appian and Nomentan ways, were unquestionably used as places of refuge, of worship, and of burial by the early Christians. It is impossible here to enter upon the difficult question of their origin, and their possible connection with the deep sand pits and subterranean works at Rome mentioned by classical writers. See the story of the murder of Asinius (Cicero, Pro Cluent. 13), and the account of the concealment offered to Nero before his death (Suetonius, Nero, 48). A more complete account of the Catacombs than any previously given may be found in G.B. de Rossi's Roma Sotteriana Christiana (1864 sq.). Some very interesting notices of this work, and descriptions of the Roman Catacombs, are given in Burgon's Letters from Rome, p. 120-258. “De Rossi finds his earliest dated inscription A.D. 71. From that date to A.D. 300 there are not known to exist so many as thirty Christian inscriptions bearing dates. Of undated inscriptions, however, about 4000 are referable to the period antecedent to the emperor Constantine” (Burgon, p. 148). SEE CATACOMBS. The lately exhumed foundations of the Church of St. Clement are confidently claimed as relics of the same age (Mullooly, Clement's Basilicta in Rome [Rome, 1873, 8vo]). SEE CLEMENT.

Linus (who is mentioned in 2Ti 4:21) and Clement (Php 4:3) are supposed to have succeeded Peter as bishops of Rome. SEE LINUS.

IV. Mystical Titles. — Rome, as being their tyrannical mistress, was an object of special hatred to the Jews, who therefore denominated her by the name of Babylon the state in whose dominions they had endured a long and heavy servitude (Schottgel, Hot. Heb. 1, 1125; Eisenmenger, Entdeckt. Judenth. 1, 1800). Accordingly Rome, under the name of Babylon, is set forth in the Apocalypse (Rev 14:8; Rev 16:19; Rev 17:5; Rev 18:2) as the center and representative of heathenism; while Jerusalem appears as the symbol of Judaism. In Rev 17:9 allusion is clearly made to the Septicollis, the seven-hilled city — “seven mountains on which the woman sitteth.” The description of this woman, in whom the profligacy of Rome is vividly personified, may be seen in Revelation 17. In ch. 13 Rome is pictured as a huge, unnatural beast, whose name or number “is the number of a man, and his number is χξ῍῎,” 666, not improbably Latinos, Λατείνος, Latin, Roman. This beast has been most variously interpreted.  The several theories serve scarcely more than to display the ingenuity or the bigotry of their originators, and to destroy each other. Minter (De Occulto Urbis Romoe Nomine [Hafn. 1811]) thinks there is a reference to the secret name of Rome, the disclosure of which, it was thought, would be destructive to the state (Pliny, list. Nat. 3, 9; Macrobius, Sat. 3, 5; Plutarch, Quoest. Rom. c. 61; Servius, Ad AEn. 2, 293). Pliny's words occur in the midst of a long and picturesque account of Italy. Coming in the course of it to speak of Rome, he says, “the uttering of whose other name is accounted impious, and when it had been spoken by Valerius Soranus, who immediately suffered the penalty, it was blotted out with a faith no less excellent than beneficial.” He then proceeds to speak of the rites observed on the first of January, in connection with this belief, in honor of Diva Angerona, whose image appeared with her mouth bound and sealed up. This mystic name tradition reports to have been Valencia.

One of the most recent views of the name of the beast, from the pen of a Christian writer, we find in Hyponoia, or Thoughts on a Spiritual Understanding of the Apocalypse (Lond. 1844). “The number in question (666) is expressed in Greek by three letters of the alphabet: χ, six hundred; 10, sixty; ῍, six. Let us suppose these letters to be the initials of certain names, as it was common with the ancients in their inscriptions to indicate names of distinguished characters by initial letters, and sometimes by an additional letter, as C. Caius, Cn. Cneus. The Greek letter χ (ch) is the initial of Χριστός (Christ); the letter ξ is the initial of ξύλον (wood or tree); sometimes figuratively put in the New Test. for the cross. The last letter, ῍ is equivalent to σ and τ, but whether an s or an st, it is the initial of the word Satanas, Satan, or the adversary. Taking the first two names in the genitive, and the last in the nominative, we have the following appellation, name, or title: Χριστοῦ ξύλου σατανᾶς, ‘the adversary of the cross of Christ,' a character corresponding with that of certain enemies of the truth described by Paul (Php 3:19).” SEE NUMBER OF THE BEAST.

## Rome Land[[@Headword:Rome Land]]

             a large open space in front of the minster of Waltham, Bury St. Edmund's, and St. Alban's, called the forbury at Reading, and probably the original of the tombland of Norwich, so called since 1302.

## Rome Scot, Or Rome Fee[[@Headword:Rome Scot, Or Rome Fee]]

             an annual tribute of a thousand marks paid by king John to the see of Rome. The money was remitted for the support of an English school or college in Rome, and was held by some of the popes to be a proof of the dependence of England on the Roman see. It was abolished Jan. 15, 1534. SEE PETER-PENCE.

## Rome, Benjamin (Ben-Jehuda) Of[[@Headword:Rome, Benjamin (Ben-Jehuda) Of]]

             a learned Jew, flourished in the 14th century, and is the author of commentaries on Kings, Chronicles, and Proverbs. They are still in MS., but “represent the sound and single exegesis of the Spanish school, abounding with quotations from Jonah Ibn-Jaunah, Ibn-Gikatilla, Ibn- Balam, Ibn-Ezra, Joseph Kimchi, and David Kimchi, and are of considerable interest for the history of exegesis.” See De Rossi, Dictionario Storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 63 (Germ. transl.); Ginsburg, Levita's Massoreth ha-Massoreth, p. 81, note 91; Wolf, Bibliotheca Hebr. 3, 152, No. 393; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodleiana, p. 790, 1840, 2769; the same in the Jewish Literature (Lond. 1857), p. 146, 376; and Bibliographisches Handbuch, p. 21, No. 206 (Leips. 1859); Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 1, 117. (B.P.)

## Rome, Bishop Of[[@Headword:Rome, Bishop Of]]

             SEE POPE.

## Rome, Councils Of[[@Headword:Rome, Councils Of]]

             The most important are:

1. In 313, against the lapsi, and on discipline;

2. In 341, by pope Julius I and the Eastern bishops, in favor of Athanasius;

3. In 352, by Liberius, for the same object;

4. In 358, against the emperor Constans and the heretics;

5. In 364, at which were present deputies from the Council of Lampsacus;

6. In 366, at which the Macedonians adopted the Nicene Creed;

7. In 367, to examine into the charge of adultery preferred against the pope Damasus;

8. In 369, by Damasus, at which Ursinus and Valera were condemned;

9. In 372, at which Auxentius, bishop of Milan, was excommunicated;

10. In 374, by Damasus, condemning Apollinaris;

11. In 375, condemning Lucius, bishop of Alexandria;

12. In 376, against the Apollinarists and others;

13. In 380, fourth of Damasus, against the Sabellians, Arians, etc.;

14. In 400, against the Donatists;

15. In 430, against Nestorius;

16. In 444, against the Manichees;

17. In 774, giving Charlemagne power to elect the Roman pontiff, and to invest all bishops;

18. In 963, deposing pope John XII and appointing Leo VIII;

19. In 964, deposing Leo VIII;

20. In 964, restoring Leo VIII and deposing Benedict V, etc. SEE LATERAN; SEE VATICAN.

## Rome, Jews In[[@Headword:Rome, Jews In]]

             The origin of the Jews in Rome is very obscure. If credit is to be given to a reading in Valerius Maximus, as it is found in two epitomists — Julius Paris and Januarius Nepotianus — the Jews were already in Rome in 139 B.C. The old reading was, “Idem (C. Cornelius Hispalla, praetor peregrinus) qui Sabazii Jovis cultu simulato mores Romanos inficere conati sunt, domos suas repetere coegit.” The epitomists read:

PARIS.

“Idem Judoeos qui Sabazii Jovis cultu Romance inficere domos suas coegit.” mores conati sunt, repetere

NEPOTIANUS.

“Judaeos quoque qui Romanis tradere sacra sua conati sunt, idem Hispalus urbe exterminavit arasque privatas a publicis locis abjecit.”

If this reading be genuine, we find the Jews not merely settled in Rome, but a dangerous and proselyting people, three quarters of a century before the taking of Jerusalem by Pompey. But aside from the fact that both Paris and Nepotianus are post-Christian writers, the question comes up, “What have the Jews to do with Jupiter Sabazius — a Phrygian god?” Without arguing the question at any length, we may unhesitatingly say that the whole is a flagrant anachronism, introduced into the text of Valerius after the time when the Jews, either of themselves or as connected with the Christians, had become much more familiar to the general ear. Friedlander, in his Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms, 3, 510, adopts the reading of Valerius Maximus as a source; but it is certain that the first settlement of the Jews at Rome was under Pompey, when vast numbers of slaves were brought to the capital. These slaves were publicly sold in the markets, but, if we may believe Philo, were soon emancipated by their tolerant masters, who were unwilling to do violence to their religious feelings. Is it not more probable that there were some, if not many, opulent commercial Jews already in Rome, “who, with their usual national spirit, purchased, to the utmost of their means, their unhappy countrymen, and enabled them to settle in freedom in the great metropolis?” Certain it is that at the time when Cicero delivered his memorable oration to vindicate Flaccus their influence was already felt; for being afraid of the large number of Jews Cicero saw in the audience, he delivered his speech in a low voice (Cicero,  Pro Flacco, 28). Under Julius Caesar they enjoyed great liberties; for, as Suetonius tells us, they were among the mourners — the most sincere mourners — at the obsequies of Caesar; they waited for many nights around his entombment (“praecipue Judei qui noctibus continuis bustum frequentarunt” [Jul. c. 84]). At the time of Augustus, the number of Jews residing at Rome already amounted to several thousand. Tacitus gives their number at 4000, and Josephus states that 8000 were present when Archelaus appeared before Augustus (Ant. 17, 11, 1; War, 2, 6, 1). They formed the chief population of the trans-Tiberine region: τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς ῾Ρώμης ἀποτομήν, ἣν οὐκ ἠγνόει κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ι᾿ουδαίων· ῾Ρωμαῖοι δὲ ησαν οἱ μλείους ἀπελευθερωθέντες. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀχθέντες εἰς Ι᾿ταλίαν, ὑπὸ τῶν κτησαμένων ἐλευθερώθησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων παραχαράξαι βιασθέντες. Such is the report Philo gives in Legat. ad Caium, § 23 (Mang. 2, 568). Augustus was at first an enemy to all foreign religions, and even praised Caius, the son of Agrippa, for not having sacrificed in Jerusalem (Sueton. Augustus, 93). But as he advanced in years he grew more superstitious, and finally ordered that sacrifices for his welfare should be offered in the Jewish temple. The kindly feelings of Augustus towards the Jews were no doubt increased by his private friendship for Herod, and we must not be surprised at the special favors shown to the Jews by Augustus; for the less wealthy Jews not only shared in the general largess of corn which was distributed among the poorer inhabitants of the city, but, by a special favor of the monarch, their portion was reserved for the following day if the distribution fell on a Sabbath.

The first direct persecution of the Jews occurred under the reign of Tiberius, who sent 4000 Jewish youth against the robbers of Sardinia, purposely exposing them to the inclemencies of the climate (“si ob gravitatem coeli interirent, vile damnum,” as Tacitus writes), and who banished all the others from Rome (Tacit. Annal. 2, 85; Sueton. Tiberius, 36). The ground of this decree is stated to have been the emperor's desire to suppress all foreign superstitions, more especially the Jewish, which numbered many proselytes. Josephus explains that a certain Jewish impostor who acted as a rabbi in Rome had, in concert with three other Jews, succeeded in proselytizing Fulvia, a noble Roman lady. On pretense of collecting for the Temple, they received from her large sums, which they appropriated to their own purposes. The fraud was detected, and Sejanus, who at that time was high in the emperor's confidence, used the opportunity for inciting his master to a general persecution of the Jews.  After the death of Sejanus, the Jews were allowed to return to Rome to be oppressed by Caligula. Claudius (A.D. 41-45) again banished them from Rome, probably on account of the disputations and tumults excited by them in consequence of the spread of Christianity (“Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit” [Sueton. Claudius, 25]). Yet here, as elsewhere, oppression and persecution seemed not to be the slightest check on their increase, and it is true what Dion Cassius remarks, that the Jews were a γένος, κολουσθὲν μὲν πολλάκις, αὐξηθὲν δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον (37:17). They had a sort of council, or house of judgment, which decided all matters of dispute. To this, no doubt, either in the synagogue or law court attached to it, Paul expected to give an account of his conduct. “The numbers of the Jews in Rome were, doubtless, much increased; but their respectability as well as their popularity was much diminished by the immense influx of the most destitute as well as of the most unruly of the race, who were swept into captivity by thousands after the fall of Jerusalem.” The change appears to be very marked. Rome tolerated, indeed, all religions; but the exclusiveness and the isolation of the Jews at Rome raised against them popular prejudice. The language of the incidental notices which occur about the Jews in the Latin authors, after this period, seems more and more contemptuous, and implies that many of them were in the lowest state of penury the outcasts of society. Juvenal bitterly complains that the beautiful and poetic grove of Egeria was let out to mendicant hordes of Jews, who pitched their camps, like gypsies, in the open air, with a wallet and a bundle of hay for their pillow as their only furniture:

“Nunc sacri fontis nemus et delubra locantur Judaeis,

quorum cophinus foenumque supellex” (Sat. 3, 12).

And Martial alludes to their filth, and, what is curious enough, describes them as peddlers, venders of matches, which they trafficked for broken glass (1, 42; 12, 46). Be it as it may, certain it is that the Jews had once a flourishing and influential congregation at Rome, as may be seen from Jewish inscriptions and tombstones which of late have been brought to light.

Such was the checkered history of the dispersed of Israel during the period which ends with the destruction of Jerusalem. Their wanderings and settlements in other parts of Europe, and the events which befell them in  the Roman empire and elsewhere, are fully treated in the articles SEE JEW and SEE ROME.

See Schürer, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte, p. 624 sq.; Hausrath, Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte. 3, 71-81; Edersheim, History of the Jewish Nation, p. 83 sq.; Milman, History of the Jews, 1, 458 sq.; Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 3, 141, 142, 211, 212, 251; Kraus, Roma Sotteranea: Die romischen Katakomben (1873), p. 61 sq., 489 sq.; S. Garrucci, Cimitero degli Antichi Ebrei Scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini (Roma, 1862); Corpus Inscript. Groec. vol. 4, Nos. 9901-9926. (B.P.)

## Romeyn[[@Headword:Romeyn]]

             the name of a family who have long been prominent in the ministry of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. Their ancestors fled from their native country, the United Provinces (now Belgium), during the persecutions of Louis XIV for conscience' sake and for their attachment to the Protestant cause. They took their lives in their hands, leaving all their effects behind them. There were three brothers, one of whom went to England, and was the ancestor of the celebrated Rev. William Romaine, author of The Life, the Walk, and the Triumph of Faith. He was the contemporary and colaborer of Whitefield, Berridge, the countess of Huntingdon, and the Wesleys, with others of the great revivalists of the last century. The other two brothers, somewhere between 1650 and 1660, went to the Dutch West India Islands and Brazil. One of them died soon after. Claas Janse Romeyn, the survivor, left Brazil when that country, which had been subject to the States-general, passed from their possession in 1661. He came to New York and died about twelve years later. Of his descendants the following are entitled to notice among the deceased ministers of the Reformed Church.

1. JAMES,

son of James Van Campen Romeyn, born at Greenbush, N.Y., in 1797, was a graduate of Columbia College in 1816, and of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at New Brunswick in 1819. He was settled successively at Nassau, N.Y., 1820-27; Six Mile Run, N.J., 1827- 33; Hackensack, N.J., as colleague with his venerable father, 1833-36; Catskill, N.Y., 1836-40; Leeds, N.Y., 1842-44; Bergen Neck, N.J. 1844- 50; Geneva, N.Y., 1850-51. He had scarcely begun his labors at this place when he was stricken down with paralysis, of which he lingered, often in great suffering, until death brought him a happy release in 1859. He had previously been declared emeritus at his own request by the classis to which he belonged — a provision by which a minister is honorably discharged from active duties. None of the churches which he served offered him so prominent a position as his pulpit power seemed to others to demand. But this was the result entirely of his own peculiar views, his feeble health, and of his very sensitive nature, which led him to decline more commanding places and enabled him to occupy a congenial retirement. With these feelings he also declined the professorship of logic and rhetoric in Rutgers College, and seldom published any of his pulpit  discourses. He was a frequent contributor to the religious press, writing upon almost all topics of current interest with equal ease and ability. His only published sermons were, one on The Crisis and its Claims upon the Church of God, preached, June, 1842, before the General Synod of the Reformed Church, of which he was the retiring president; another, entitled A Plea for the Evangelical Press, preached at the public deliberative meeting of the American Tract Society, October, 1843; and the very last effort of his pen, before he was paralyzed, entitled Enmity to the Cross of Christ. These are all characteristic sermons. The last was published in Dr. H.C. Fish's Pulpit Eloquence of the Nineteenth Century, and also in pamphlet form by the author as “A parting memorial to the people of his former charges.” He was the author of a famous Report on the State of the Church, made to the General Synod in 1848; and also published a remarkable address before the Greene County Agricultural Society, during his residence there. In his will he forbade any posthumous publication of his discourses. His correspondence would make one of the raciest volumes of epistolary writing in our language. Probably the best idea of his pulpit oratory and sermons may be formed from the statements which we quote. Dr. James W. Alexander, writing to a friend in September, 1844, from Staten Island, says: “Here I heard James Romeyn; and a more extraordinary man I never heard. Fullness of matter, every step sudden and unexpected, genius, strength, fire, terror, amazing and preposterous rapidity, contempt of rule and taste. It was an awful discourse: 1Th 5:3.

It was one which I shall not soon forget.” Another contemporary says of him: “I think I see him now — his tall form, which, in face at least, I fancy to have been Laurence Sterne's, strung up to the highest nervous tension, and his tongue pouring forth a lava tide of burning eloquence, the most powerful to which I have ever listened. Powerful,” he adds, “is just the word. I have heard men more remarkable for literary polish, more original in fancy, more erudite in learning, more winning in pathos; but for the grander sublimities of eloquence I never heard his equal. His denunciations were awful; he abounded in this style. I have heard of his preaching his first sermon on the text, ‘Yet forty days and Nineveh shall be destroyed,' of which the effect was startling. He abounded and excelled in illustration. He laid all literature and knowledge under contribution for this purpose.” Yet with all these characteristics of a Boanerges, he was tender and soul moving. He could as easily bring tears to the eyes as terrors to the conscience. His zeal was flaming. His love to Christ and to souls and to the kingdom of Christ burned in every sermon and inflamed every prayer. His  prayers were as remarkable as his sermons for fullness, variety, point, and overwhelming effects. The hymnology of the Church afforded him more illustration, and was quoted with more power than by any other minister whom we ever heard. His grasp of a great subject, his analytic skill, his surprising fertility of figurative language, and historical, scientific, literary, and especially scriptural, illustrations, his condensed, intense modes of expression, the beauty of his language, and the uplifting power of his I eloquence made him, as a preacher, perfectly unique and inimitable. He thought in figures, and his figures were powers. His voice was strong and commanding; his utterance was more rapid than that of any other public speaker, not excepting the celebrated statesman Rufus Choate; his action was as energetic as his thought, and perfectly exhausting to his weak and overtaxed body. He never went into his pulpit, not even to lecture in a country school-house, without the most careful preparation. His manuscript sermons and lectures are quite as marvelous for their neat and minute chirography as for their literary and theological contents. It is wonderful how he could read them in or out of the pulpit. But his physical and mental peculiarities seem to have been more acutely sensitive than those of ordinary mortals. He could see further, hear quicker, speak and think more rapidly than almost all others. But these very qualities brought with them a more excitable and naturally irritable temperament, more impatience with things and people that were not right in his sight, and other infirmities that needed the constant control of divine grace to enable him to live for Christ. Yet he was, in private life, a most entertaining and interesting companion, mirthful, exuberant, simple as a child, and a fast friend. In the ecclesiastical affairs of his denomination he was a conspicuous and zealous worker, and although, as in his Report on the State of the Church, he seemed to be far in advance of the times, yet, one by one, nearly all of his proposed changes have been adopted and incorporated with the policy and life of the Church. He dealt in principles and facts rather than in theories and fancies. His afflictions enriched his experience, while they caused “many a conflict, many a doubt.” His last days were beclouded by the saddening shadows of disease that fell upon the wreck of his body and mind. But the spirit of his piety and ministerial life still shot up its heavenly radiance through the gloom until he entered into rest. On his tombstone are graven these words expressive of his highest aims: “Thou hast dealt well with thy servant, O Lord! I have passed my days as a minister of Jesus Christ. That is enough! That is enough! I am satisfied. God has led me by a right way. Bless the Lord, O my soul!”

2. JAMES VAN CAMPEN,

son of Rev. Thomas and Susannah (Van Campen) Romeyn, was born at Minisink, Sussex Co., N.J., Nov. 15, 1765. A child of the covenant, he was converted at an early age, and was always noted for conscientious piety and for the simplicity and frankness of his well-balanced character. He was educated at the Schenectady Academy, which was the germ of Union College, under the eye of his uncle, Dr. Theodoric Romeyn, with whom he afterwards studied theology. He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of New York, Oct. 5, 1787, and immediately settled as pastor of the united churches of Greenbush and Schodac, Rensselaer Co., N.Y., opposite Albany. In 1794 he relinquished the Schodac Church and took charge of a new enterprise which he had organized at Wynant's Kill in connection with the Church at Greenbush. In 1799 he removed to New Jersey, having accepted a call to the united Second Churches of Hackensack and Schralenburg, which had been formed out of the old original churches there, and where he remained until disease compelled him to cease all active service, in 1832. His ministry in New Jersey began at a period of bitter dissensions between the Coetus and Conferentie parties, which, perhaps, raged with more theological and personal violence in these two churches than in any other part of the Dutch denomination. True to the antecedents and instincts of his family, Mr. Romeyn was a leader of the liberal and progressive side. The reactionary party were, as a rule, arrayed also against the national struggle for independence. Politics embittered the ecclesiastical disputes. Families were divided; personal strifes ran so high that, in many cases, the opposing parties would neither worship together, nor speak to each other, nor even turn out for each other on the roads.

In 1822 another great conflict which had arisen some years previously culminated in the secession of Rev. Solomon Froeligh, D.D., a professor of theology and pastor of the old churches of Hackensack and Schralenburg, and four other clergymen, with seven congregations, who formed what they called the “True Reformed Dutch Church in America.” All the rancor and obstinacy of the old strifes seemed to be transferred to this unhappy movement, in which Mr. Romeyn was necessarily involved as the chief representative of the faith and polity of the Church against which this revolt was directed. But he stood undaunted — prudent in counsel, energetic in action, and conciliatory in disposition. He was admirably fitted for his burdens by his natural endowments, his high moral qualities, and his pervading piety. No one could charge him with rash enterprise, doubtful  expedients, personal antipathies, excited words, retaliating acts, or irritating and aggressive measures. In the affairs of the Church he was the ready helper, the judicious counsellor, the pacificator. Without the form of judicial authority, he wielded an influence far more effectual, desirable, and honorable. In person Mr. Romeyn was tall, large and well proportioned, erect and of commanding presence, dignified and impressive. He was retiring, modest, stable, strong, and earnest. His piety was serene, profound, chastened by divine discipline, and developed with great simplicity and tenderness. His mind was neither rapid nor brilliant nor original, but clear, comprehensive, well trained, and practical. In doctrine he was a strong Calvinist, holding the truth in love, “and insisting more upon the spirit which is life than upon the letter which killeth.” His own congregations remained perfectly united and peaceful amid the surrounding strife, and his ministry was blessed with a steady ingathering of souls and growth in grace. He preached from carefully prepared analyses, with fluent speech, terse expression, and a remarkable facility in the use of appropriate Scripture language. This was especially the case in his communion services, when the Church members stood around successive tables, and, as he gave with his own hand the broken bread to each one, he accompanied it with some brief quotation from the Bible particularly adapted to the circumstances of the recipient. Here his pastoral tact and intimate knowledge of his flock were often manifested with a power which melted every heart and carried his people up to the top of the mount of communion. He was very active and prominent in the general councils of the Church, for many years was stated clerk, and in 1806 president of the General Synod. From 1807 till his death he was a trustee of Rutgers College, and also rendered great aid in securing funds for the theological professorships. His only published matter consists of a manifesto in regard to a controversy, an address to theological students at New Brunswick (Magazine of the Reformed Dutch Church, 4, 202), and some synodical reports. He died in perfect peace at Hackensack after a lingering illness of paralysis which had laid him aside from all pastoral work for eight years, June 27, 1840.

3. JEREMIAH,

son of John and Juliana (M'Carty) Romeyn, and nephew of the Rev. Thomas Romeyn, Sr., was born in New York Dec. 24, 1768. He was educated at Hackensack Academy under the celebrated Peter Wilson,  LL.D., and in theology under the Rev. Drs. Theodoric Romeyn and John H. Meyer. Before he was twenty years old he was ordained to the ministry, Nov. 10, 1788, and settled as pastor of a Dutch Church at Linlithgow, N.Y., Livingston's Manor. In 1806 he removed to Harlem, remaining there as pastor until 1814, when he went to Delaware County, serving churches at Schoharie Kill and Beaver Dam, the latter of which was resuscitated by his labors. In 1817 he removed to Woodstock, N.Y., on account of his daughter's health, but after a few months was himself taken with the disease of which he died, July 17, 1818. In 1797 he was appointed professor of Hebrew by the General Synod of the Reformed Church, and held this office until his death. “His personal appearance,” says one of his pupils of 1812, “was uncommonly imposing — nearly six feet in height, of a full habit, grave, dignified, and graceful. His head was finely formed, his visage large, with a dark-blue powerful eye, well set under an expanded brow; his countenance florid; his hair full and white, and usually powdered before entering the pulpit or associating with gentlemen of the old school.” As a preacher, he was distinguished by his “deep bass voice, of remarkable smoothness and considerable compass;” by an easy, deliberate manner; and by great accuracy of language, precision of thought, and variety of treatment. He was described as combining the Dutch style of pulpit method with the English mode of reasoning and the French vivacity, and picturesque setting of illustration and expression with the most perfect self command. His theological culture was large and profound, and his reputation as a linguist was very high. “He pronounced the Hebrew with the German accent, with great skill according to the Masoretic points. His attachment to this language brought him, and kept him for many years, in close intimacy with the Jewish rabbins and other teachers of Hebrew in New York, who often spoke of his high scholarship in this department.” His temperament was nervous and somewhat irritable, but his piety was pervasive and controlling. He was generous, witty, impulsive, kind, and vivacious — religion and his pulpit absorbed his whole soul. His death was marked by the most perfect trust in “Christ, the hope of glory,” and by patient waiting for his coming.

4. JOHN BRODHEAD, D.D.,

the only son of Theodoric Romeyn, was born at Marbletown, Ulster Co., N.Y., Nov. 8, 1777. After a preliminary education in the Schenectady Academy, he entered the senior class of Columbia College at the age of  seventeen, and graduated with high rank in 1795. The next year he united with his father's Church in Schenectady, and immediately began his theological studies with Dr. John H. Livingston, but completed them under his father. At twenty-one he was licensed to preach by the Classis of Albany, June 20, 1798. In 1799 he became pastor of the Reformed Church of Rhinebeck, Dutchess Co., N.Y., and labored there with increasing popularity and success until, in 1803, he took charge of the Presbyterian Church in Schenectady, which had united in a call upon him after a long period of division. This change enabled him to be with his aged father in his last days. After one year of labor, he went to the First Presbyterian Church in Albany, and sustained himself with great ability in that important Church at the capital of the state. Four years later (in 1808) he accepted the call of the newly formed Cedar Street Presbyterian Church in New York city, of which he continued the pastor until his death, which occurred Feb. 22, 1825, in the twenty-sixth year of his ministry. Dr. Romeyn inherited the nervous sensibility, and the acute, rapid, and decisive characteristics of his family. He was a man of medium size and fine personal appearance; quick in his movements, cultivated in manner, and earnest in his work.

He was a great reader, and his fine library was filled with well-used works in almost all departments of literature. His theological attainments were general rather than profound. As a preacher, he was among the foremost of his day. Even when the New York pulpit contained such men as Dr. John M. Mason and Dr. Alexander M'Leod, he built up his new Church under the very shadows of their sanctuaries with complete success. With a congregation composed of the elite of the city, his popularity was maintained by discourses which always evinced careful preparation, and by a pastoral tact which was almost unrivalled. Few men have had such power to attach their people to their ministry as he. The greatest characteristic of his preaching was his magnetic power of attraction and impression. His sermons were not remarkable for analysis or discussion, hut in their application, and especially in dealing with consciences, and in appeals to the emotional nature, he was a prince of preachers. His published volumes of sermons, like those of Whitefield, do not sustain his great reputation as a pulpit orator.

Their power over his audiences was doubtless owing to his impressive delivery, which was generally pleasing, natural, and full of vivacity. “At times every line of his face, even his whole frame, became instinct with passion, and then the eye kindled or became tearful, the very soul speaking through the body, that trembled with emotion or erected itself into an attitude of authority. The torrent of feeling often subdued and  carried away his hearers with responding emotion. Dr. Romeyn, and young Spencer, of Liverpool, have always been associated in my mind as having strong points of resemblance” (Dr. Vermilye, in Sprague's Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 223). His ministry was exceedingly blessed, and especially among the young. “His catechetical classes were crowded. Of a very large Bible class of young ladies every one became a professor of religion. More young men became ministers from his congregation than from any other.” In addition to two volumes of Sermons (published in 1816 and reprinted in Scotland), Dr. Romeyn printed a number of occasional discourses, delivered upon national and other important occasions among these was an Oration on the Death of Washington (1800). He was active in the benevolent movements of his day — a trustee of Princeton College from 1809; a principal agent in establishing the Theological Seminary in that place, and one of its first directors; moderator of the General Assembly in 1810, when he was but thirty-three years of age; and one of the founders of the American Bible Society in 1816. He was also its first secretary for domestic correspondence. His health was not equal to the constant strain to which his zealous spirit, peculiar trials, and infirmities of mind and body subjected him. A tour in Europe in 1813 and 1814 brought transient relief; but for more than a year prior to his death his strength gave way, and he finished his course with joy, making “earnest intercession for his family and his flock, “and supported by the most cheering heavenly prospects and triumphant faith in Christ.

5. THEODORE (OR DIRCK), D.D.,

a younger half-brother of Thomas, Sr., was born at Hackensack, N.J., Jan. 12 (O.S.), 1744. His elementary education was received from his elder brother Thomas and the Rev. J. M. Goetschius, pastor of the united churches of Hackensack and Schralenburg. He entered the junior class in Princeton College while the Rev. Dr. Finley was president, and graduated in 1765 in the same class with the younger Jonathan Edwards, who was his bosom friend; and Dr. Sprague states that it was partly through his influence that Dr. Edwards was, many years after, chosen president of Union College. Converted at the age of sixteen, he immediately gave himself up to the ministry of the Gospel, studied theology with the Rev. J.M. Goetschius, and was licensed in 1766, after a two days' examination, by the American Classis, or Coetus, of the Dutch Church. His first settlement was at Marbletown, Rochester, and Wawarsing, Ulster Co.,  N.Y., from 1766 to 1775. He then removed to Hackensack, his native place, and Schralenburg, where he ministered until 1784, when he went to Schenectady, his last settlement (1784 to 1804). During this period he declined numerous urgent calls from more prominent churches. He was twice elected president of Queen's College (now Rutgers), N.J., but declined both invitations. His zeal for education led him to establish the Schenectady Academy, out of which grew Union College. He was the father of this institution, and its presidency was first offered to him, but declined for reasons satisfactory to himself. The General Synod of his Church appointed him lector in theology, an office which he held from 1792 to 1797, when he was elected professor of theology, and so remained until his decease. Dr. Romeyn was gifted with a powerful intellect, mature and comprehensive judgment, great executive ability, a remarkably retentive memory, a strong will, and those marked qualities which made him “a leader and commander in Israel.”

He was foremost, with Dr. Livingston and others, in the movements which secured the independence of the Dutch Church from the control of the Church in Holland. His bold patriotism during the Revolutionary war made him a conspicuous mark for Tory and British persecutions and revenges. The British troops sacked his dwelling, and destroyed or carried off all his furniture, clothing, books, and papers. He was obliged to remove his family for safety, but made frequent visits to his congregations, which were always attended by danger; and at one time his life nearly paid the forfeit from armed loyalists. Among the prisoners who were carried off from Hackensack when it was attacked by the British was his own brother, who was held captive three months. He also saved a number of men by hiding them in his own house behind a chimney. During all this period he was in intimate relations with some of the most distinguished officers of the army. “He was the counsellor of senators, the adviser and compeer of the warriors of the Revolution, and an efficient co-worker with the patriot.”

His pulpit oratory was powerful and popular. He was learned and yet practical; “a son of thunder,” and “a son of consolation” also. His discourses were rich in solid matter, enlivened with historical anecdote and illustration. He went deeply into his subject, and his appeals to conscience and the feelings were at times overwhelming. His manner was natural, easy, and commanding. “His most expressive organ was his eye, and when he was excited no one could withstand its power.” As a theological professor he gave full satisfaction to his students and to the Church which honored him. He was stately, reserved, affable, but not familiar. Governor De Witt Clinton describes him as having  “something in his manner peculiarly dignified and benevolent, calculated to create veneration as well as affection, and it created an impression upon my mind that can never be erased.” Another of his friends, and a student in theology (Dr. Jacob Brodhead), says that “un his external form, his manly, noble stature, his majestic though sometimes stern countenance, he resembled the illustrious Washington.” Another says, “He was unquestionably the first man in our Church, among the first in the whole American Church. His piety was deep, practical, and experimental. He realized more than others his own errors and weaknesses, and trusted like a little child in the Savior whom he preached and loved.” He died April 16, 1804, having been in the ministry thirty-eight years. His wife was Elizabeth Brodhead, of Ulster Co., N.Y., by whom he had two children, a daughter and a son. The daughter became the wife of Caleb Beck, of Albany, and mother of three very eminent physicians — Drs. Theodoric Romeyn, Lewis C., and John B. Beck. The son was the Rev. John B. Romeyn, D.D., whose memorial is given above.

6. THOMAS, SR.,

son of Nicholas Romeyn, was born at Pompton, N.J., March 20 (0. S.), 1729. His father being a farmer, he was brought up in the same calling until April, 1747, when he began to study for the Gospel ministry. He was a student in Princeton College under the presidency of the Rev. Aaron Burr, D.D., and pursued his studies with the Rev. Theodorus Frelinghuysen. pastor of the Dutch Church in Albany, N.Y. Having completed this course, and received a call from the Dutch Church in Jamaica, L.I., he sailed for Europe April 11, 1753, and was examined, licensed, ordained, and installed by the Classis of Amsterdam as pastor of the Church in Jamaica, to which he returned Aug. 27, 1754. His first wife was Margaret, daughter of the Rev. Theodorus Jacobus Frelinghuysen, by whom he had one son, the Rev. Theodorus Frelinghuysen Romeyn. She died at Jamaica in 1757. In 1760, on account of difficulties in his congregation, he accepted a call to the Church at Minisink, on the Delaware River. After a pastorate of ten years he removed to Caugllnawaga, N.Y., in 1770, where he continued as pastor of the Church until his decease at Mayfield, Montgomery Co., Oct. 22, 1794. He married his second wife, Susannah Van Campen, of Sussex County, N.J., Oct. 3, 1770. Six sons were born of this marriage. Of all his seven sons, four were educated for the ministry — Theodorus Frelinghuysen, James Van Campen, Benjamin, and Thomas, Benjamin died  soon after graduating at Williams College in 1796. The others were all ordained to the ministry of their mother Church. Theodorus F. died in 1785, after a single year of service as the beloved pastor of the churches of Bridgewater and Bedminster, N.J. Their venerable father was the first Low-Dutch minister who settled west of Schenectady, in the valley of the Mohawk.

His field of labor, being on the frontier, embraced large portions of what are now Fulton and Montgomery counties, surrounding the old church at Caughnawaga (now Fonda). His duties were consequently very arduous and often dangerous, from exposure to Indians and other pioneer trials. His missionary spirit was accompanied by intense devotion to the liberal views of the Coetus, who advocated the education and ordination of the clergy in this country, and independence of the Church in Holland. During the whole period of the Revolutionary war he was an enthusiastic patriot. His residence on the frontier was the theater of frequent alarms, murders, and desolations, which often interrupted, and at one time stayed, his ministerial labors. He was obliged to flee with all his family into the interior for safety until the danger was passed. He is represented to have been of a mild and patient spirit, “enduring hardness as a good soldier of Jesus Christ,” and unostentatious in his demeanor. As a preacher, he was lucid and winning, strongly attached to the doctrines of grace as set forth in the standards of his Church, and able in their defense. In the pulpit he was solemn, earnest, and tender. His last illness, for more than a year, was borne with meek submission to the will of God, until his long ministry of forty years was closed by death. His remains were buried in front of the pulpit in the old church where for twenty-four years he had preached the Gospel of Christ.

7. THOMAS, JR.,

son of Rev. Thomas Romeyn, Sr., was born at Caughnawaga (now Fonda), N.Y., Feb. 22, 1777. Educated in the classics by his brother, Rev. James V. C. Romeyn, and at the Schenectady Academy, he graduated at Williams College, Mass., in September, 1796; studied theology with Dr. Theodoric Romeyn in Schenectady; was licensed to preach by the Classis of Albany in 1798, and ordained in the Dutch Church of Remsenbush (now Florida), N.Y., in 1800, having the double charge of that congregation and the Second Church of Schenectady. In 1806 he accepted the pastoral care of the churches of Niskayuna and Amity, N.Y., and served them until 1827, when he was disabled by a fall, which lamed him for life and compelled him  to abandon active duty as a settled minister. He had a large, powerful frame, and was dignified, humorous, courteous, and decided, as well as amiable and transparently honest. His intellect was vigorous, his judgment almost uniformly correct, and his shrewd, pointed, quiet humor gave great zest to his deliberate and thoughtful speech. In the pulpit he was noted for theological exactness of statement, for knowledge and apt quotations of Scripture, for deep piety, and for practical usefulness. His attainments were respectable, but his wide influence over a large section of the Church was chiefly due to his thorough knowledge of “the law of the house” and his wisdom as a counsellor and peacemaker. He died Aug. 9, 1859, revered by all who knew him, and in “the full assurance of faith.” He was a pillar of the Reformed Church in the valley of the Mohawk. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 4, 9; Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Church; Magazine of the Ref. Dutch Church; Life of Dr. J.H. Livingston; Taylor. Annals of the Classis of Bergen; Fish, Pulpit Eloquence of the 19th Century. (W.J.R.T.)

## Rommel, Dietrich Christopher Von[[@Headword:Rommel, Dietrich Christopher Von]]

             the Hessian historian, was born April 17, 1781. For some time he was professor at Marburg, and from 1820 he resided at Cassel as president of the governmental archives. He died in 1859. His historical works are of great importance to Church history. He published, Philipp der Grossmuthige, Landgraf von Hessen. Eins Beitrag zur genaueren Kunde der Reformation und des 16. Jahrhunderts (Giessen, 1830, 3 vols.): — Landgraf Philipp der Hochherzige u. die Reformation (Darmst. 1845): — Kurze Gesch. d. hess. Kirchenverbesserung unter d. Landgr. Philipp d. Grossmuthige, etc. (Cassel, 1817). See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, 1, 793; 2, 39; Zuchold, Biblioth. Theol. 2, 1082. (B.P.)

## Romowa[[@Headword:Romowa]]

             in Prussian mythology, is the sacred place of the ancient Prussians. A civil war had divided the native Prussians and the immigrant Skandians. Waidewut and Grive, the first king and the first chief priest, had restored peace, and Grive afterwards assembled the people on a beautiful plain on which stood a massive oak with widely spreading branches. Before this tree he had placed three images, which he called Potrimpos, Perkunos, and Pikullos, and declared them to be the supreme gods. Punishments were threatened and rewards promised in their names. Three niches were cut in the oak tree which had been selected to become the home of the idols, and  they were placed there with great solemnity. A pyre was then erected before the tree, from the top of which Grive exhorted the people, and on which sacrifices, including several unmanageable persons, were afterwards burned. A fearful thunderstorm, which the priest declared to be the voice of God, made the people tremble, and caused them to regard Grive with a dread that put them in mortal terror for centuries afterwards when they were obliged to approach him. The place in which this occurred was called Romowa. The priests continued to dwell and offer sacrifices there until the increased population and extension of its territories caused the establishing of other sacred oaks. Christianity ultimately came in and extirpated them all, so that the location of the original Romowa is no longer known.

## Romulus[[@Headword:Romulus]]

             a prime character in Roman mythology; but which of the legends concerning this alleged founder and earliest king of their city was regarded as genuine by the Romans is wholly uncertain, since our information is based on very modern sources. The following tradition had, however, become quite generally established in the flourishing period of Roman literature: Two brothers belonging to the royal family descended from AEneas and reigning in Alba, who were named Numitor and Amulius, divided their inheritance so that Numitor received the throne and Amulius the treasure. Amulius, however, soon dethroned his brother, and made a vestal of his daughter Ilia, or Rhea Silvia, in order to guard against offspring on her part. She was, however, approached by the god Mars, and gave birth to the twins Romulus and Remus, whom Amulius caused to be exposed by means of a servant on the overflowed banks of the Tiber. They were nourished by a she wolf and a bird, until found by the shepherd Faustulus, who bore them to his house and reared them with the assistance of his wife, Acca Larentia. On arriving at manhood, they dethroned and killed Amulius and reinstated their grandfather Numitor. After this they founded a new city (Rome); but in the progress of the work a quarrel broke out between them, and Remus was slain by his brother's hand. Romulus now reigned alone in the new state, and after his death was venerated as a god under the name of Quirinus, because of the declaration of Julius Proculus that Romulus had appeared to him in superhuman form. A bronze group of the wolf suckling the twins is still preserved in the  Capitoline Palace, and constitutes one of the most eminent relics of ancient Roman art.

## Romus[[@Headword:Romus]]

             in Greek mythology, was the son of Ulysses and Circe.

## Ronde, Lambertus De[[@Headword:Ronde, Lambertus De]]

             a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America, was colleague with Johannes Ritzema in the Collegiate (Dutch) Church of New York, and successor to the venerable Gualterus du Bois from 1751 to 1784. With his associate Ritzema he was thoroughly educated in one of the universities of Holland, and brought to his pulpit ample preparations. When driven from New York during the Revolutionary war, he supplied the Church of Schaghticoke, near Albany, where he resided during the rest of his life, being too old to resume his labors. He preached only in the Dutch language, and was the leading spirit in opposition to the introduction of English preaching, and in the lawsuit which resulted in favor of the consistory and against “the Dutch party,” who had to pay in costs £300. Notwithstanding all this, his character was always venerated, and he died in a good old age at Schaghticoke, his place of voluntary exile, in 1795. The consistory of the Church in New York gave him an annuity of £200 for life after he left their active service, and the same was given to his aged colleague Ritzema, who died at Kinderhook, N.Y. Mr. de Ronde was a man of respectable attainments and abilities as a preacher, but was not so eminent for these things as he was for his part in the ecclesiastical controversies in that transition period of the Dutch Church. See De Witt, Hist. Discourse, p. 70; Gunn, Life of Livingston, p. 88, 164; Corwin, Manual of the Ref. Ch. p. 70. (W.J.R.T.)

## Roney, Moses[[@Headword:Roney, Moses]]

             a minister of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, was born in Washington County, Pa., Sept. 20, 1804. In his fourteenth year he entered the grammar school of Jefferson College, and graduated from the college in 1823. He spent some time in teaching in Baltimore, and then pursued his studies under Dr. Wilson, receiving his license June 8, 1829. He was ordained and installed pastor in Newburgh, N Y., June 8, 1830. In the great controversy concerning the relations of the Church to the authorities of the United States he opposed the proposed changes. In 1836 the Synod chose him to  be editor of a contemplated magazine, which first appeared in March following as The Reformed Presbyterian, and which he conducted, with the exception of a single year, until it reached the middle of the eighteenth volume. In 1848, on account of ill health, he resigned the editorship, and the next year took charge of the literary institution in Allegheny, Pa., which he retained until nearly the time of his death (July 3, 1854). See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 79.

## Rongala[[@Headword:Rongala]]

             in South Sea Island mythology, is the name of the supreme being or highest god among the inhabitants of the Caroline Islands, in the Pacific Ocean.

## Ronsdorf Sect[[@Headword:Ronsdorf Sect]]

             This name has been given to the clique of fanatics founded by Elias Eller (q.v.) at Elberfeld, and subsequently transferred to Ronsdorf, in the duchy of Berg, Germany.

## Rood (Saxon)[[@Headword:Rood (Saxon)]]

             a cross or crucifix. The term is more particularly applied to the large cross erected in Roman Catholic churches over the entrance of the chancel or choir. This is often of very large size, and when complete is, like other crucifixes, accompanied by the figures of St. John and the Blessed Virgin, placed one on each side of the foot of the cross; but these are often omitted. Lights are frequently placed in front of these roods, especially on certain festivals of the Church.

Occasionally roods or crucifixes are found sculptured outside of churches, on churchyard crosses, on wayside crosses, and at the entrance of chantries and oratories. There is a much-defaced example at Sherborne Minster, in Dorsetshire.

Many churches were dedicated to the holy rood, as the abbey near Edinburgh, and at Daglingworth, Caermarthen, Bettws-y-Grog, Capel Christ, Southampton, Wood Eaton, Swindon, and others. The Church of SS. Vincent and Anastasius, after it received the addition of a transept, was called Holy Cross, from its new shape. The rood was set before the feet (of  the dying, stretched on straw or ashes, emblems of mortality, and also, Beleth says, erected at the head of graves.

## Rood Arch[[@Headword:Rood Arch]]

             the arch which separates the choir from the nave of a cathedral or church, under which the rood screen and rood were anciently placed.

## Rood Beam, Or Rood Loft[[@Headword:Rood Beam, Or Rood Loft]]

             The rood spoken of above was supported either by a beam called the rood beam, or by a gallery called the rood loft, over the screen separating the choir or chancel of a church from the nave. Rood lofts do not appear to have been common in England before, if so soon as, the 14th century. They were approached from the inside of the church, generally by a small stone staircase in the wall, which is often to be found in churches which have lost all other traces of them. The front was frequently richly paneled, and the under side formed into a large covered cornice, or ornamented with small ribs and other decorations, connecting it with the screen below. Although most of the rood lofts in England have been destroyed, a considerable number of examples (more or less perfect) remain, as at Long Sutton, Kingsbury Episcopi, Barnwell, Dunster, Timberscombe. Minehead, and Winsham, Somersetshire; Newark, Nottinghamshire; Charlton-on-Otmoor, and Handborough, Oxfordshire; Merevale, Knowle, and Worm- Leighton, Warwickshire; Flamsted, Hertfordshire; Uffendon, Bradninch, Collumpton, Dartmouth, Kenton, Plymptree, and Hartland, Devon, etc. The rood loft was occasionally placed above the chancel arch, as at Northleach, Gloucestershire. It sometimes extended across the first arch of the nave, as in Castle Hedingham Church, Essex. There are some very fine and rich rood lofts in Wales, in churches which are in other respects plain and poor.

## Rood Bowl[[@Headword:Rood Bowl]]

             a bowl of latten or other material, with a pricket in the center, to hold a taper for lighting the rood screen.

## Rood Chains[[@Headword:Rood Chains]]

             those chains by which, in the case of large figures placed on or beside the rood, such figures were supported. These chains were inserted in the roof in front of the chancel arch. Remains of such chains are to be seen at Collumpton, Devonshire.

## Rood Cloth (Or Rode Cloth)[[@Headword:Rood Cloth (Or Rode Cloth)]]

             the veil by which the large crucifix or rood, which anciently stood over the chancel screen, was covered during Lent. Its color in England was either violet or black, and it was frequently marked with a white cross. We find examples of this cloth figured in mediaeval illuminations.

## Rood Doors[[@Headword:Rood Doors]]

             the doors of the rood screen, separating the nave from the chancel.

## Rood Gallery[[@Headword:Rood Gallery]]

             SEE ROOD-LOFT.

## Rood Gap[[@Headword:Rood Gap]]

             the space under a chancel arch.

## Rood Loft[[@Headword:Rood Loft]]

             SEE ROOD BEAM.

## Rood Mass[[@Headword:Rood Mass]]

             a term sometimes applied

(1) to the daily parish mass said in large churches at the altar under the rood screen; and

(2) sometimes to the mass said on Holy cross Day, or on the feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross.

## Rood Saints[[@Headword:Rood Saints]]

             images of the Virgin Mary and of John the beloved disciple, which were placed on each side of the rood.

## Rood Screen[[@Headword:Rood Screen]]

             a screen separating the choir or chancel of a church from the nave. Above it was a gallery supporting the rood, and called the rood loft. The rood screen had no upper loft, or solar. In early times it had three doors, one facing the altar, the second fronting the gospel side, and a third the epistle side. Before it veils were dropped at the consecration.

## Rood Stair[[@Headword:Rood Stair]]

             the staircase winding up to the rood (q.v.).

## Rood Steps[[@Headword:Rood Steps]]

             the steps into a choir or chancel, commonly found under or immediately before the roodscreen.

## Rood, Anson[[@Headword:Rood, Anson]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was ordained at New Haven, Conn., in 1829. He took up his residence in Philadelphia, Pa., where he died in 1857. He published, A Church Minutes for the Members of the Presbyterian Church (Phila. 1843, 8vo); several pamphlets and papers on theological subjects, temperance reform, etc.; and edited a daily paper in Philadelphia. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors. s.v.

## Rood, Heman, D.D[[@Headword:Rood, Heman, D.D]]

             a Congregational minister, was born at Jericho, Vermont, January 29, 1795. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1819, was preceptor at Montpelier Academy for two years, and in 1822 tutor at Middlebury College. In 1825 he graduated from Andover Theological Seminary; the next year, July 12, became pastor at Gilmanton, N.H.; in April 1830, at New Milford, Connecticut; in September, 1835, professor of sacred literature at the Gilmanton Theological Seminary, and occupied that position until November, 1843. The next ten years he was employed in teaching at Haverhill. From 1853 to 1858 he was acting-pastor at Quechee, in Hartford, Vermont, and from 1858 to 1864 served in the same relation at Hartland. From 1864 to 1878 he resided without charge at Hanover, N.H., and thereafter at Westfield, N.Y., until his death, June 8, 1882. See Cong. Year-book, 1883, page 31.

## Rood-Altar[[@Headword:Rood-Altar]]

             an altar standing under the rood screen. In large churches there were generally two, one on each side of the entrance into the choir.

## Rood-Light[[@Headword:Rood-Light]]

             a light, whether from a mortar with taper or from oil lamps or cressets, placed on or about the rood beam. Such were kept continually burning in ancient parish churches.

## Rood-Steeple, Or Rood-Tower[[@Headword:Rood-Steeple, Or Rood-Tower]]

             This name is sometimes applied to the tower built over the intersection of a cruciform church.

## Roof[[@Headword:Roof]]

             (גָּג, στέγη, Mat 8:8; δῶμα, Act 10:9). The roofs of dwelling houses in the entire East, because of the generally dry weather, are made  flat and are surrounded with a guard or railing (מִעֲקֶת; στεφάνη, See Deu 22:8, where the parapet is insisted on, and comp. Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 48 sq.; 2Ki 1:2; comp. Mishna, Moed Katan, 1, 10; Michaelis, Mos. Rit. 4, 356). Anciently only buildings intended for display had raised roofs; such as temples (Cicero, Orat. 3, 26; Philo, 2, 43; Sueton. Claud. 17). So the Temple in Jerusalem, we are told by Jewish writers, was arched or vaulted, so that no one should repair thither for the same purposes as to the roofs of the houses (comp. also Jerome, Ad Suniamn et Fretel. p. 661). In the East the roof consists usually of a waterproof tiling (Mariti, Trav. p. 246 sq.; Tavernier, Voyage, 1, 168) or of stones (Vitruv. 2, 1, 5; Schweigger, Reis. p. 263), and is raised a little at one side or in the middle to shed water (Pliny, 36, 62; Burckhardt, Arab. p. 152). Pipes are also used to convey the water into cisterns (see Maimon. ad Middoth, 6, 6). A kind of weak, perishable grass commonly grew up between the tiles (Psa 129:6; 2Ki 19:26; Isa 37:27; see Shaw, Trav. p. 210). The roof of Dagon's temple (Jdg 16:27) is said to have been crowded with 3000 persons to behold Samson's feats; but this can hardly mean the top of the temple, because the persons thereon could not see what was passing within. It appears rather to have been a loft or gallery running around the top of the building inside, and supported by pillars with two main posts, in the middle of the temple. A very usual kind of roof is constructed in the following manner: The beams are placed about three feet apart; across these sticks are arranged close together, and thickly matted thorn bush; over this is spread a coat of thick mortar, and lastly the marl or earth, which covers the whole. A large stone roller is kept on the top of the house for the purpose of hardening and flattening the layer of earth, to prevent the rain from penetrating. Roofs, however, are often of a very inferior description to this. They are at times composed of the palm leaf, and in other cases are made of cornstalks or brushwood, spread over with gravel (Robinson, Biblical Res. 1, 243; 2, 279), or of reeds and heather with a layer of beaten earth (Hartley, Researches in Greece, p. 240). The roofs of the great halls in Egypt are covered with flagstones of enormous size. Parapets are uniformly placed around the roof, for the purpose of guarding against accident by falling (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. 2, 122). The roof was much used by the Hebrews, as it still is in Eastern nations. It was often resorted to get fresh air, by convalescents and others (2Sa 11:2; Dan 4:26; comp. Buckingham, Mesop. p. 70; Thomson, Land and Book, 1, 49 sq. See Thilo, Cod. Apocryph. 1, 120, 297, where it is a playground for children). In summer the people slept  there (1Sa 9:26; comp. Tavernier, 1, 168; Buckingham, Mesop. p. 336; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. 3, 85; Morier, Second Journey, p. 230; Robinson, 3, 242).

 It was sought as a place for quiet conversation (1Sa 9:25), for undisturbed lamentation (Isa 15:3; Jer 48:38), for building “booths” (q.v., Neh 8:16), and for various religious actions (2Ki 23:12; Jer 19:13; Zep 1:5; Act 10:9), perhaps with the feeling of being raised nearer to heaven and to God. Acts of a public nature were transacted there (2Sa 16:22), and announcements made (Mat 10:27; Luk 12:3; comp. Josephus, War, 2, 21. 5; Talm. Babyl. Shab. fol. 35, 2; comp. Lucian, Ver. Hist. 2, 46). Nor is this inconsistent with its use for secret interviews, before named, as these took place when neighbors were supposed to be occupied; yet the “upper chamber” (q.v.) was certainly more commonly sought for. Again, the roof was a lookout over the street (Jdg 16:27; Isa 22:1; comp. Shaw, Trav. p. 190), a place for exposing clothes and household stuff to the air (Jos 2:6; comp. Mishna, Toroth, 9, 6; Mikvaoth, 2, 7; Machshir, 6, 2; Maaser, 1, 6, 3; Megilla, 3, 3; Menach, 8, 4); a commanding position for defense against attacks from below (Jdg 9:51; 2 Maccabees 5, 12; comp. Josephus, Ant. 14, 15, 12; War, 4, 1, 4; Schweigger, Reis. p. 263). But a constant residence on the roof, in loneliness and exposure, is a forcible image of a sorrowful life (Pro 21:9; comp. 25:24). It was usual to have two flights of steps to ascend to the roof; one within the house and one in the street. It was easy, too, to climb over the railing of the roof and thus pass from that of one house to its neighbor; or from house to house along a whole street (Mat 24:17; Mar 13:15; Luk 17:31; comp. Flamin, Reisebesch. p. 10; Russel, Aleppo, 1, 45; Josephus, Ant. 13, 5, 3; Mishna, Baba Metsia, fol. 88, 1; Barhebr. Chronicles p. 170). Thus, too, it was easy to pass down from the roof into a house (see Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 601). The passage Mar 2:4 is most naturally explained by supposing Jesus to have been in the chamber immediately under the roof. The people took up the floor of the roof (comp. Josephus, Ant. 14, 15, 12) and let down the sick man (Strauss, Leb. Jes. 2, 61, supposes the usual mode of access from the roof to the upper chamber to be used, which contradicts Mark). This is the meaning of Luke in the parallel passage, Luk 5:19.

If we understand the midst (τὸ μέσον) to mean the court of the house, then the tiling (κέραμοι), as our version has it, or rather bricks, must mean the guard wall around the roof (Faber, Archoeol. 1, 419), or the cornice (Host, Nachr. v. Maroe, p. 264). But it is doubtful whether the  latter was common in Palestine; and the expression into the midst (comp. Luk 4:35; Mar 3:3; Mar 14:60; Joh 20:19) does not admit the above interpretation (Shaw, Trav. p. 186 sq., gives an explanation which does not suit the passage). A literal taking up of the roof, however, would be but a trifling matter, and would involve no injury to the building, if it were like the modern Arab houses in that vicinity. They are very low, and the roof is formed chiefly of twigs and earth, on beams some three feet apart. It is very common to remove part of this to let down goods, etc. (see Thomson, Land and Book, 2, 6 sq.); the Talm. Babl. Moed Katon, 25, 1, says, when R. Huna died, his bier could not pass the door, and it was thought best to let it down through the roof. See Mill, Diss. de Aedium Hebr. Tectis, in Oelrich's Coll. Opusc. Hist. Phil. Theol. 1, 2, 573 sq.; Battus, Diss. de Tectis Hebr. Retectis (Viteb. 1696); Faber, Archoeol. 1, 417 sq.; Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 70, 71, 72, and on Pro 27:15, p. 85. SEE HOUSETOP.

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

             in architecture, is the external covering on the top of a building; sometimes of stone, but usually of wood overlaid with slates, tiles, lead, etc. The form and construction of the timber work of roofs differ materially according to the nature of the building on which it is to be placed, and any attempt to notice all the varieties would far exceed the limits of this work. The main portions of the framing, which in most cases are placed at regular intervals, are each called a truss, principal, or pair of principals. These, in ornamental open roofs, are the leading features, and in some ancient roofs are contrived with an especial view to appearance. The accompanying diagrams of two of the simplest kinds of modern roofs will serve to explain the names of the most important timbers: a king-post roof has one vertical post in each truss, a queen-post roof has two.

Mediaeval roofs vary so much in their structure, on account of the ornamental disposition of the pieces, that it is not easy to establish a universal nomenclature for them. Many names of beams and timbers occur in old contracts of which the original application is often uncertain.

The Hammer-beam roofs contain most of the peculiarities of structure that distinguish the mediaeval roofs from the modern roofs, and the following nomenclature may be adopted in describing them: Sometimes one hammer- beam is repeated over another, forming, as it were, two stories. It is then called a double hammer-beam roof, and the nomenclature runs: lower hammer-beam, upper hammer-beam, lower hammer-brace, upper hammer-brace, lower side-post, upper side-post, etc.

It must be remembered that all upright pieces may be called posts, with an epithet, if necessary, e.g. Pendant-post. Inclined pieces, if not rafters, are braces, and commonly derive their epithet from the piece under which they are placed, or which they principally stiffen, as collar-brace. Ashlar pieces are fixed to every one of the rafters in most mediaeval roofs. but they are sometimes concealed by cornice — moldings and frieze — boards. The example from Dorchester shows the hammer-beam construction with collar-brace, side post, etc.

Of the construction of the wooden roofs of the Ancients very little is known, but it was probably of the most inartificial kind, and judging from the form of their pediments, the pitch of them was low. Some small buildings still retain their original roofs of marble, as the Tower of the Winds, and the Choragic Monument of Lisicrates at Athens. The Mausoleum of Theodoric at Ravenna has a domed roof, formed of a single block of stone, nearly thirty-six feet in diameter.

Saxon roofs were elevated, but to what degree we have no certain account; neither is there satisfactory evidence of their internal appearance. The illuminations in manuscripts seem to represent them as often covered with slates, tiles, or shingles.

Norman roofs were also raised, in some cases to a very steep pitch; but in others the elevation was more moderate, the ridge being formed at about a right angle. It does not appear that at this period the construction was made ornamental, although, doubtless, in many cases the framing was open to view. The covering was certainly sometimes of lead, but was probably oftener of a less costly material.

Early English roofs were generally, if not always, made with a steep slope, though not universally of the same pitch. Sometimes the section of the roof  represented an equilateral triangle, and sometimes the proportions were flatter. A few roofs of this date still exist, as on the nave of Hales Owen Church, Shropshire: this originally had tie beams across it, and under every rafter additional pieces of timber are fixed, which are cut circular, so that the general appearance is that of a series of parallel ribs forming a barrel vault. This seems to have been a common mode of improving the appearance of roofs in this style before any important ornaments were applied to them. The additional pieces under the rafters were usually either quite plain or only chamfered on the edges. A molded rib sometimes ran along the top, and a cornice next the wall plate, both of which were generally small. The tie beams also were frequently molded.

When first the approach of the Decorated style began to exercise an influence, the roofs, though still of the same construction, became somewhat more ornamental. There are also roofs existing of this date, and some probably earlier, in country churches, the insides of which are formed into a series of flat spaces, or cants. They are usually quite plain, with the exception of the tie beam and cornice, which are frequently molded, and the king post, which is commonly octagonal, with a molded capital or base. Of a later period, roofs of this kind are extremely common in some districts, but they are generally to be distinguished from the earlier specimens by being arranged in seven cants instead of six. Of the older description good examples remain at Chartham Church, Kent, and on the south aisle of Merrow Church, Surrey. Most of these roofs are now ceiled, but probably many of them were originally open.

As the Decorated style advanced, the leading timbers of the principals were often formed into an arch by the addition of circular braces under the tie beams, the beams themselves being also frequently curved. The spandrels formed by these braces were very usually filled with pierced tracery, and the timbers generally were more molded and enriched than in the earlier styles. Where the lines of moldings were interrupted, they very commonly terminated in carved leaves or other ornaments. Sometimes, the tie beams were omitted in roofs of high pitch, but the principals were generally arched. The roofs of domestic halls, in the Decorated style, appear to have been more enriched than those of churches: that of Malvern Priory had a variety of cross braces above the tie beams cut into ornamental featherings; that of the archbishop of Canterbury's palace at Mayfield, Sussex, was  supported on stone arches spanning the whole breadth of the room (about forty feet). This kind of construction is also partially used in the hall at the Mote, Ightham, Kent. This kind of construction, a wooden roof supported on stone arches instead of the large timbers necessary for the principals, seems to have been more common than is generally supposed, and at all periods.

In the Perpendicular style hammer-beam roofs were introduced (one of the finest specimens of which is that on Westminster Hall), and, together with them, most numerous varieties of construction for the sake of ornament. These are far too manifold to be enument. These are far too manifold to be enumerated; many specimens exist in churches and halls, some of which are extremely magnificent, and are enriched with tracery, featherings, pendants, and carvings of various kinds, in the greatest profusion. Many roofs in this style were nearly or quite flat; these, when plain, had the timbers often exposed to view, and molded; in other cases they were ceiled with oak and formed into panels, and were usually enriched with bosses and other ornaments of similar description to those of the higher roofs; good examples remain at Cirencester Church, Gloucestershire. On halls hammer-beam roofs were principally used, but on churches other kinds of construction were more prevalent. There are some mediaeval buildings, principally vestries, apses, and portions of churches, which are entirely roofed with stone. They are generally of high elevation, and often have ribs answering to the rafters in a wooden roof. They occur at all periods, and in some cases may have been erected for protection against fire; in other cases, when the material was suitable, perhaps from economy.

The name of roof is often applied to what are, in fact. ceilings having an external coverings or outer roof, distinct from that which is seen. Vaulted roofs are also frequently spoken of, but a vault usually has an outer roof over it, and is more properly a vaulted ceilings See Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.; Chambers's Encyclop. s.v.; Walcott, Sac. Archoeol. s.v.

## Rooke, Thomas George[[@Headword:Rooke, Thomas George]]

             an English Baptist minister, was born in 1838 in London. After four years devoted to legal studies, the state of his health compelled him to travel in the East. On his return he determined to enter the ministry, and was  accordingly received and educated in Regent's Park College. .In; 1862 he again travelled in the East, and on his return became pastor at Sheppard's Barton, Frome serving until 1876, when he became president of the college at Rawdon. He acquired an exceptional knowledge of the Oriental languages. He died December 8, 1890. See (Lond.) Baptist Hand-book, 1892.

## Roolwer[[@Headword:Roolwer]]

             a Scotch prelate, was bishop of Ross about the year 900, and is buried at St.Mangholds, in the Isle of Man. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 296.

## Room[[@Headword:Room]]

             is employed in the A.V. as the equivalent of no less than four Heb. and eight Greek terms. The only one of these, however, which need be noticed here is πρωτοκλισία (Mat 23:6; Mar 12:39; Luk 14:7-8; Luk 20:46), which signifies, not a “room” in the sense we commonly attach  to it of a chamber, but the highest place on the highest couch round the dinner or supper table — the “uppermost seat, “as it is more accurately rendered in Luk 11:43. SEE MEAL. The word “seat” is, however, generally appropriated by our translators to καθέδρα, which seems to mean some kind of official chair. In Luk 14:9-10, they have rendered τόπος by both “place” and “room.” SEE UPPER ROOM.

The convenience of dividing habitations into separate apartments early suggested itself. We read of various kinds of rooms in Scripture — bedchamber, inner chamber, upper chamber, bride chamber, guest chamber, guard chamber, of the king's house. In early times the females and children of the family slept in one room, on a separate beds, and the males in another. SEE CHAMBER.

## Roos, Johann Friedrich[[@Headword:Roos, Johann Friedrich]]

             only son of the following, was born in 1759, and died in 1828, at Marbach, where he had held the position of dean. He wrote a History of the Reformation and a Church History, neither of which was based on original sources, and both of which have been superseded by more modern works. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.

## Roos, Magnus Friedrich[[@Headword:Roos, Magnus Friedrich]]

             the last of the series of clergymen in Wirtemberg who during the 18th century promoted the independent development of Pietism (q.v.), and exercised an important influence over the clergy and churches of Wurtemberg against the rationalistic and other movements of North Germany. He was born at Sullz-on-the-Neckar, Sept. 6, 1727, passed through the schools of Wurtemberg in regular course, and in 1749 became vicar at Owen. After filling various ministerial stations in Tubingen, Stuttgart, etc., he was made pastor at Lustnau, near Tubingen, in 17(67, where he was brought into contact with the notabilities and students of the university, and sought to benefit the latter by the delivery of private lectures on Biblical theology. In 1784 he was appointed to the prelature of Anhausen, which gave him a seat in the district government, and in 1787 he was promoted to a place in the national diet, which diverted his attention largely towards political affairs. He preached his last sermon to his people on Christmas day, 1802, and died March 19, 1803.  Roos was emphatically a man of one book — the Bible.

He was not the representative of any scientific idea in theology, nor a rhetorician who attached importance to the elegancies of style. His theology was contained in the sentences of the Bible, so that nothing is left for the theologian to perform beyond condensing what is there expanded, collecting what is scattered, and converting the whole directly into faith and life. As a dogmatist he simply brought together the doctrines of Scripture, holding that they require no elaboration in order to appear as a faultless whole. As an expositor and polemic he displayed an utter incapacity to appreciate difficulties, and accepted all the statements of the Bible with unquestioning faith; and in that one of his works which partakes most largely of a scientific character, the Fundamenta Psychologioe Sacroe (Tubingen, 1769; Stuttgart, 1857), he simply gathered from the Scriptures every passage in which a psychological term occurs, and given the specific and general meaning of the terms and phrases so obtained. He held that the truth was fully and appropriately given in the Bible, and therefore did not attempt a thorough system of psychology. He also gave attention to the times in which he lived and to the impending future, taking the Apocalypse for his guide and following the interpretations of Bengel (q.v.), though without accepting the dates of that scholar for the end of the world (e.g. 1836), and without placing implicit reliance on the results of his investigations.

The writings of Roos were very numerous, and have no importance for our times. The principal ones are the Fundam. Psychol. Sacr., already cited: — a devotional manual entitled Hausbuch (1790, 2d ed.), which was largely used, and a practical work entitled Christliche Gedanken v. d. Verschiedenheit und Eigkeit d. Kinder Gottes (1st ed. 1764; new [3d] ed. 1850).

## Roosevelt, James Henry, Hon.[[@Headword:Roosevelt, James Henry, Hon.]]

             a distinguished philanthropist, was born in New York city, Nov. 10, 1800. He was a descendant of the well known and wide spread family of that name. His father, James C. Roosevelt, was an attorney of the New York bar, educated at Columbia College. James Henry was left a large property by his father, and in early life manifested his benevolence by taking an interest in charitable institutions, particularly the Leake and Watts Orphan Asylum, of which he was for twenty-three years the treasurer. He never married, and lived a quiet and frugal life. As his natural heirs were wealthy  and did not need his property, he determined on devoting it to benevolent objects. In March, 1854, he made his will, and after certain bequests, gave the residue of his estate to five incorporations in the city of New York, known as the Society of the New York Hospital, the College of Physicians and Surgeons, the New York Eye Infirmary, the Demilt Dispensary, and the New York Institution for the Blind. It also provided for the establishment in the city of New York of a hospital for the reception and relief of sick and diseased persons, and for its permanent endowment. The charity was to extend to all sick, without limit or restriction of any kind, and without distinction as to race, sex, color, or religion. The hospital, which occupies an entire block between Ninth and Tenth avenues, was in due time erected, and was formally opened Nov. 2, 1871. The generous founder died Nov. 30, 1863. He was “a man upright in his aims, simple in his habits, sublime in his benefaction.” (W.P.S.)

## Root[[@Headword:Root]]

             (שֹׁרֶשׁ, shoresh, ῥίζα), that part of a plant which extends downwards and fastens itself in the earth. The rocky ground of Palestine is in some places covered with a very thin soil, so that the plants growing in these spots cannot strike deep roots, and are therefore easily uptorn by the winds or withered by the scorching sun — a circumstance to which a beautiful allusion is made in the parable of the sower (Mat 13:21). The root of a family is the progenitor from whom the race derives its name; thus, “Out of the serpent's root shall come forth a cockatrice” (Isa 14:29), meaning Hezekiah, who was descended from David, and was, like him, a scourge to the oppressors of Israel. The word is used in this sense in a very remarkable prophecy, “And in that day there shall be a root of Jesse, which shall stand for an ensign of the people; to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious” (Isa 11:10). The Messiah, elsewhere called “the branch,” is here described as “the root,” for though David's son in his human character, yet in his divine capacity he is David's “root,” as being his Lord and God. A similar passage occurs in Revelation. “The lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, hath prevailed” (5:5). So “covetousness is the root of all evil” (1Ti 6:10); that is, the origin, the cause, the occasion; “Lest any root of bitterness trouble you” (Heb 12:15). In Job 19:28, “root of the matter” signifies a ground or cause of controversy. The root may also denote the race, the posterity: Pro 12:3, “The root of the righteous shall not be moved,” i.e. shall not fail;  Jer 12:2, “Whence do the wicked prosper in all things? thou hast planted them, and they have taken root.” In Daniel and in the Maccabees, Antiochus Epiphanes, the persecutor of the Jews, is represented as a young sprout or sucker, or root of iniquity, proceeding from the kings, the successors of Alexander the Great. Jesus Christ, in his humiliation, is described as a root ill nourished, growing in a dry and barren soil (Isa 53:2). In the contrary sense, Paul says (Rom 11:16-18) that the Jews are, as it were, the root that bears the tree into which the Gentiles are grafted; and that the patriarchs are the pure and holy root of which the Jews are, as it were, the branches. Jesus Christ is the root on which Christians depend, and from which they derive life and subsistence (Col 2:7).

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

             a name sometimes found in the inventories of English church furniture, by which were designated richly embroidered copes that had the “stem of Jesse” and the genealogy of our Lord figured upon them.

## Root, Henry[[@Headword:Root, Henry]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Canaan, Columbia Co., N.Y., July 17, 1813. He graduated at Williams College, Mass., studied theology at Auburn Seminary, N.Y., and was licensed by Cayuga Presbytery. After graduating he removed to Michigan, where he was ordained in 1835, and was stated supply for Dexter and Howell churches. Subsequently he preached for Granville, Portland, and Bunker Hill churches. He was connected with the American Home Missionary Society, and was one of their most successful missionaries. He died at Feltz, April 5, 1860. Mr. Root was a powerful preacher, and in building up churches in the faith he had no superior. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 163. (J.L.S.)

## Ropes, Timothy Pickering[[@Headword:Ropes, Timothy Pickering]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in Oxford, N.H., Sept. 13, 1802, and was graduated at Waterville College in the class of 1827. He was ordained as an evangelist Aug. 13, 1828, and became pastor of the Baptist Church at Hampton Falls in July, 1829. He was afterwards pastor of the churches in Weston and Lexington, Mass., and for several years was engaged in teaching in different places. He went West in 1854, and for ten years was  pastor of the Baptist Church in Le Roy, Minn., where he died, July 3, 1873. (J.C.S.)

## Roque, St.[[@Headword:Roque, St.]]

             a popular saint of the Roman Catholic Church in France, who is considered the special patron of those sick of the plague. Few particulars of his history have been preserved. He was born of a noble family in Montpellier, at the end of the 13th or early in the 14th century; and having undertaken a pilgrimage to Rome, was surprised on his way through Italy by an outbreak of the plague at Piacenza. He labored with generous zeal for the victims, fell sick, was abandoned by men, but a dog licked his sores. He recovered his health, returned to France, and after a life of great sanctity died at Montpellier, probably in 1327.

## Roquelaure, Jean Armand De Bessuejouls, Count Of;[[@Headword:Roquelaure, Jean Armand De Bessuejouls, Count Of;]]

             a French prelate, was born at Roquelaure in 1721. Of a noble family, he entered the Church when quite young, was doctor of theology at the age of twenty-six, and vicar-general of Arras when, in 1754, he received the bishopric of Senlis. In 1764 he was first almoner of the king, in 1767 councilor of state, in 1768 abbe of St. Germer, and in 1771 member of the French Academy. He was one of the few bishops who remained in France after the civil oath was required, but did not yield to the constitution of 1790. During the Reign of Terror he retired to Arras. He resigned his see of Senlis, but was in 1802 made archbishop of Malines. In 1808 he received a canonry in St. Denis, and spent the remainder of his life in Paris. He died of old age, April 23, 1818. His writings are, Oraison Funebre de la Reine d'Espagne (Paris, 1761): — Oraison Funebre de Louis XV (ibid. 1774): — Mandements, and Lettres to the clergy.

## Roques, Pierre[[@Headword:Roques, Pierre]]

             a Protestant French theologian, was born at La Canne, July 22, 1685. His parents were obliged to leave France on account of their faith, and Roques was educated in Switzerland, at Geneva and Lausanne. He was ordained in 1709, and in 1710 became pastor of the Protestant French Church at Basle, where he died, April 13, 1748. His principal writings are, Le Pasteur Evangelique (Basle, 1723), transl. into German (Halle, 1741-44): — Elements des Verites Historiques, etc. (Basle, 1726): — Lettres a un Protestant de France etc. (Lausanne, 1730-35): — Les Devoirs des Sujets  (Basle, 1727): — Sermons sur Divers Sujets de Morale (ibid. 1730), transl. into German (Halle, 1731): — Le Vrai Pietisme (Basle, 1731): — Traite des Tribunaux de Judicature (ibid. 1738). Besides these are scattered pieces in several works, an edition of the Dictionnaire of Moreri (ibid. 1731-45), and one of Martin's Bible (ibid. 1736). He continued with Beausobro the Sermons of Saurin, and revised the French translation of Hubner's Geographie (ibid. 1747). See Frey, Vie de P. Roques; Haag, La France Protestante.

## Roquette, Gabriel De[[@Headword:Roquette, Gabriel De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Toulouse in 1632. After finishing his studies he went to Paris, where he soon obtained ecclesiastical preferment, became abbe of Grandselve, prior of Charlieu and of St. Denis de Vaux, vicar- general of Armand, and abbe of Cluny. In 1666 he was made bishop of Autun, and in 1669 founded the Hospital of St. Gabriel in that place. He resigned his see in 1702 in favor of his nephew, Bertrand de Senaux. He died at Autun, Feb. 23, 1707. Roquette was an ambitious man, a slave of the Jesuits, and devoted to the interests of cardinal Mazarin. He left a work entitled Ordonnances pour le Retablissement de la Discipline Ecclesiastique (Autun, 1669-74), and an Oraison Funebre d'Anne-Marie Martinozzi, Princesse de Conti (Paris, 1674).

## Rosa Of Lima[[@Headword:Rosa Of Lima]]

             the most noted of Peruvian saints, was a beautiful virgin, born in 1586 at Lima, who early displayed great fortitude in the enduring of physical pain, and manifested a strong inclination towards an ascetic life. Her parents permitted her to become a Dominican nun; but having entered a church to pray while on her way to the convent, she found herself unable to proceed farther, and consequently became a hermit, living in a cell which she built in the garden belonging to her parents. She inflicted cruel bodily mortifications on herself, and died in 1617. She was buried in the Dominican church, and was canonized in 1671. She ranks as the patroness of the state, and is annually commemorated, with great solemnity and pomp, on Aug. 26. See Acta SS. for Aug. 26.

## Rosa Of Viterbo[[@Headword:Rosa Of Viterbo]]

             a hermit attached to the order of Fanciscans, though without having been formally received. She occupied a cell in the house of her parents, and was accustomed to preach repentance, standing with crucifix in hand in the public streets. She was temporarily banished from Viterbo, but eventually recalled and received with enthusiasm. She died in A.D. 1252, aged about eighteen. See Acta SS. for Sept. 4.

## Rosa, Salvator[[@Headword:Rosa, Salvator]]

             an Italian painter, was born at Aranella, near Naples, June 20, 1615. He was brought up under Francisco Francanzano, but was obliged to get his living by selling his pictures upon the street. After his father's death, he went with Ribera to Rome, at which city he remained four years, when cardinal Brancacci carried him to Viterbo, where he painted several pieces. He afterwards went with Prince John Charles of Medici to Florence, and stayed nine years in this city. He finally fixed his residence at Rome, where he died, March 15, 1673. Among his most celebrated works are, the Catiline Conspiracy: — Saul and the Witch of Endor: — Attilus Regulus, and altar pieces. He was also a good composer of music. See lady Morgan, Life and Times of Salvator (Lond. 1824, 2 vols.); Cantu, Salvator Rosa (Milan, 1844); Reynolds [Sir Joshua], Works.

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

             SEE ROSA OF LIMA.

## Rosalia, St.[[@Headword:Rosalia, St.]]

             the greatest of Sicilian saints, is said to have died between 1160 and 1180. Her father was the count Sinibald of Quisquina and Rosis, and was descended from the ancient kings of Sicily. She lived for a time on Mount Quisquina in the character of a hermit, but afterwards on Mount Pelegrino, near Palermo. It is alleged that her body was found in 1624, together with an inscription on Mount Quisquina narrating her descent and sojourn in an adjoining cave. A pestilence ceased to prevail at the time her body was found, and this fact was attributed to her intercessions, which may account for the veneration she receives. Her day is Sept. 4, and is observed with much pomp in Palermo, one of the features being a procession in which a colossal statue of the saint is carried about. See Acta SS. for Sept. 4.

## Rosario, Jerome[[@Headword:Rosario, Jerome]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic and writer, was born at Pordenone in 1485. He was nuncio from pope Clement VII to Hungary, and died in 1556. He wrote a curious treatise — Quod Animalia Brutal soepe Ratione utantur melius Homine (“That brutes often reason better than man” [1648]).

## Rosary (Rosarium)[[@Headword:Rosary (Rosarium)]]

             This is a Roman Catholic instrument, composed of a number of larger and smaller beads strung on a cord, which serves among Romanists to aid in the repeating of a definite number of Paternosters and Ave Marias. In its wider meaning the word denotes the worship in which the rosary is employed. The custom of repeating the Lord's Prayer a number of times originated among the early hermits and monks, and it is stated by Palladius (Λαυσιακά, cap. 35) and Sozomen (Hist. 6, 29) that the abbot Paul of the desert of Pherme repeated the Pater noster 300 times, and at each repetition dropped a small stone into his lap. The Hail Mary was added in the 11th century, but did not attain its completed form until the 16th. A combination of the Lord's Prayer with the Credo and the angelical greeting in this worship occurs as early as 1196 in the Statuta Communia of bishop Odo of Paris.

The rosary is accordingly of modern origin, and all opinions which assign to it a high antiquity are false. Some modern inquirers hold that it was brought from the East by returning Crusaders, since it is found among Mohammedans and Brahmins also; but it would seem to have had an independent origin in the West as well. It was first used by the Dominican monks, though it is by no means certain that it was introduced by St. Dominic himself.

As many as twenty forms of rosary devotions have been enumerated by Schulting in his Bibl. Eccles. 1, 3, 205. The more familiarly known are as follows:

1. The complete (or Dominican) rosary, consisting of fifteen decades of small Mary-beads, alternating with fifteen Pater noster beads, so that ten Hail Marys are said after each Lord's Prayer. This rosary is accordingly called the Psalterium Marioe.

2. The ordinary rosary (rosarium) has five decades of Mary beads and five Pater noster beads, in all fifty-five beads. Three repetitions equal rosary No. 1.

3. The intermediate rosary has sixty-three Mary beads and seven Pater noster beads, denoting the sixty-three years of life which the legend assigns to the Virgin. The Franciscans repeat seventy-two Hail Marys, because they believe that the Virgin lived seventy-two years.

4. The smaller rosary has three decades of Mary beads and three Pater noster beads, signifying the years of Christ's life on earth.

5. The angelical rosary is similar to No. 4, but requires a single recital of the Hail Mary with each decade, and for each of the nine remaining beads the Sanctus (“Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth! Pleni sunt coeli et terra gloria tua, Hosanna in excelsis! Benedictus qui venit in nomine Domini, Hosanna in excelsis!”) with the lesser doxology (“Gloria Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto!”).

6. The crown (capellaria, corona) has thirty-three Pater noster beads, indicative of the years of Christ's earthly life, and five Mary beads to denote the number of his wounds. A rosary composed of twelve Ave Marias and three Pater nosters has also been termed the crown in recent times (Binterim, Denkw. VII, 1, 105).

The Officium Laicorum is composed only of Pater nosters, and cannot therefore be reckoned among the rosaries.

The devotion begins with the sign of the cross, after which the worshipper grasps the cross depending from the cord, repeats the Apostles' Creed, and prays the Lord's Prayer with three Hail Marys. A corresponding form serves as the conclusion. With the Dominican rosary is connected the contemplation of the so called mysteries, according to which the rosary is characterized as joyful, sorrowful, or glorious.

The joyful rosary embraces the five mysteries of –

1. The annunciation of our Lady when the Son of God was conceived.

2. The visitation of Elisabeth.

3. The nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

4. The presentation of our Lord in the Temple.

5. The finding of our Lord in the Temple among the doctors. The sorrowful rosary embraces

1. The prayer of our Lord in the garden.

2. The whipping him at the pillar.

3. The crowning him with a crown of thorns.

4. His carrying of the cross to Mount Calvary.

5. His crucifixion and death on the cross. The glorious rosary contains

1. The resurrection of our Lord.

2. His ascension into heaven.

3. The coming of the Holy Ghost.

4. The assumption of the Blessed Virgin.

5. Her coronation above all angels and saints.

Each of these fifteen mysteries is appended to the words “Jesus Christ” in the Ave Maria, and is thus repeated ten times.

The rosary of the Blessed Virgin Mary is altogether the most popular form of devotion among Roman Catholics. It has been strongly recommended by many popes, who have granted great indulgences to those that practice it. The five Joyful Mysteries are said on Mondays and Thursdays through the year, and daily from the first Sunday in Advent to the Feast of the Purification. The five Sorrowful Mysteries are said on Thursdays and Fridays through the year, and daily from Ash Wednesday to Easter Sunday. The five Glorious Mysteries are said on ordinary Sundays and Wednesdays and Saturdays through the year, and daily from Easter Sunday to Trinity Sunday. The manner of saying the rosary on the beads may be understood by the accompanying cut, with the following directions (see Barnum, Romanism, p. 486):

On the cross say the Apostles' Creed. On the next large bead say the Lord's Prayer. On the next small bead say the Hail Mary, thus: “Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women, and  blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Who may increase our faith. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners, now, and at the hour of our death. Amen.”

On the second small bead repeat the Hail Mary, substituting for the above italicized words, “Who may strengthen our hope.”

On the third small bead repeat the Hail Mary, substituting in the same place, “Who may enliven our charity.” Then, and at the end of every decade, say, “Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, as it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be, world without end. Amen.”

On the next large bead, and on every large bead, say the Lord's Prayer. In saying the ten Hail Marys for the first Joyful Mystery, substitute for the above italicized clause, “Who was made man for us;” in the second, “Whom thou didst carry to St. Elisabeth's;” in the third, “Who was born in a stable for us;” in the fourth, “Who was presented in the Temple for us;” in the fifth, “Whom thou didst find in the Temple.”

At the end of the five Joyful Mysteries, and at the end of the five Sorrowful and five Glorious Mysteries, say the Salve Regina (=Hail, Queen), thus: “Hail, Holy Queen, Mother of Mercy, our life, our sweetness, and our hope. To thee do we cry, poor banished children of Eve. To thee do we send up our sighs, mourning and weeping in this valley of tears. Turn, then, O most gracious advocate, thine eyes of mercy towards us; and after this our exile is ended, show us the blessed fruit of thy womb, Jesus. O clement! O pious! O sweet Virgin Mary! “V. Pray for us, O holy Mother of God. “R. That we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ.”

In saying the five Sorrowful Mysteries, the clauses substituted in the Hail Marys for the italicized clause are:

(1) “Who sweated blood for us;”

(2) “Who was scourged for us;”

(3) “Who was crowned with thorns for us;”

(4) “Who carried the heavy cross for us;”

(5) “Who was crucified and died for us.”

In saying the five Glorious Mysteries, substitute for the italicized clause:

(1) “Who arose from the dead;”

(2) “Who ascended into heaven;”

(3) “Who sent the Holy Ghost;”

(4) “Who assumed thee [or took thee up] into heaven;”

(5) “Who crowned thee in heaven.”

The term rosary is variously explained by Roman Catholic writers: as derived from Rosa mystica, an ecclesiastical predicate of the Virgin; from St. Rosalia, who is represented with a wreath formed of gold and roses; from the fact that the beads are made of rosewood, etc. Steitz (in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.) suggests that it may be derived from a rose garden (rosarium), after the manner in which devotional manuals were in the Middle Ages termed Hortulus Animoe.

## Rosary, Brothers Of The[[@Headword:Rosary, Brothers Of The]]

             The troubles which came upon Europe in the 14th and 15th centuries led to the forming of pious associations which sought to secure the averting of such evils by means of prayer to God; and the brotherhoods of the rosary were among the earliest of these unions. Pope Leo's bull Pastoris Eterni, of Oct. 6, 1520, shows that they had then become old. The popes Sixtus IV, Innocent VIII, and Clement VII conferred on them valuable exemptions, which were confirmed by Sixtus V. The Brothers of the Rosary displayed great zeal during the contests of Western Europe with the Turks, and aided the warriors with their prayers; and after the victory of Lepanto they instituted processions in honor of the Virgin Mary. The festival instituted by Pius V in commemoration of that victory was consequently called “the Feast of the Rosary.”

A modern organization called “the Living Rosary” consists of unions of fifteen persons each, who severally pray the decades of the rosary which have been assigned to them respectively.

## Rosary, Ceremony Of The[[@Headword:Rosary, Ceremony Of The]]

             a ceremony, practiced among the Mohammedans on special occasions, called in the Arabic Sobhat, and usually performed on the night succeeding a burial. The soul is then supposed to remain in the body, after which it departs to Hades, there to await its final doom. The ceremony is thus described: “At night fikis, sometimes as many as fifty, assemble, and one brings a rosary of 1000 beads, each as large as a pigeon's egg. They begin  with the 67th chapter of the Koran, then say three times, ‘God is one;' then recite the last chapter but one and the first, and then say three times, ‘O God, favor the most excellent and most happy of thy creatures, our lord Mohammed, and his family and companions, and preserve them.' To this they add, ‘All who commemorate thee are the mindful, and those who omit commemorating thee are the negligent.' They next repeat 3000 times, ‘There is no God but God,' one holding the rosary and counting each repetition. After each thousand they sometimes rest, and take coffee; then 100 times, ‘(I extol) the perfection of God with his praise;' then the same number of times, I beg forgiveness of God the great;' after which fifty times, ‘The perfection of the Lord, the Eternal;' then, ‘The perfection of the Lord, the Lord of might,' etc. (Koran, ch. 37, last three verses). Two or three then recite three or four more verses. This done, one asks his companions, ‘Have ye transferred (the merit of) what ye have recited to the soul of the deceased?' They reply, ‘We have;' and add, ‘Peace be on the apostles.' This concludes the ceremony, which, in the houses of the rich, is repeated the second and third nights.” See Macbride, Mohammedan Religion Explained; Gardner, Faiths of the World, s.v.

## Rosary, Fraternity Of The[[@Headword:Rosary, Fraternity Of The]]

             SEE ROSARY, BROTHERS OF THE.

## Rosbrugh, John[[@Headword:Rosbrugh, John]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Ireland in 1717, emigrated to the United States in 1735, and graduated at the College of New Jersey in 1761. He studied theology under the Rev. John Blair, then of Fagg's Manor, and was taken on trial by the New Brunswick Presbytery May 22, 1762. He was licensed to preach Aug. 18, 1763, and was ordained at Greenwich, N.J., Dec. 11, 1764, having charge of Mansfield, Greenwich, and Oxford. He was dismissed from the three congregations April 18, 1769, and on the same day was called to the Forks of Delaware (now Allentown and Mount Bethel). He was installed pastor of these congregations Oct. 28, 1772, and continued such until his death, in January, 1777, at the hands of the Hessians, near Trenton. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 3, 254.

## Roscelin (Also Roceln, Rucelin, Or Ruzeltn), Jean[[@Headword:Roscelin (Also Roceln, Rucelin, Or Ruzeltn), Jean]]

             a scholastic theologian of the 11th century, who ranks in the common estimation as the originator of the Nominalist theory in philosophy and as a Tritheist in theology. The circumstances of his life are shrouded in obscurity, however, and the particular views he advocated are not well determined. His place in history was achieved chiefly through controversies with Anselm and Abelard (see the respective articles) in which he became engaged. He first arrested attention by expressing opinions concerning the Trinity which were deemed heretical, at a time when he was canon at Compilgne. As he claimed that Anselm shared his views, the latter interposed a denial, and was about undertaking a refutation of Roscelin's teaching, when the Synod of Soissons (1092) compelled a retraction of the heresy. The course of Roscelin's life becomes doubtful again at this point, and such facts as are known to have occurred are variously combined by students. The following seems to be the view now generally preferred. Roscelin soon recalled his retraction, according to Anselm, because his action at Soissons had been governed by fear of the populace. Anselm consequently wrote the refutation previously begun (De Fide Trinitat. et Incarnat.), and Roscelin went to England, where he attempted to injure Anselm by treating him with contumely, but was himself compelled to return to the Continent, partly because of his relations with Anselm, then archbishop of Canterbury, and partly because he had offended the English clergy by denouncing abuses which existed among them. He then addressed an unsuccessful application for refuge to Ivo of Chartres (q.v.), and from that time was lost to notice for some years. The name of Roscelin is next mentioned in connection with a controversy with Abelard. The latter had been Roscelin's pupil; but the publication of his Introductio ad Theologiam (1119), in which he emphasized the divine unity in three persons, and in such a way as to reflect on the position Roscelin had occupied at Soissons, caused an open rupture between them. Abelard's language savored of Sabellianism, and Roscelin prepared to bring the new heresy to the notice of the bishop of Paris. Each of the parties contributed a letter to this controversy, which documents are still extant; and with the issuing of the Epistola ad Aboelard. Roscelin passes definitely from our view.

1. Roscelin as a Tritheist. — His opinions grew out of an emphasizing of the idea of personality in connection with the divine nature, and, as they appear in the writings of his opponents, may be comprehended in the  statement that the three Divine Persons cannot be conceived as una res (οὐσία), unless the necessary consequence that the Father and the Spirit became incarnate with the Son be also accepted. To escape this consequence, he holds that the distinction between the Persons is one of substance; but he strives to preserve the divine unity by postulating a unity of will and power. It seems evident that he believed this provision sufficient to preserve his doctrine from being charged with polytheism and atheism, and that he was therefore not guilty of intentional heresy; but it was not difficult for the keen dialectics of Anselm to demonstrate his error. Roscelin cannot be justly charged with tritheism; and, if his argumentation was at fault, he certainly earned for himself the credit of scholarly penetration in having recognized the full greatness of the difficulty to be overcome in reconciling the doctrine of the Trinity with that of the Incarnation.

2. Roscelin as a Nominalist. — We are wholly dependent for a knowledge of his position in this respect upon the statements of his enemies, and it appears certain that they caricatured his views; but it is evident that they did not regard him as the originator of nominalism. He held the extreme of the nominalist position, denominating universal conceptions an empty sound (flatum vocis), but apparently only for the purpose of antagonizing the extreme realism of Anselm. His idea doubtless was that universal concepts exist simply in our thought, and do not at the same time postulate a real existence extraneous to the mind. He laid down the axiom that “no thing has parts” — a paradox which can only mean that no whole can really exist and furnish its parts from out of itself. The parts really constitute the whole, and alone possess a real existence; and the whole, as a unity, cannot be distinguished from them otherwise than in thought. In its application to the doctrine of the Trinity, the axiom implied that the real existences in the Deity are in the three Persons, and that the unity of the Godhead exists only in the thought which comprehends them together into one. The only point of interest to him as a philosopher, however, was to discover whether the reality lies in the general concept or in the concrete individual; and his axiom has, e.g., no relationship with the atomism of Democritus.

3. The Connection between Roscelin's Philosophy and his Theological Views. — This is evident from the foregoing statements. He did not, however, publicly connect his theological innovation with his nominalism, but based it on the Christological difficulty already mentioned. According  to Anselm (De Fide Trinit. 3), Roscelin declared that “Pagani defendunt legem suam, Judaei defendunt fidem suam, ergo et nos Christianam fidem defendere debemus,” thus showing that it was not his purpose to damage the faith: but the words sound like a plea for scientific discussion of the faith in general, or perhaps for liberty of the thinking mind to apprehend, and consequently to further the development of, the doctrines of the Church. Nominalism, in general, would seem to have been nearly always connected with a rationalistic tendency.

See Anselm, Ep. 2, 35 and 41, and De Fide Trinitatis et Incarnatione; a letter to Anselm by John, abbot of Telese, later cardinal-bishop of Tuseoli (in Baluz. Miscell. 4, 478); Abelard, Epist. 21 (Opp. [Paris, 1616] p. 334), and Dialectica (in Cousin, Oeuvres Inedits d'Abel.); Epist. Roscel. ad Aboelardum (ed. Schmeller, Munich, 1851); a letter to Roscelin by Theobald of Estampes (in D'Achery, Spicilegium, vol. 3), and one by Ivo of Chartres (Epist. 7); John of Salisbury, Metalog. 2, 17; Otto of Freisingen, De Gest. Frider. vol. 1, c. 47, et al.

## Roscholchika[[@Headword:Roscholchika]]

             a term signifying “Seditionists, “and applied to the Russian sect Isbraniki, or the “Company of the East.” This sect was formed in the middle of the 17th century, during the patriarchate of Nicon, A.D. 1654. The cause of separation was not any difference of doctrine or ritual, but a desire to protest against the laxity and inclination to change displayed by the clergy, and to adopt a greater piety and purity of life. Pinkerton (Dissertation on Russian Sects) identifies them with the Starovertzi, or “Believers of the Old Faith.” See Platon, Present State of the Greek Church. SEE RUSSIAN SECTS.

## Roscoe, William[[@Headword:Roscoe, William]]

             a historian and poet, was born near Liverpool, March 8, 1753, and in 1769 was articled to an attorney for six years. During this time he paid great attention to English classics, and subsequently added an acquaintance with choice writers in the Greek, Latin, Spanish, Italian, and French languages. He was admitted to the bar in 1774, and retired from practice in 1796. His means, through unfortunate business speculations, became very limited, but he still continued his literary labors for many years. He was a member of Parliament for Liverpool in 1806, and died June 30, 1831. Among his works are, Scriptural Refutation of a Pamphlet on the Licitness of the  Slave-trade (1788, 8vo): — The Life and Pontificate of Leo X (Liverpool, 1805, 4 vols. 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rose[[@Headword:Rose]]

             (חֲבִצֶּלֶת, chabatstseleth; Sept. κρίνον, ἄνθος; Aq. κάλυξ; Vulg. flos, lilium) occurs twice only in the canonical Scriptures; namely, first in Son 2:1, where the bride replies, “I am the rose of Sharon and the lily of the valley,” and secondly in Isa 35:1, “The wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad for them, and the desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.” There is much difference of opinion as to what particular flower is here denoted, and the question perhaps does not admit of definite determination. Tremellius and Diodati, with some of the rabbins, believe the rose is intended, but there seems to be no foundation for such a translation. The Sept. renders it simply by flower in the passage of the Canticles. In this it has been followed by the Latin Vulgate, Luther, etc. It is curious, however, as remarked by Celsius (Hierobot. 1, 489), that many of those who translate chabatstseleth by rose or flower in the passage of the Canticles render it by lily in that of Isaiah. The rose was, no doubt, highly esteemed by the Greeks, as it was, and still is, by almost all Asiatic nations; and as it forms a very frequent subject of allusion in Persian poetry, it has been inferred that we might expect some reference to so favorite a flower in the poetical books of the Scripture, and that no other is better calculated to illustrate the above two passages. But this does not prove that the word chabatstseleth or any similar one was ever applied to the rose. Other flowers, therefore, have been indicated, to which the name chabatstseleth may be supposed, from its derivation, to apply more fitly. Scheuzer refers to Hiller (Hierophyt. p. 2), who seeks chabatstseleth among the bulbous-rooted plants, remarking that the Hebrew word may be derived from chabab and batsal, a bulb, or bulbous root, of any plant, as we have seen it applied to the onion (q.v.). So Rosenmüller remarks that the substantial part of the Hebrew name shows that it denotes a flower growing from a bulb, and adds in a note “that chabatstseleth is formed from betsel, or bulb, the guttural cheth being sometimes put before triliterals in order to form quadriliterals from them” (see Gesen. Gram. p. 863).

Some, therefore, have selected the asphodel as the bulbous plant intended, respecting which the author of Scripture Illustrated remarks, “It is a very beautiful and odoriferous flower, and highly praised by two of the  greatest masters of Grecian song. Hesiod says it grows commonly in woods, and Homer (Odyss. 1, 24) calls the Elysian Fields ‘meads filled with asphodel.'” Celsius (loc. cit.) has already remarked that Bochart has translated chabatstseleth by narcissus (Polyanthus narcissus), and not without reason, as some Oriental translators have so explained it. In the Targum (Son 2:1), instead of chabatstseleth we have narkom (נרקו ם), which, however, should have been written narkos (ניקוס), as appears from the words of David Cohen de Lara, “Narkos is the same as chabatstseleth of Sharon.” So in Isa 35:1, chabatstseleth is written chamzaloito in the Syrian translation, which is the same as narcissus (Cels. Hierobot. 1, 489). This, Rosenmüller informs us (Bibl. Bot. p. 142), according to the testimony of Syriac-Arabic dictionaries, denotes the Colchicum autumnale, that is, the meadow saffron. That plant certainly has a bulb-like rootstock in form the flowers resemble those of the crocus, and are of a light violet color, without scent. Narkom and narkos are, no doubt. the same as the Persian nurgus, which throughout the East indicates the Narcissus tazetta, or the Polyanthus narcissus. The ancients describe and allude to the narcissus on various occasions, and Celsius has quoted various passages from the poets indicative of the esteem in which it was held. Since they were not so particular as the moderns in distinguishing species, it is probable that more than one may be referred to by them, and therefore that N. tazetta may be included under the same name as N. poeticus, which was best known to them. It is not unimportant to remark that the narcissus was also called Bulbus vomitorius, or the Emetic bulbus, in Greek and Latin; and the Arabic busl- al-kye no doubt refers to the same or a kindred species. It is curious, also, that an Eastern name, or the corruption of one, should be applied by gardeners even in England to a species of narcissus: thus, N. trewriamus and crenulatus (the former supposed by some to be a variety of N. orientalis) were once called “Bazalman major” and “Bazalman minor.” That the narcissus is found in Syria and Palestine is well known, as it has been mentioned by several travelers, and also that it is highly esteemed by all Asiatics from Syria even as far as India (comp. Soph. (Ed. Col. p. 698 sq., Mosch. Idyl. 2, 65 sq.; Athen. 15, 679 sq.). Chateaubriand (Itineraire, 2, 130) mentions the narcissus as growing in the plain of Sharon; and Strand (Flor. Palest. No. 177) names it as a plant of Palestine, on the authority of Rauwolf and Hasselquist (see also Kitto, Phys. Hist. of Palest. p. 216). Hiller (Hierophyt. 2, 30) thinks the chabatstseleth denotes some species of asphodel (Asphodelus); but the finger-like roots of this genus of  plants do not well accord with the “bulb” root implied in the original word. Thomson (Land and Book, 1, 161; 2, 269) suggests the possibility of the Hebrew name being identical with the Arabic khubbaizy, “the mallow, “which plant he saw growing abundantly on Sharon; but this view can hardly be maintained. The Hebrew term is probably a quadriliteral noun with the harsh aspirate prefixed, and the prominent notion implied in it is betsel “a bulb” and has therefore no connection with the above-named Arabic word. The narcissus alone is still called buseil by the natives of Palestine (Quar. Statement of the Palest. Explor. Soc. Jan. 1878, p. 46). SEE SHARON.

Though the rose is apparently not mentioned in the Hebrew Bible, it is referred to in Ecclesiastes 24:14, where it is said of Wisdom that she is exalted “as a rose-plant (ώς φυτὰ ῥόδου) in Jericho” (comp. Mishna, Maaser, 2, 5). So also in Ecclesiates 39:13, “And bud forth as a rose growing by the brook of the field;” and the high priest's ornaments are compared in 18 to “the flowers of roses in the spring of the year.” But the passage in the book of Wisdom (2, 8; comp. Pliny, 21, 6; Athen. 15, 683), “Let us crown ourselves with roses ere they be withered,” is especially well suited to the rose. Yet roses have not been found by travelers in the neighborhood of Jericho. They cannot be considered exactly as spring flowers, nor do they grow specially by the sides of brooks. The rose was as highly esteemed among ancient as it is among modern nations, if we may judge by the frequent references to it in the poets of antiquity. As we know that it continues to be the favorite flower of the Persians, and is much cultivated in Egypt (Hasselquist, Trav. p. 248; Russegger, Reis. 1, 1, 193), we might expect more frequent mention of some of its numerous species and varieties in the Jewish writings. This, however, is not the case, which probably arises from its being less common in a wild state in a comparatively dry and warm climate like that of Syria. Still it is indigenous in some parts. Monro, as quoted by Kitto in the Physical History of Palestine, “found in the valley of Baalbec a creeping rose of a bright- yellow color in fill bloom about the end of May. About the same time, on advancing towards Rama and Joppa from Jerusalem, the hills are found to be to a considerable extent covered with white and pink roses. The gardens of Rama itself abound in roses of a powerful fragrance.” Mariti, as stated by Rosenmüller, found the greatest quantity of roses in the hamlet of St. John, in the desert of the same name. “In this place the rose plants form  small forests in the gardens. The greatest part of the roses reared there are brought to Jerusalem, where rosewater is prepared from them, of which the scent is so very exquisite that in every part of Lycia, and also in Cyprus, it is in request above all other rosewaters.” Burckhardt was struck with the number of rose trees which he found among the ruins of Bozra beyond the Jordan.

That the rose was cultivated in Damascus is well known. Indeed, one species is named Rosa Damascena from being supposed to be indigenous there. “In the gardens of the city roses are still much cultivated. Monro says that in size they are inferior to our damask rose and less perfect in form, but that their odor and color are far more rich. The only variety that exists in Damascus is a white rose, which appears to belong to the same species, differing only in color” (Kitto, loc. cit. p. 284). The attar of roses from Damascus is famous. Dr. Hooker observed the following wild roses in Syria: Rosa eglanteria L., R. sempervirens L., R. Henkeliana, R. Phoenicia Boiss., R. seriacea, R. angustifolia, and R; Libanotica. Some of these are doubtful species. R. centifolia and Damascena are cultivated everywhere. It is possible, however, that the common rose may not be the plant meant in the above passages of Ecclesiasticus, and that the name rhodon may have been used in a general sense, so as to include some rose- like plants. We have an instance of this, indeed, in the oleander, of which rhododendron, or rose tree, was one of the ancient names, and rhododaphne another. The former name is now applied to a very different genus of plants; but laurier-rose, the French translation of rhododaphne, is still the common name in France of the plant which used to be called rose bay in England, but which is now commonly called oleander. Its long and narrow leaves are like some kinds of willows, and in their hue and leathery consistence have some resemblance to the bay tree, while in its rich inflorescence it may most aptly be compared to the rose. The oleander is well known to be common in the south of Europe by the sides of rivers and torrents, also in Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. It is seen in similar situations in the north of India, and nothing can be conceived more beautiful than the rivulets at the foot of the mountains, with their banks lined with thickets of oleanders, crowned with large bunches of roseate colored flowers. Most travelers in Palestine have been struck with the beauty of this plant. Of the neighborhood of Tripoli, Rauwolf says, “There also by the river's side are found Anthilis marina, etc., and oleander with purple flowers, by the inhabitants called defle.” At the foot of Lebanon, again, he says, “In the valley further down towards the water, grew also the oleander.” It is mentioned as a conspicuous object in similar situations  by Robinson and Smith. Kitto says, “Among the plants in flower in April, the oleander flourishes with extraordinary vigor, and in some instances grows to a considerable size by all the waters of Palestine. When the shrub expands its splendid blossoms, the effect is truly beautiful. Lord Lindsay speaks with rapture of the glorious appearance which the groves of blooming oleanders make in this season along the streams and in the lone valleys of Palestine” (loc. cit. p. 237). “In the month of May, “adds Kitto (loc. cit. p. 244), “oleanders, continuing still in bloom, are as much noticed in this as in the preceding month by travelers. Madox noticed in this month that fine oleanders in fill bloom were growing all along the borders of the Lake of Tiberias, mostly in the water. The same observation was made by Monro. The lake is here richly margined with a wide belt of oleanders, growing in such luxuriance as they are never known to do even in the most genial parts of Europe.” Such a plant could hardly escape reference, and therefore we are inclined to think that it is alluded to in the book of Ecclesiasticus by the name rhodon. If this should not be considered sufficiently near to rhododaphne and rhododendron, we may state that in Arabic writers on Materia Medica rodyon is given as the Syrian name of the oleander (see Tristram, Nat. Hist. of Bible, p. 477). SEE ENGEDI.

The plant commonly called “rose of Jericho” is in no way referred to in the above-quoted passages. Dr. Lindley, in the Gardener's Chronicle, 2, 362, has thus described it: “The Anastatica Hierochuntina, or rose of Jericho of the old herbalists, is not a rose at all, nor has it the smallest resemblance to a rose; nor is it, as it is often described to be, alive as sold in the shops. It is gathered by the poor Christians of Palestine and sold to pilgrims as a charm. It is a little gray-leaved annual, very common in Palestine, and of which hundreds may be gathered in full flower in June by the sides of the road over the Isthmus of Suez (see Arvieux, Neaehr. 2, 156; Seetzen, in Zach. 17, 146; Forskal, Flora, p. 117). It produces a number of short, stiff, zigzag branches, which spread pretty equally from the top of the root, and, when green and growing, lie almost flat upon the ground, having the flowers and fruit upon their upper side. It is, in fact, a cruciferous plant, nearly related to the common purple sea-rocket, which grows on the coast of England, and has a somewhat similar habit. When the seed vessels of this plant are ripe, the branches die, and, drying up, curve inwards, so as to form a kind of ball, which then separates from the roots, and is blown about on the sands of the desert. In the cavity thus formed by the branches,  the seed vessels are carefully guarded from being so disturbed as to lose their contents. In that condition the winds carry the anastatica from place to place, till at last rain falls, or it reaches a pool of water. The dry, hard branches immediately absorb the fluid, become softened, relax, and expand again into the position they occupied when alive; at the same time, the seed vessels open and the seeds fall out, germinate if favored, and become new plants. This is due, then, to the hygroscopic property of vegetable texture.” So D'Arvieux, who calls the anastatica a “natural hygrometer” (see the fables told of it in Zedler, Universal Lex. 32, 867 sq.; Helmuth, Naturgesch. 8, 288 sq.). SEE ROSE OF JERICHO.

## Rose Of Jericho[[@Headword:Rose Of Jericho]]

             a plant of the natural order Cruciferoe, which grows in the sandy deserts of Arabia, on rubbish, the roofs of houses, and other such situations, in Syria and other parts of the East. It is a small, bushy, herbaceous plant, seldom more than six inches high, with small white flowers. After it has flowered, the leaves fall off, and the branches become incurved towards the center, so that the plant assumes an almost globular form, and in this state it is often blown about by the wind in the desert. When it happens to be blown into water the branches expand again, the pods open and let out the seeds (see illustrations on the following page). Numerous superstitions are connected with this plant, which is called Rosa Marioe, or the Rose of the Virgin. SEE ROSE.

## Rose Window, Or The Marygold[[@Headword:Rose Window, Or The Marygold]]

             was derived from the round window called the eye in the basilica, pierced through the gable over the entrance, and imitated in the Norman period at Canterbury in the transept, and at Southwell in the clerestory, but is unknown in Rhenish architecture. About the 13th century the rose became of large dimensions. There are fine examples at Paris (1220-57), Nantes (1220), Laon, Rheims (1239), Amiens (1325), St. Denis, Seez, Clermont, and Rouen. The mullions of this window converge towards the center, something like the spokes of a wheel; hence they are sometimes called Catherine, or wheel, windows. They also bore the names of the elements the northern being called the rose of the winds; the west, of the sea; the south, of heaven; and the east, of the earth. When there were two of these transeptal windows in a cathedral, that on the north was called the bishop's, and the southern one the dean's eye, as representing their respective jurisdiction — one watching against the invasion of evil spirits on the north, and the latter as presiding as censor morum over the capitulars and close. At St. Paul's, exceptionally, the Lady Chapel had a superb eastern rose, and one still adorns the nine chapels of Durham. SEE WINDOW.

## Rose, Alexander[[@Headword:Rose, Alexander]]

             a Scottish prelate, was born in the north of Scotland, was educated at King's College, Aberdeen, and afterwards studied theology at Glasgow. His first preferment was Perth, which he left to become professor of divinity in the University of Glasgow. In 1684 he was nominated to the principality of St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrew's, and in 1687 he was made bishop of Edinburgh. He refused to join the standard of William, and during the Revolution was deprived of his cathedral, despoiled of his revenues, and stripped of his civil dignities. He died in March, 1720, and was buried in the church of Restalrig, near. Edinburgh.

## Rose, Architectural[[@Headword:Rose, Architectural]]

             A kind of rose was sometimes used as an ornament on the face of the abacus on Corinthian capitals. It also occurs in ornamental moldings during the Norman style; but the full rose, as in the accompanying illustration, was a badge of the Tudors, and during their reigns it is often found carved on buildings in conjunction with the portcullis. Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.

## Rose, Guillaume[[@Headword:Rose, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was born at Chaumont, about 1542. He was professor of grammar and rhetoric in the College of Navarre, but subsequently went to Paris, where his eloquent and incisive preaching gained for him a wide reputation. Becoming chaplain-in-ordinary to Henry III, he soon joined the Holy League, and in 1583 opposed himself to the king; but the break was only temporary. Rose was made headmaster of the College of Navarre, and in 1584 received the bishopric of Senlis. For some time he repressed the  expression of any extreme views, but when he departed for Paris as member of the Council of the Union, he said publicly that the celestial palm was reserved for the members of the League when they had killed father and mother. Thereafter he was one of the fiercest preachers of his party, and in the contest between Mayenne and the Spanish he was an ardent partisan of the latter. He was member of the States-general in 1593, and rendered important service to the country in opposing the friends of the infanta of Spain, which was all the more remarkable considering his previous attitude towards the Spaniards. After the triumph of Henry IV, Rose took refuge in the convent of Val de Beaumont-sur-Oise, but by letters patent was allowed to retain his bishopric. Continuing his hostility to the king, he was in 1598 arrested and forced to pay a fine of one hundred livres d'or. Rose died at Senlis, March 10, 1602. The celebrated pamphlet entitled De Justa Republicoe Christianoe in Reges Impios Authoritate (Paris, 1590; Antwerp, 1592) has been attributed to Rose, but its authorship is uncertain. See Labitte, Predicateurs de la Ligue; De Thou, Historia; L'Estoil, Journal. — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Rose, Henry John[[@Headword:Rose, Henry John]]

             an English author, was born in 1801, graduated at St. John's College, Cambridge, in 1821, and became fellow of his college in 1824. He was made Hulsean lecturer in 1833, rector of Houghton Conquest, Bedfordshire, in 1837, and archdeacon of Bedford in 1866. His death took place in Bedford, Jan. 31, 1873. Rose edited the Encyclopaedia Metropolitana from 1839, also vol. 1 of Rose's Biographical Dictionary. He translated Neander's History of the Christian Religion and Church during the First Three Centuries (1831, 2 vols.; 2d ed. 1842); contributed an essay to Replies to Essays and Reviews (1861); and was one of the authors of The Speaker's Commentary. He published, The Law of Moses, etc. (Hulsean Lectures, 1834), and History of the Christian Church, 1700- 1858.

## Rose, Hugh James[[@Headword:Rose, Hugh James]]

             an English clergyman, was born in Little Horsted, Surrey, in 1795, and was educated at Trinity College. Cambridge. He gained the first Bell's scholarship in 1814, took his degree in 1817, became tutor to the son of the duke of Athol, was ordained deacon and became curate of Uckfield, Surrey, in 1818. In 1821 he became vicar of Horsham, Surrey; in 1825  select preacher at Cambridge; in 1826 chaplain to bishop Howley, and prebendary of Chichester, 182733. In 1830 he became rector of Hadleigh, Suffolk; exchanged it for Fairstead and Werley, Essex, in 1833, and immediately exchanged the latter for St. Thomas's, Southwark, which he retained until his death. He was made professor of divinity of the University of Dublin in 1833, domestic chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury in 1834, and principal of King's College, London, in 1836. Rose died at Florence, Italy, Dec. 22, 1838. He was the author of Christianity Always Progressive (1829, 8vo): — Notices of the Mosaic Law (1831, 8vo): — The Gospel an Abiding System (1832, 8vo): — an edition of Parkhurst's Greek Lexicon: — besides Lectures, Sermons, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rose, John Baptist[[@Headword:Rose, John Baptist]]

             a French priest, was born at Quingey, Feb. 7, 1716. He was made curate of a chapel in his own village, which position nothing could induce him to leave, and he there continued during his life. In 1778 he was made a member of the Academy of Besancon. He submitted to the decrees of 1789, and in 1795 the National Convention voted him a pension of 1500 livres. Rose died Aug. 12, 1805. His works are, Traite Elementaire de Morale (2 vols. 12mo): — La Morale Evangelique (1772, 2 vols. 12mo): — Traite sur le Providence: — L'Esprit des Peres (1791, 3 vols. 12mo). He was also a good mathematician, and sent papers to the Academy of Sciences, Paris.

## Rose, Stephen[[@Headword:Rose, Stephen]]

             a deacon and ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church, Bridgehampton, Long Island, N.Y., was born there, June 5, 1780. After a period of darkness and doubt, he was converted in 1803 and united with the Church. Renouncing all efforts to obtain wealth, he devoted himself exclusively to the Church, and he emphatically “loved the gates of Zion more than all the dwellings of Jacob,” and no one was more distinguished for piety and usefulness than elder Rose. He was a pioneer in the cause of the circulation of the Bible, temperance, and Sabbath schools in Suffolk County. To the Church and these institutions he devoted the energies of a powerful and cultured mind. He was a man of large and liberal views, and was ready to labor for the cause of Christ in all denominations, no Church lines  interfering with beneficent actions. He did much in winning souls to Christ by personal effort, always seeming to be in a revival; spirit. In his religious experience he knew little of those alternations of hope and despondency which enter into the feelings of many professing Christians. In him there was a harmonious blending of virtues and graces unsullied by any defects. He was wise, yet modest and unassuming; cautious, yet decided and unwavering. His sense of justice was strong and inflexible, but not stern and merciless — following the dictates of his Divine Master in a readiness to forgive even the greatest injuries on the first movement of repentance on the part of the offender. Everywhere, among all classes, he was revered as a man of God, perfect in his day and generation. He was a perfect storehouse of information, not only on all matters pertaining to Church history, but of Bible doctrines. He died “as a shock of corn cometh in its season,” at his home on Rose Hill, July 18, 1866. (W.P.S.)

## Rose, The Golden[[@Headword:Rose, The Golden]]

             (Rosa aurea), a rose made of gold and consecrated by the pope, which is presented to such princes as have rendered special service to the Church, or as may be expected to promote its interests, though it is sometimes given also to cities and churches. The essential parts of the rose are gold, incense, and balsam, signifying the threefold substance of Christ — Deity, body, and soul; and its color denotes purity, its scent attractiveness, its taste the satisfying of desire. It is not known when the ceremony of consecrating the rose was introduced, though the time is commonly placed in the 11th century and in the pontificate of Leo IX, and it has become increasingly impressive with the progress of time. The day is always the fourth Sunday in Lent, which is consequently known also as “Rose Sunday” (Dominica de Rosa). The pope, clothed wholly in white, intones before the altar the Adjutorium nostrum and offers a prayer of consecration, after which he dips the rose in balsam and sprinkles it with balsam, dust, incense, and holy water. It is then placed on the altar, mass is said, and the benediction concludes the solemnity. When the rose is not conferred by the hand of the pope, it is always transmitted by special messenger, and accompanied with a letter from the pope. Its use as a  symbol of joyous events has been continued in the Romish Church down to the present time. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Rosecrans, Sylvester Horton, D.D[[@Headword:Rosecrans, Sylvester Horton, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate, was born at Homer, Ohio, February 5, 1827. He entered Kenyon College, but on joining the Roman Catholic Church went to St. John's College, Fordham, N.Y., where he graduated with high-  honors in 1846. He studied five years in the College of the Propaganda at Rome, and was ordained priest in 1852. Returning to the United States, he became an assistant at the cathedral of Cincinnati, a position which he held for seven years, and was at the same time professor of theology at Mt. St. Mary's Seminary and one of the editors of the Cincinnati Catholic Telegraph. In 1859 archbishop Purcell established a college in-connection with the seminary for the education of Catholics, and Dr. Rosecrans was appointed president, which position he filled until the college was closed, March 25, 1862. He was made auxiliary bishop of Cincinnati in 1868, and when Columbus was erected into. a diocese he was appointed. its first bishop, the duties of which office he faithfully discharged until his sudden death, October 21, 1878. See (N.Y.) Catholic Annual, 1879, page 91.

## Roselli (Or Rosselli), Cosimo[[@Headword:Roselli (Or Rosselli), Cosimo]]

             an Italian painter, was born of a noble family at Florence in 1439, and studied under Neri di Bicci and Fra Angeli. He decorated what is called  “the Chapel of the Miracle” at Sant Ambrogio, and in 1476 aided in decorating the Sistine Chapel at Rome, where he had charge of the four great subjects — the Passage of the Red Sea, the Worship of the Golden Calf, the Lord's Supper, and Christ Preaching on the Sea of Tiberias. Returning to Florence loaded with honors, he died about 1506. The Museum of Berlin contains a Virgin with the Magdalen painted by him; that of Paris, a Virgin Gloriosa, a Christ Entombed, and two Madonnas; and at the Exposition of Manchester were shown a Christ on the Cross and the Virgin Surrounded by Saints. Roselli's principal pupil was Fra Bartolomeo.

## Roselli (Or Rosselli), Matteo[[@Headword:Roselli (Or Rosselli), Matteo]]

             an Italian painter, descended from the preceding, was born at Florence in 1578. He studied under Gregorio Pagani, and after the death of his master finished several of his uncompleted pictures. He decorated the Clementine Chapel. Some of his paintings are, the Manger, the Trinity, the Crucifixion of St. Andrew, and St. Elizabeth of Hungary. His frescos are superior to his other paintings, five of the best of which are in the cloister of the Annunciation. He died in 1650.

## Rosellini, Ipolito[[@Headword:Rosellini, Ipolito]]

             an Italian antiquary, was born at Pisa, Aug. 13, 1800. In 1821 he received the degree of doctor of theology, and afterwards studied at Bologna under Mezzofanti; and taught in the University of Pisa. At the time of the discoveries of Champollion, in 1825, Rosellini became interested in the study of hieroglyphics, and, in company with Champollion, studied Egyptian antiquities in the museums of Italy, and went with him to Paris. In 1828 he was commissioned by the grand-duke of Tuscany to explore the ruins of Egypt and Nubia with his son and three naturalists. Champollion was sent at the same time, and on a similar errand, by the duke de Blacas. The two parties united, and for fifteen months traveled through the two countries. Returning to Pisa, Rosellini spent the rest of his life in directing the publication of the results of the expedition, the whole of the work having fallen upon him at the death of Champollion. On account of his feeble health, he gave up his professor's chair, and was made librarian of the university. He died June 4, 1843. His works are, La Fionda di David (Bologna, 1823), a treatise upon the age of the Masoretic points: — Lettera Filoloqico-critica al Am. Peyron (Pisa, 1831): — Tributo di  Riconoscenza e d'Amore reso alla Memoria di Champollion il Minore (ibid. 1832): — Monumenti dell' Egitto e della Nubia, Interpretati ed Illustrati (Florence, 1832. 1840); this is his great work, the foundation of all modern research concerning ancient Egypt; it is divided into Monumenti Storici, Civili, e Religiosi: — and Elementa Linguoe Egyptiacoe vulgo Copticoe (Rome, 1837). The latter, published by P. Ungarelli, is a resume of the lectures given by Rosellini, but the substance of it is printed in the Grammaire Copte of Champollion. Some other works, De Interpretatione Obeliscorum Urbis Romoe, published by Ungarelli as those of Rosellini, belong really to Champollion. See Miller and Unbenas, Revue de Bibliographie Analytique (1842); Bardelli, Biogr. dell' Ipp. Rosellini.

## Rosemary, Use Of At Funerals[[@Headword:Rosemary, Use Of At Funerals]]

             The early Christians rejected the use of the cypress at funerals, as used by the heathen, and substituted rosemary. The heathen, having no thoughts of a future life, but believing that the bodies of the dead would lie forever in the grave, made use of cypress, which is a tree that, being once cut, never revives, but dies away. The Christians, having better hopes, and expecting the reunion of soul and body, use rosemary, which, being always green, and flourishing the more for being cut, is more proper to express this confidence and trust.

## Rosen, Friedrich Augustus[[@Headword:Rosen, Friedrich Augustus]]

             a celebrated Oriental scholar, was born in Hanover, Sept. 2, 1805, and entered Leipsic University in 1822, where he devoted himself to the study of the Biblico-Oriental languages. He went to Berlin in 1824, and studied Sanskrit under Bopp. He was subsequently called to the London University as professor of Oriental literature, which professorship he resigned in 1831, and devoted himself to study and writing. As secretary of the Asiatic Society, he conducted its entire foreign correspondence. Rosen died in London, Sept. 12, 1837. His first work was Radios Sanskrit (Berlin, 1827). He edited the Arabic Handbooks of Algebra, by Mohammed ben- Musa (Lond. 1831), wrote Oriental articles for the Penny Cyclopaedia, and revised the Sanskrit-Bengali Dictionary of Houghton (ibid. 1835). In 1836 he began to publish Hymns of the Rig-Veda, but left it unfinished. It was published by the Asiatic Society under the title Rigveda-Sanhita, Liber Primus, Sanscrite et Latine (ibid. 1838).

## Rosenbach, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Rosenbach, Johann Georg]]

             a journeyman spurmaker of Heilbronn, in Wurtemberg, who became one of the most prominent fanatics of the last century. Converted to God, as he thought, by the reading of Pietistic works, he forsook his handicraft in 1703, and traversed the cities of Central Germany, preaching and holding devotional meetings. He secured the endorsement of several professors in the faculty at Altorf, and gained over some of the students at Tubingen; but he was everywhere opposed by the clergy and driven away by the civil authorities. He eventually went to Holland, and there disappeared from view.

The teachings of Rosenbach were given to the world in three books-- Glaubensbekenntniss (1703), Wunder-u. gnadenvolle Bekehrung (1704), and Wunder-u. gnadenvolle Fuhrung Gottes eines auf d. Wege d. Bekehrung Christo nachfolgend. Schafes. It appears that he rejected infant baptism as not commanded in Scripture, and ineffective to produce conversion. He held the Lord's supper to be simply a memorial; despised the ministry in the churches; regarded the Bible as a mere dead letter, and not the Word of God; believed Christ to be the Savior, but asserted that the kindling of inward goodness would result in the saving, through Christ, of those who do not know of him; and confounded faith with its fruits, and justification with sanctification. He insisted positively on the existence of an intermediate state of souls after death, and on the prospect of a millennial reign of saints with Christ during a thousand years prior to the general resurrection.

The appeal of Rosenbach to the professors of Altorf in support of his views led to a protracted controversy, in which Joh. Phil. Storr, pastor at Heilbronn, and Prof. J. Michael Lange were the principal champions. See Walch, Einl. in d. Rel.-Streitigkeiten d. ev.-luth. Kirche, 1, 799 sq., 838 sq.; 2, 755 sq.; 5, 109 sq.; Unschuldige Nachrichten, 1704, p. 852; 1707, p. 172; 1708, p. 758; 1715, p. 1054; 1716, p. 426 sq.; 1721, p. 1096; also Von Einem, Kirchengesch. des 18ten Jahrhunderts, 2, 747 sq.; and Schrockh, Kirchengesch. seit d. Reformation, 8, 404.

## Rosenbaum, Johann Joseph[[@Headword:Rosenbaum, Johann Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic theologian of Germany, was born in 1797. In 185 he was professor of dogmatics in the clerical seminary at Treves, in 1842 pastor at Andernac, in 1862 member of the chapter at Treves, and died April 13, 1867, doctor of theology. He was one of the founders of the Zeitschri tfiir Theologie und Philosophie, published at Bonn, and printed in defence of Hermes and his philosophical system, Ueber Glauben (Treves, 1833). (B.P.)

## Rosenfeld, Hans[[@Headword:Rosenfeld, Hans]]

             a German impostor who set himself up as the Messiah, about the year 1763, in Prussia, declaring that Jesus Christ and his apostles were impostors, and that Frederick the Great was the Evil One, whom Rosenfeld  was to depose. He taught that he was to govern the world, assisted by a council of twenty-four elders, like those of the Apocalypse. He deluded multitudes, and lived upon them in outrageous profligacy for twenty years. Eventually, in 1782, one of his followers appealed to the king, whom he believed to be the Evil One, to revenge him on Rosenfeld for the deduction of his three daughters. The king ordered proceedings against Rosenfeld, and he was sentenced to be flogged, and imprisoned for the remainder of his life at Spandau. After this his followers, called Rosenfelders, quietly disappeared.

## Rosenfeld, Samson Wolf[[@Headword:Rosenfeld, Samson Wolf]]

             rabbi of Bamberg, was born Jan. 26, 1780, at Uhlefeld, in Bavaria. At the age of thirteen he entered the Jewish academy at Furth, where, besides the Talmud, he studied the philosophical writings of Maimonides, Albo, and others. At the age of nineteen he returned to his native place, and continued his studies, especially devoting himself to the writings of Moses Mendelssohn. In 1817 he was appointed rabbi of his native place. In 1819 he represented his coreligionists in Munich, and presented a memorial concerning the amelioration of the condition of the Jews; an act which he repeated in 1846, in spite of the hatred of the orthodox Jews, who thought of putting him under ban. In 1826 he was called to Bamberg, and, having passed the necessary examination required by the government, he entered upon his new field in March of the same year. He was a conservative reformer, and as such he published some works which tended to enlighten his coreligionists. He died May 12, 1862. Of his publications, we mention especially his Stunden der Andacht fur die Israeliten beiderlei Geschechts (2d ed. Dinkensbuhl, 1858, 3 vols.). See Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. 3, 169; Kayserling, Bibl. jud. Kanzel redner, 1, 414 sq.; Klein, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, 1863, p. 201 sq.; Kramer, in the Jewish year-book Achawa, 1866, p. 15-33. (B.P.)

## Rosenfelders[[@Headword:Rosenfelders]]

             SEE ROSENFELD, HANS.

## Rosenfeldt, Frederick John[[@Headword:Rosenfeldt, Frederick John]]

             a missionary of the Episcopal Church, was born of Jewish parents Feb. 10, 1804, at Mitau, in Courland, Russia. According to the custom of that country, Rosenfeldt was instructed in the religion of Rabbinism, and when  ten years old he was taken to Berditschev for further instruction in the Talmud. One of the most learned teachers, however, at that place endeavored to awake in his students a desire to apply themselves to the study of other languages, and not without success. Rosenfeldt, with two fellow scholars, was permitted by a Roman Catholic priest to take part in the instruction of his school, which he did in secret, acquiring a knowledge of reading and writing Russian, Polish, German, and a little arithmetic. At the age of eighteen he was married, according to the fashion of the country, and for two years lived in the house of his father-in-law, spending his time in the study of the Talmud. Having returned to Berditschev, he came into possession of a copy of the New Testament in Hebrew, circulated by the missionary Mr. Moritz (q.v.). His two former fellow scholars and himself resolved to embrace Christianity, and intended to go to Berlin. Rosenfeldt was prevented from carrying out his plan by circumstances beyond his control. In the meantime he received letters of introduction to the missionaries in Poland, and arrived at Warsaw in September, 1827. Having received the necessary instruction, he was baptized in the Reformed Church Feb. 10, 1828. His exemplary life and Rabbinical learning recommended him to the London Society, and in September, 1828, he was appointed assistant to the mission station at Radom. From this time on till his death, which occurred July 11, 1853, he was connected with the London Society, his last station being Lublin. See the Jewish Intelligencer, 1853, p. 313 sq.; Annual Reports of the London Society, 1829, p. 52 sq. (B.P.)

## Rosenkrans, Cyrus E.[[@Headword:Rosenkrans, Cyrus E.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallpack, N.J., March 12, 1809. He graduated at Amherst College, Mass.; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary, New York city; and was licensed and ordained by New York Third Presbytery April 8, 1842. He entered upon his labors as a minister in the West, at East May, Wis., and subsequently at Columbus, Wis. He died March 8, 1861. Mr. Rosenkrans was a man of fine conversational powers, excellent judgment, and had the tact necessary to carry out useful plans of action. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1862, p. 195. (J.L.S.)

## Rosenkrans, Joseph[[@Headword:Rosenkrans, Joseph]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Wallpack, N.J., Nov. 13, 1812. He received his education at Amherst College, Mass., and Union College, Schenectady, N.Y.; studied theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York city; and was ordained by New York Third Presbytery in 1842 as pastor of the Church in Bethlehem, N.Y. He subsequently preached for the churches of Newport, Martinsburg, Romulus, and Onondaga Valley, N.Y., where he was laboring when he died, June 19, 1863. Mr. Rosenkrans was a man of well-balanced mind; orthodox, faithful to every trust, a fair scholar, and a good preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, p. 321. (J.L.S.)

## Rosenkranz, Johann Karl Friedrich[[@Headword:Rosenkranz, Johann Karl Friedrich]]

             a Protestant theologian and philosopher of Germany, was born April 23, 1805, at Magdeburg. He studied at different universities, and commenced his academical career at Halle in 1828. In 1831 he was appointed professor, and was called to Konigsberg in 1833, where he died, June 14, 1879. In his philosophical system he was a follower of Hegel, and published, Der Zweifel amn Glauben, Kritik der Schriften: De Tribus Impostoribus (Halle, 1830): — Die naturreligion (Iserlohn, 1831):Encyclopddie der theologischen Waissenschcften (Halle, eod.; 2d ed. 1845): — Kritik der Schleiermacherschen Glaubenslehre (Konigsberg, 1836): — Ueber Schelling und Hegel (1843): — Kritik der Principien der Strausschen Glaubenslehre (Leipsic, 1845): — Neue Studien (1875-77, 3 volumes). See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rosenkreuz[[@Headword:Rosenkreuz]]

             SEE ROSICRUCIANS.

## Rosenmuller, Ernst Friedrich Karl[[@Headword:Rosenmuller, Ernst Friedrich Karl]]

             a noted German Orientalist, who contributed largely to the advancement of our acquaintance with the Shemitic languages, literature, and customs. He was the oldest son of the rationalist theologian Johann Georg Rosenmüller (q.v.), and was born Dec. 10, 1768. The various positions held by his father introduced him to learned studies at an unusually early age, and afforded him unequalled facilities for their prosecution. He became identified with the University of Leipsic, first as a student, in 1792 as tutor, extraordinary professor of Arabic in 1796, and professor in ordinary of Oriental languages from 1813 to the time of his death, Sept. 17, 1835. His principal work was authorship; his chief importance that of a learned, keen, and industrious writer on Oriental subjects. He promoted the study of the Arabic language (Institutiones ad Fundam. Linguoe Arab. [Lips. 1818]; Analecta Arabica [ibid. 1824-27, 3 vols.]), brought within the reach of theologians the rapidly increasing knowledge of his day with reference to the conditions of the East (Altes u. Neues Morgenl. etc. [ibid. 1816-20, 6 vols.]), and endeavored to raise the exposition of the language and statements of the Old Test. to the level of the science of his day. Comp. his Scholia in Fetus Test. (16 pts. ibid. 1788-1817; the same in epitome, 5 pts. 1828-35); Handb. fur Lit. d. Bibl. Kritik u. Exegese (4 pts. Götting. 1797- 1800), and the Handb. d. Bibl. Alterthumskunde (4 pts. Leips. 1823-34). His works, with biography annexed, are fully given in Neuer Nekrolog d. Deutschen, 13th year, pt. 2, p. 766769.

## Rosenmuller, Johann Georg[[@Headword:Rosenmuller, Johann Georg]]

             the father of the preceding, a prominent theologian, preacher, and writer of Germany in the close of the last and the beginning of the present century, was born of humble parentage Dec. 18, 1736. Unusual talents secured for him assistance by which he was enabled to procure an education at Nuremberg and the University of Altorf. He subsequently spent several years as tutor in different families and schools, and became popular as a preacher, so that a number of prominent churches were successively placed under his charge. In 1775 he became professor of theology at Erlangen, in which position he secured a name, and in 1783 at the pedagogium at Giessen. In 1785 he entered on a theological professorship at Leipsic, and in that office, joined with the pastorate of St. Thomas's Church and the superintendency, he spent the last thirty years of his life. It is not strange that he should have become tinged with rationalism from association with the element then in control of the Leipsic University; but he has retained the name of a pious rationalist. His influence was highly beneficial to the progress of the theology and ecclesiastical life of Protestantism. Many of his sermons were printed, and earned for him the reputation of an exemplary popular preacher; and devotional manuals from his pen have not yet lost their hold upon the Christian public. His literary activity was surprising, nearly 100 different writings having been given by him to the world, among them works on exegesis, hermeneutics, and practical theology; e.g. Scholia in N.T. (6th ed. Lips. 1815-31, 6 vols.): — Hist. Interp. Libr. Sacrorum in Eccles. Christ. (ibid. 1795-1814, etc., 5 vols.). His practical activity was equally respectable. He founded and improved schools, labored to secure a modernized hymnology, sought to eliminate objectionable features from the administration of the Lord's supper, etc. After having been rewarded with all the titles and honorary positions usually conferred on a senior of the theological faculty, he died, March 14, 1815. See Dolz, Dr. J.G. Rosenmüller's Leben und Wirken (ibid. 1816).

## Rosenroth[[@Headword:Rosenroth]]

             SEE KNORR VON ROSENORIOTH.

## Rosenthal, David Augustus, Dr.[[@Headword:Rosenthal, David Augustus, Dr.]]

             a German writer of ecclesiastical history, was born of Jewish parentage at Neisse, in Silesia, in the year 1812. Having finished his preparatory studies at the gymnasium, he entered the University of Breslau for the study of medicine. After having been promoted as doctor of medicine, he settled at Breslau, and in 1851, together with his family, became a member of the Roman Catholic Church. As a member of that Church he was especially  active in ameliorating the Catholic press and societies of Silesia. He also distinguished himself as an author by editing the poetical works of Angelus Silesius, better known as Scheffler (1862, 2 vols.), but more especially by the publication of his Convertitenbilder aus dem 19. Jahrhundert (5 vols.). Rosenthal died March 29, 1875. His Convertitenbilder, or biographical sketches of converts to the Roman Catholic Church in the 19th century, are a very important contribution to Church history, in which the lives of Jews and Protestants are described who joined the Romish Church in our century. The first volume (Schaffhausen, 1871-72) treats of the converts in Germany; the second, of those of England; the first division of the third (1869), of those of France and America; the second division of the third (1870) is devoted to Russia, besides giving a supplement to the former volumes. See the Literarischer Handweiser, 1875, p. 120. (B.P.)

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

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Sondershausen, September 21, 1641, studied at different universities, and died at Quedlinburg, November 6, 1689, superintendent and court-preacher. He wrote, De Manifestatione Nominis Jehovah ad Exo 6:2 : — De Fictitia Denominatione Missae a Papicolis ex Deu 16:10 : — De Dagone 1Sa 5:2-4 : — De Morte Judce Proditoris Jesu Christi: — De Genealogia Christi Secundum Lucanz, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten Lexikon, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:567. (B.P.).

## Rosetta Stone[[@Headword:Rosetta Stone]]

             SEE HIEROGLYPHICS.

## Rosette[[@Headword:Rosette]]

             an ornament in front of the hat worn by prelates, dignitaries in a cathedral, and archdeacons. Savage (Progress of a Divine, 1735) says, “He gained a cassock, beaver, and a rose.” — Walcott, Sac. Archoeol. s.v.

## Rosewell, Thomas (1)[[@Headword:Rosewell, Thomas (1)]]

             an English clergyman, was born near Bath in 1630, and educated at Pembroke College, Oxford. He became rector of Sutton Mandeville in 1657, was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and was settled as minister at Rotherhithe in 1674. He was tried for high treason in 1684 by judge Jeffreys for some expressions in a sermon, was condemned, but pardoned. He died in 1692. Rosewell published, The Causes and Cure of the Pestilence (Lond. 1665, sm. 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Rosewell, Thomas (2)[[@Headword:Rosewell, Thomas (2)]]

             an English Dissenting minister, was born at Rotherhithe in 1680, and educated partly in Scotland. He was for a time assistant to Mr. John Howe, at Silver Street, London, and then colleague with Mr. John Spademan at the same place till towards the close of his life, when he removed to Mare Street, Hackney, where he died in 1722. Rosewell had a share in the continuation of Henry's Exposition, the part assigned him being the Epistle to the Ephesians. He published a volume of Sermons (1706): — sixteen  single Sermons (1706-20): — and The Arraignment and Trial of Mr. Thomas Rosewell (1718, 8vo).

## Rosh[[@Headword:Rosh]]

             (Heb. Rosh, ראֹשׁ, head, as often; Sept. ῾Ρώς), the name of a man and perhaps of a people. SEE GALL.

1. The seventh named of ten sons of Benjamin, each of whom was head of a family in Israel (Gen 46:21). B.C. cir. 1880. He is perhaps identical with the RAPHA of 1Ch 8:2. SEE JACOB. “Kalisch has some long and rather perplexed observations on the discrepancies in the lists in Genesis 46 and Numbers 26, and specially as regards the sons of Benjamin. But the truth is that the two lists agree very well so far as Benjamin is concerned; for the only discrepancy that remains, when the absence of Becher and Gera from the list in Numbers is explained [see those words], is that, for the two names אהיand ראש(Ehi and Rosh) in Genesis, we have the one name אחיר ם(Ahiram) in Numbers If this last were written רא ם, as it might be, the two texts would be almost identical, especially if written in the Samaritan character, in which the shin closely resembles the memo That Ahiram is right we are quite sure, from the family of the Ahiramites, and from the non mention elsewhere of Rosh, which, in fact, is not a proper name. The conclusion, therefore, seems certain that אחיוראשin Genesis is a mere clerical error, and that there is perfect agreement between the two lists. This view is strengthened by the further fact that in the word which follows Rosh, viz. Muppim, the initial m is an error for sh. It should be Shuppim, as in Num 26:39; 1Ch 7:12. The final m of Ahiram and the initial sh of Shuppim have thus been transposed.”

2. The Heb. word rosh, rendered “prince” (Eze 38:2-3; Eze 39:1), ought to be read as a proper name, as in the Sept. — “the chief” or “prince of Rosh, Meshech, and Tubal.” Rosh thus appears as the name of a northern nation, along with Meshech and Tubal (comp. Rhoas, in Pliny, 6, 4, which may be a city, a river, or a people, between Suavi and the district Erectoe, on Caucasus; and Rhadsh, an Iberian province in the same place, named by Russegger [Beschreib. d. Caucas. 2, 34]). Gesenius says, “Without much doubt Rosh designates the Russians, who are described by the Byzantine writers of the 10th century, under the name of the Roos, as inhabiting the northern parts of Taurus; and also by Ibn-Fosslan, an Arabic  writer of the same period, under the name Rus, as dwelling upon the river Volga” (Thes. Heb. s.v.). The Oriental writers say that Rus was the eighth son of Japhet, and his descendants are, by Abulfaraj, always joined with the Bulgarians, Slavonians, and Alani. For other suppositions, see Stritter, Memor. Populorolin ad Danub., etc., Habitant. 2, 957 sq.; Michaelis, Suppl. 6, 22-24 sq.; Bochart, Phpal. 13, 13; Schulthess, Parad. p. 193; Ierbelot, Biblioth. Or. 3, 137 sq. If the view of Gesenius be correct, in this name and tribe we have the first trace of the Russ, or Russian, nation. “Von Hammer identifies this name with Rass in the Koran (25, 40; 1, 12), the peoples Aad, Thamud, and the Asshabir (or inhabitants) of Rass or Ross.' He considers that Mohammed had actually the passage of Ezekiel in view, and that ‘Asshabir' corresponds to Nasi, the ‘prince' of the A.V., and ἄρχοντα of the Sept. (Surm les Origines Russes [St. Petersb. 1825], p. 24-29). The first certain mention of the Russians under this name is in a Latin Chronicle under the year A.D. 839, quoted by Bayer (Origines Russicoe, Comment. Acad. Petropol. [1726], p. 409). From the junction of Tiras with Meshech and Tubal in Gen 10:2, Von Hammer conjectures the identity of Tiras and Rosh (p. 26). The name probably occurs again under the altered form of Rasses (q.v.) in Jdt 2:23 — this time in the ancient Latin, and possibly also in the Syriac version, in connection with Thiras or Thars; but the passage is too corrupt to admit of any certain deduction from it. This early Biblical notice of so great an empire is doubly interesting from its being a solitary instance. No other name of any modern nation occurs in the Scriptures, and the obliteration of it by the A.V. is one of the many remarkable variations of our version from the meaning of the sacred text of the Old Test.”

## Rosh hash-Shanah[[@Headword:Rosh hash-Shanah]]

             SEE TALMUD.

## Rosicrucians[[@Headword:Rosicrucians]]

             a pretended fraternity in Germany which existed simply in a book entitled Fama Fraternitas des loblichen Ordens des Rosenkreuzes, and published in 1614. That book recited that Christian Rosenkreuz, a German of noble family, born in 1388, and educated in a convent, had in early youth visited the holy sepulchre, and had spent three years in Damascus with the Arabians, engaged in the study of physics and mathematics, after which he went to Fez by way of Egypt, and there pursued the study of magic. He  learned among other things that every man is a microcosm. An attempt to dispense his new found wisdom in Spain met with no encouragement, for which reason he determined to bestow his treasures on his fatherland. He built a sort of convent, which he named Sanctus Spiritus, and associated with himself three friends from the monastery to which he originally belonged. This was the institution of the Rosicrucian order, which was afterwards enlarged by the addition of four other persons. The members traveled everywhere to promote the reformation of the world, but met at their central house once a year. They claimed the possession of the highest knowledge and freedom from sickness and pain, though not from death. Each member chose his successor, but concealed his own death and place of burial. Even the tomb of Rosenkreuz himself was unknown until after 120 years from the founding of the order, when a vault was discovered in his house which was brilliantly illumined from above by an artificial light, and which contained a round altar placed over the yet undecomposed body of the founder. The inscription “Post CXX annos patebo” over the door of the vault showed that the time had come for making known the order to the world. The learned were accordingly invited to carefully examine the arts described in the Fama (which was printed in five languages), and to publish their opinions through the press, as the hope was expressed that many would connect themselves with the order. Other writers appeared in confirmation or illustration of the Fanza, e.g. a Confession (1615), and the Chymische Hochzeit Christian Rosenkreuz (1616). An immense excitement in Germany and adjoining lands was produced by these works, and called forth a flood of appreciative or condemnatory reviews. The interest felt at the time in secret arts, particularly that of making gold, led many to seek association with the fraternity, while others suspected a most dangerous heresy in theology and medicine; but it was remarkable that no actual member of the original Rosicrucian order was ever discovered. Every theological text book contended at length against this heresy, and medical writers discovered its intention to destroy the reputation of Galen and supersede him by Paracelsus. Robert Fludd, in England, defended the order with zeal, and the court physician of the emperor Rudolph II, Michael Maier, asserted the truth of the statements contained in the Fama. The title of Rosicrucians was finally adopted by a society of alchemists, which originated at the Hague in 1622, and afterwards by other fraternities. Investigations made by such societies into the origin of the Fama Fraternitas led to the conclusion that the book was intended as a satire on the condition of the times. The authorship of the book was finally ascribed  to Joh. Val. Andreae, the Wurtemberg theologian, and this opinion is still generally received.

A list of the older Rosicrucian literature may be found in Missiv an d. hocherl. Bruderschaft d. Osdens d. goldenen u. Rosenkreuzes, etc. (Leips. 1783); Chr. v. Murr, Wahrer Ursprung d. Rosenkreuzer, etc. (Sulzbach, 1803). See also Gottfr. Arnold, Unparthei. Kirchen- u. Ketzer- Historie (Frankft. 1729; Schaffhausen, 1742), pt. 2, ch. 18 and suppl., p. 947; Herder, Hist. Zweiffl uber Fr. Nicolai's Buch, etc., in the Deutscher Merkur of 1782 (Sämmtl. Werke z. Phil. u. Gesch. vol. 15); Zur Lit. u. Kunst, vol. 20; Buhle, Ursprung u. vornehmenste Schicksale der Orden d. Freimaurer u. Rosenkreuzer (Gtt. 1804); Nicolai, Ueber Ursprung und Gesch. d. Freimaurer (Berl. and Stettin, 1806); Hossbach, Joh. Val. Andreoe u. sein Zeitalter (Berl. 1819); Guhrauer, Vemfasser u. ursprungl. Zweck d. Fama Fraternitas, etc., in Niedner's Zeitsch. f. hist. Theologie, 1852, p. 298-315.

## Rosin[[@Headword:Rosin]]

             properly “naphtha “(νάφθα; Vulg. naphtha, so thee Peshito-Syriac). In the Song of the Three Children (Jdt 2:23), the servants of the king of Babylon are said to have “ceased not to make the oven hot with rosin. pitch, tow, and small wood.” Pliny (2, 101) mentions naphtha as a product of Babylonia, similar in appearance to liquid bitumen, and having a remarkable affinity to fire. To this natural product (known also as Persian naphtha, petroleum, rock oil, Rangoon tar, Burmese naphtha, etc.) reference is made in the passage in question. Sir R.K. Porter thus describes the naphtha springs at Kirkulk, in Lower Kurdistan, mentioned by Strabo (17, 738): “They are ten in number. For a considerable distance from them we felt the air sulphurous, but in drawing near it became worse, and we were all instantly struck with excruciating headaches. The springs consist of several pits or wells, seven or eight feet in diameter, and ten or twelve deep. The whole number are within the compass of five hundred yards. A fight of steps has been cut into each pit for the purpose of approaching the fluid, which rises and falls according to the dryness or moisture of the weather. The natives lave it out with ladles into bags made of skins, which are carried on the backs of asses to Kirkuk, or to any other mart for its sale.... The Kirkuk naphtha is principally consumed by the markets in the southwest of Kurdistan, while the pits not far from Kufri supply Baghdad and its environs. The Baghdad naphtha is black” (Trav. 2, 440). It is  described by Dioscorides (1, 101) as the dregs of the Babylonian asphalt, and white in color. According to Plutarch (Alex. p. 35), Alexander first saw it in the city of Ecbatana, where the inhabitants exhibited its marvelous effects by strewing it along the street which led to his headquarters and setting it on fire. He then tried an experiment on a page who attended him, putting him into a bath of naphtha and setting light to it (Strabo, 17, 743), which nearly resulted in the boy's death. Plutarch suggests that it was naphtha in which Medea steeped the crown and robe which she gave to the daughter of Creon; and Suidas says that the Greeks called it “Medea's oil,” but the Medes “naphtha.” The Persian name is naft. Posidonius (in Strabo) relates that in Babylonia there were springs of black and white naphtha. The former, says Strabo (17, 743), were of liquid bitumen, which they burned in lamps instead of oil. The latter were of liquid sulphur. SEE BITUMEN; SEE NAPHTHA.

## Rosini, Carlo Maria[[@Headword:Rosini, Carlo Maria]]

             an Italian archaeologist, was born at Naples, April 1, 1748. He studied among the Jesuits, embraced the ecclesiastical life, and in 1784 became the successor of Nicolo Ignarra as professor of Holy Scripture in a college at Naples. He was canon of the Cathedral of Naples till 1792, when he was elected bishop of Pozzuoli. He was in favor with the king, and received the position of councilor of state and grand almoner, and later, under Ferdinand I, was minister of public instruction. Rosini was a member of the Academy of Herculaneum after its reorganization, and was one of the most active in deciphering ancient MSS., of which he published a great number. They are included in the Herculanensia Volumina (Naples, 1793). Rosini died at Naples, Feb. 18, 1836. His works are all on archaeological subjects, the principal one being Dissertatio Isagogica ad Herculanensium Voluminum Explanationem (ibid. 1797), a history of the destruction of Herculaneum and Pompeii. See Tipaldo, Biogr. degli Ital. Illustri; Rosa [Prospero della], Vita di C.M. Rosini.

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

             a German doctor of theology and professor of history, was born June 19, 1736, at Canstadt, in Wirtemberg. For some time he labored as deacon at Vaihingen, and in 1777 he was called to Tubingen, where he died, March 20, 1821. He wrote, Lehrbegriff der christl. Kirche in den ersten Jahrunderten (Frankft.-on-the-Main, 1775): — De Philosophia Vet.  Ecclesioe de Spiritu et de Mundo (Tubingen, 1783): — Bibliothek der Kirchenvater in Uebersetzungen u. Auszugen, etc. (Leips. 1776-86). See Winer, Handbuch de theol. Literatur, 1, 594, 598, 876; 2, 738. (B.P.)

## Rosmini (Serbati), Antonio[[@Headword:Rosmini (Serbati), Antonio]]

             an Italian ecclesiastic and philosopher, was born at Roveredo, in the Tyrol, March 24, 1797. He studied at Padua, became a priest at the age of twenty-four, and in 1827 published his first treatise on philosophy, to which he had devoted himself from his early youth. About the :same time he formed the acquaintance of Malnzoni, and the next year founded a new religious order, the "Instituto del Preti della Carita" (Brethren of Charity), visiting Rome in 1830 to obtain the sanction of the pope. In 1834 he returned to Roveredo as archdeacon, and in 1836 became abbot there, and founded a similar female order (Sisters of Providence). Meanwhile he continued his philosophical studies and publications, in consequence of the liberality of which he failed to secure. the confirmation of his cardinialship (given him in 1848 by Pius IX), and some of his books were even put on the Index Expurgatorius. He died at Stresa, July 1, 1855. His writings fill thirty-five volumes. His Life has been written by Lockhart (1856) and Garelli (1861). For a notice of his career and philosophy see the Fortnightly Review, November 1881, and July 1882.

## Ross (Also Rous, Rouse, Or Rows), John (1)[[@Headword:Ross (Also Rous, Rouse, Or Rows), John (1)]]

             usually called “the Antiquary of Warwick, “was born in the town of that name in England, and educated there until prepared for the university. He then studied at Baliol College, Oxford, where he took the degree of A.M., and afterwards was installed canon of Osney. English antiquities became his favorite pursuit, and he traveled over the greater part of the kingdom to acquire information. He then took up his residence at Guy's Cliff, in Warwickshire, where he had a possession granted him either by the earl of Warwick or by Edward IV, and died Jan. 14, 1491. Of the manuscripts left by him the following were published: Joannis Rossi Antiquarii Warwicensis Historia Rerum Anglioe Descripsit (Oxon. 1716, 8vo; 2d ed. 1745, 8vo): — Joannis Rossi Historiola de Comitibius Wariwicensibus (1729, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ross, Alexander[[@Headword:Ross, Alexander]]

             a Scottish divine and writer, was born at Aberdeen in 1590. He became chaplain to Charles I, and was his zealous partisan during the civil war, 1642-49. He was also master of the Southampton Free School, to which, at his death, in 1654, he left a handsome bequest. Among Ross's works was a Continuation of the History of Sir Walter Raleigh, A.M. 3604 to A.D. 1640 (Lond. 1652): — Rerum Judaicarum (ibid. 1617-32, 4 vols.): — Exposition of the First Fourteen Chapters of Genesis, by “Abrahame Rosse” (ibid. 1626):-- A View of the Jewish Religion (ibid. 1656, small 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ross, Arthur[[@Headword:Ross, Arthur]]

             a Scotch prelate, was minister of Birse, in the shire of Aberdeen, and was educated at the University of St. Andrews. In 1665 lhe was pastor at  Glasgow, where he continued until 1675. He was then promoted to the see of Argyle, whence he was transferred to that of Glasgow in 1679, and to that of Galloway the same year. But he was retranslated to the see of Glasgow October 15, the same year, and thence advanced to the see of St. Andrews, October 31, 1684, where he continued until the revolution in 1688, when he was deprived. He died June 13, 1704. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, pages 43, 269, 282, 291.

## Ross, Edward Frederick[[@Headword:Ross, Edward Frederick]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in New York city, Feb. 12, 1826. He graduated from Union College in 1848, and entered the Andover Theological Seminary, where he pursued his theological studies for two years, when he entered the Union Theological Seminary, and graduated in 1851. He was ordained Sept. 26 of the same year, and was installed pastor of the Congregational Church of Morrisania, N.Y., in which position he remained until 1854, when he resigned and removed to Poughkeepsie. Here he remained without charge, and died at Pleasant Valley, N.Y., Feb. 22, 1855. (W.P.S.)

## Ross, Frederick A., D.D[[@Headword:Ross, Frederick A., D.D]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in 1796. His long life was devoted to the service of Christ. He was remarkable for the vigor of his intellect, boldness and zeal in the pulpit, and the contributions of his pen to the literature of the Church. He died at Huntsville, Alabama, April 18, 1883. See (N.Y.) Observer, April 26, 1883. (W.P.S.)

## Ross, Hugh[[@Headword:Ross, Hugh]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Rothiemurchus, Inverness-shire, Scotland, in 1797. He pursued his academic studies at the parish school of Abernethy, until, in 1813, the family emigrating to Nova Scotia and settling in Pictou, he became a student in the Pictou Academy. When he had finished his academic course, he studied theology with Rev. Dr. M'Cullough, was licensed by Pictou Presbytery in 1823, and, being able to preach in Gaelic, was soon after ordained as an evangelist, and spent some time in the island of Cape Breton. In 1827 he became pastor of the churches of Tatamagouchee and New Annan, and subsequently of Georgetown and Murray Harbor. He was moderator of the synod at the time of the disruption, and gave in his adherence to the Free Church. Mr.  Ross died suddenly, Dec. 1, 1858. He was a man of fine gifts and an excellent preacher. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 234. (J.L.S.)

## Ross, John (2)[[@Headword:Ross, John (2)]]

             an English clergyman, was a native of Herefordshire, and was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge, where he took his degree of D.D. In 1756 he became vicar of Frome, Somersetshire, bishop of Exeter in 1778, and died in 1792. He published six single Sermons (1756-85, 4to): — a Defense of Epistles said to have been Written by Cicero to Brutus: — Marci Tullii Ciceronis Epistolarum ad Familiares Libri X VI (1749, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Ross, John (3)[[@Headword:Ross, John (3)]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Dublin, Ireland. July 23, 1783, of Roman Catholic parents, but was left in a state of orphanage when quite young. At the age of nineteen he left his friends secretly and went to sea. On his way to Liverpool he was seized by a press gang and put on board a man-of-war. Afterwards, at Barbadoes and elsewhere, he was pressed a second and a third time. His numerous desertions and wonderful escapes would constitute the staple of a romance. He at last reached the United States, and went to work at his early trade of shoemaker at New London, Conn. He was still a bigoted Roman Catholic; but as there was no church of that denomination in the town, he was in some degree weaned from his  attachment and, through contact with Protestants, brought to reflect upon his condition, and eventually led to realize that he was a sinner, and that something beyond the power of priestly absolution was necessary to give his troubled conscience rest. By prayer to the Friend and Savior of sinners, he found pardon and peace. Soon after his conversion his mind was turned to the ministry, and Providence wonderfully opened the way for him, as it does for all who are truly called to that work. By the aid of an association of ladies he was enabled to enter Middlebury College, Vt., where he graduated in 1811.

He entered Princeton Theological Seminary in 1813. After remaining in the seminary over two years, Mr. Ross preached as a missionary for about three months in the suburbs of Philadelphia. He was educated for the foreign field, and was in readiness to go to it, but the Board had not the funds to send him. He was therefore sent to Somerset and Bedford, Pa. Having received a call from the Church at Somerset, he was ordained as pastor by the Presbytery of Redstone in 1817. From Somerset he went to Ripley, O., in 1819, where he remained about four years, and afterwards went to Indiana, preaching at different points and for various periods of time on his way. In both Ohio and Indiana he did much missionary work, traveling on horseback over wild and wide ranges of country. He preached several sermons in the old fort at Fort Wayne, Ind., when there were very few houses in that now large and flourishing city, and he is said to have been the first Presbyterian minister that ever preached in that town. In September, 1824, he settled at Richmond, Ia., and was pastor of Beulah Presbyterian Church for twenty-five years, from 1824 to 1849. From the minutes of the General Assembly it appears that in 1849 he was a member of the Presbytery of Muncie, and continued such until his death. In 1849 he was a stated supply at Burlington, la., and in 1850 at Windsor, 0.. being yet quite vigorous for his years. After leaving Richmond, he resided in New Paris, O., Milton, Connersville, Knightstown, Burlington, Muncie, and Tipton, Ia. In labors. he was more abundant as a pioneer in what was then the “far West.” As long as he could stand in the pulpit he was fond of preaching, and sometimes preached with the fire of his younger days long after he had become an octogenarian. He lived to be the oldest minister in the Presbyterian Church, and died at the house of his daughter in Tipton, March 11, 1876. (W.P.S.) Ross, William, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Tyringham, Mass., Feb. 10, 1792. He was converted in his seventeenth year, and was received as a probationer in the New York Conference in 1812. In May, 1824, he attended the General Conference in Baltimore, where he  signalized himself as the author of a very able and luminous report on missions. He died Feb. 10, 1825. He was a diligent student and an eloquent preacher. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1825, p. 476; Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 524.

## Ross, William Charles, Sir[[@Headword:Ross, William Charles, Sir]]

             an English miniature painter, was born in London, June, 1794. In 1837 he was appointed miniature painter to the queen. In 1843 he gained a prize of one hundred pounds for a picture of The Angel Raphael Discoursing with Adam. His death occurred in 1860.

## Ross, William Z.[[@Headword:Ross, William Z.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Licking County, O., April 24, 1823. At the age of sixteen he professed faith in Christ and united with the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was licensed as a local preacher, and was admitted on trial in the Ohio Conference in 1853. In 1865 he was appointed missionary to Tennessee and stationed at Shelbyville, where he died, Oct. 11, 1866. His preaching was marked by extraordinary force and pungency of application. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1867, p. 259.

## Rossanian Manuscript[[@Headword:Rossanian Manuscript]]

             (Codex Rossanensis) is an uncial manuscript designated by the Greek letter I, and is so called from Rossano, in Calabria, where it was found. In the spring of 1879 two German scholars, Dr. Oscar von Gebhardt, of Gottingen, and, Dr. Adolf Harnack, of Giessen, made a joint expedition into Italy in search of old manuscripts. In his Hippolyti altae Feruntur Omnzia, page 216, Lagarde called attention to a notice from the 16th century, according to which manuscripts of Cyril of Jerusalem, Dionysius Alexandrinus, and of Hippolytus are said to be in the monastery of Santa Maria de lo Patire, near Rossano. This notice induced the two German scholars to search for these writings, of which, however, they could hear nothing, the monastery having long since perished. But they were informed that there was a very old Biblical book in the archiepiscopal palace. They begged to be allowed to look at this. Ushered into the presence of the archbishop, monsignor Pietro Cilento, they beheld, to their astonishment and delight, a quarto volume of the gospels, written in silver, on purple parchment, in old Greek uncial letters, unaccented, the words unseparated, and at the beginning a number of admirably drawn and colored miniatures and historical pictures. It consists of one hundred and eighty-eight leaves of parchment of two columns of twenty lines each. Mnore than half of the original manuscript seems to have perished. What survives contains the whole of Matthew and Mark as far as the middle of the fourteenth verse of the last chapter. The discoverers assign it to the 6th century; the text attaches itself closely to the chief representatives of the amended text of A, Δ, Π, over against the most ancient codices אand B; but where one of these (Δ for example) accords with the older text, Σ also usually follows it, and. shows a remarkable agreement with the scattered purple codex of the gospels N. Independent of the new Greek text (a specimen of which is given by Schaff in A Companion to the Greek Testament, N.Y. 1883, page 132), the pictures in the manuscript are believed to be of great value for the  early history of painting. While Latin manuscripts with pictures are relatively numerous, only a very few Greek manuscripts prior to the 7th century are thus adorned. Chief among them .is the Vienna purple manuscript of Genesis. The newly discovered pictures give a very favorable impression of the art of the 6th century. They are described as, being wonderful in distinctness of outline and freshness of coloring. The manuscript is the property of the chapter of the cathedral church of Rossano. See Gebhardt and Harnack, Evangeliorum Codex Graecus Purpureus Rossanensis, etc. (Leipsic, 1880); Schuer, in the Theol. Liter Liturzeituung, 1880, No. 19. (B.P.)

## Rosshirt, Conrad Eugen Franz[[@Headword:Rosshirt, Conrad Eugen Franz]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born in 1793 at Oberscheinfeld, in Franconia. He studied at Landshut and Erlargen, and in 1817 he was already professor of canon law in the latter place. He was one of the oldest professors of canon law in Germany, and died June 4, 1873, at Heidelberg. He wrote, Lehrbuch des Kirchenrechts (3d ed. Schaffhausen, 1858): — Von den falschen Decretalen u. von einigen neuen in Bamberg entdeckten Handschriften der falschen Decretalen (Heidelb. 1846): — Zu den kirchen rechtlichen Quellen des ersten Jahrtausends und zu den pseudoisidorischen Decretalen (ibid. 1849): — Canonisches Recht (Schaffhausen, 1857): — Manuale Latinitatis Juris Canonici, Rerum Moralium et Theologicarum, Brevissimis Annotationibus Instructum, quo Lexici Juris Canonici Lineamenta Proponere Studuit (ibid. 1862): — Beitrage zum Kirchenrecht (Heidelb. 1863). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1088; Literar. Handweiser, 1873, p. 300. (B.P.)

## Rossi (In Lat. De Rubeis), Bernardo Maria De[[@Headword:Rossi (In Lat. De Rubeis), Bernardo Maria De]]

             an Italian scholar, was born at Cividale di Friuli, Jan. 18, 1687. At the age of seventeen he took the vows of the Order of St. Dominic; and after finishing his studies taught for three years in a convent at Venice. In 1718 he went to Vienna, where he made the acquaintance of the learned Apostolo Zeno. On his return, he accepted the chair of theology in the same institution in which he had formerly taught. In 1730 he resigned his chair and devoted himself wholly to study and the most rigorous asceticism. In 1722 he accompanied an embassy to the court of France. He was librarian of his convent, and enriched it by the addition of many rare and valuable works. De Rossi died Feb. 8, 1775. His writings are very numerous, consisting principally of historical and religious annals. Among them are, De Fabula Moainachi Benedictini D. Thomoe Aquinatis (Venice, 1724): — De Peccato Originuali (ibid. 1757 ): — De Charitate (ibid. 1758 ): — Dissertationes Varioe Eruditionis (ibid. 1762). See Fabroni, Vitea Italorum.

## Rossi, Azariah (Ben-Moses) De[[@Headword:Rossi, Azariah (Ben-Moses) De]]

             a Jewish scholar of the celebrated family called in Hebrew Min ha- Adomim, was born in Mantua about 1514. Naturally endowed with extraordinary powers of mind, keenness of perception, refinement of taste, and with an insatiable desire for the acquisition of knowledge, De Rossi devoted himself with unwearied assiduity and zeal to the study of Hebrew literature, archaeology, history, the writings of ancient Greece and Rome, and even the fathers, which knowledge was of great use to him afterwards, when he devoted himself more especially to the criticizm of the Hebrew language and the sacred text. Having prosecuted his studies in Mantua, Ferrara, Ancona, Sabionetta, Bologna, etc., he went back to Ferrara with the accumulated learning of more than half a century, the results of which he now communicated to the world in his celebrated work entitled מְאוֹר עֵינִיַ, The Light of the Eyes (Mantua, 1574-75). The work consists of three parts, subdivided into chapters as follows:

Part I, which is entitled קוֹל אֶלֹהַי ם, The Voice of God (republished at Vienna in 1829), which was occasioned by the terrible earthquake at Ferrara, Nov. 18, 1570, and which De Rossi himself witnessed, contains, in easy style, a graphic description of the event. He believes it a duty to relate to posterity how the power of the Creator had manifested itself. He dilates on the subject, to prove that he does snot altogether agree with Greek philosophers, who attribute sudden disasters to natural causes, but argues forcibly and (quoting also Scriptural and Rabbinical authorities) concludes that the invisible hand of God uses nature — its own creation — to mete out men's deserts. He then branches out to comment scientifically on narratives in sacred and secular works relative to earthquakes, Land remarks that what happened to his wife would have confounded an AEsculapius and a Hippocrates. She had moved into her daughter's room shortly before the roof of the house fell, by a sudden shock, into her own chambers. The fright occasioned turned the color of her skin into a deep yellow, and from that moment she craved for nothing but salt. Bread and salt became to her a most delicious food. Yet that morbid desire he holds to have been her cure. Without taking any medicine, it gradually decreased, and her natural color returned. Thereupon De Rossi reasons out our ignorance of the wonders of nature, and suggests the possibility that the quantity of pure salt his wife ate destroyed the effect of the saline and  sulphuric particles which may have entered her system at the upheaving of the earth.

Part 2, which is entitled הִדְרִת זְקֵנַי ם, The Story of the Aged (republished at Vienna 3, 1829), contains an account of the Sept. version of the Bible, chiefly from the letter of Aristeas, a confidential friend of king Ptolemy Philadelphus, communicated to his brother Phylocrates. De Rossi accepted it as true in all its details. Modern criticizm has seen where it is at fault, and declared it spurious. That a Greek translation of the Pentateuch — not of the whole Bible — was made under the auspices of king Ptolemy cannot be doubted. Besides Josephus, Philo, and the fathers of the Christian Church, the Talmud has recorded the incident, somewhat hyperbolically, in the treatise Megillah. But that the so called Sept. version of the entire Scriptures should have had the origin related above is impossible. SEE SEPTUAGINT.

Part III, which is divided into two divisions, respectively called אַמְרֵי בַינָה, Word of Understanding, and יְמֵי עוֹלָ, Chronology, consists of four sections, subdivided again into sixty chapters. The first division, with its two sections (מִאֲמָרַי ם), treats, in ch. 1-13, of the use of the fathers; the heathen writings; Philo: the Jewish sects, especially the Essenes; the Sept. and the Aramaic versions; the history of the Jews in Alexandria and Cyrene; the Bar Kochba revolts; the Ten Tribes; the Talmudic story about Alexander the Great's entry into Jerusalem; and of the Talmudic theory of nature. The second section, embracing ch. 14-28, contains treatises on the explanation of Scripture by ancient sages: on the Midrash and Hagadic exegesis; on sundry striking differences between Christian and Jewish writers; the old Persian list of kings; on the different eras of the Jewish chronology; Josephus; Seder Olam; on the series of high priests during the second Temple, etc., published with the second part (Vienna, 1829-30). The third section treats, in ch. 29-44, of the Biblical chronology and the Jewish Calendar; of old Persian kings; extracts from and criticizms on Phlilo, Josephus, etc. The fourth section, embracing ch. 45-55, descants upon Jewish antiquities; Aquila and (Onkelos; the antiquity of the letters and the vowel points; Hebrew poetry, etc.

This work, considered as a whole, though not distinguished by scientific correctness or historical accuracy, has nevertheless always been a favorite among Hebrew scholars, and parts of it have been translated into Latin, as  ch. 23, 25, 33, 35, by Voorst, in his translation of the צֶמִח דָּוַד (Leyden, 1644); ch. 8, 14, 19, by Meyer, in his version of the עוֹלָ סֶדֶר (Amst. 1699); ch. 9, 42, 59, by Buxtorf. in his Tiractatus de Antiquitate Punctorum (Basel, 1648); ch. 1, 55, by the same. in his translation of Kuzari (ibid. 1660), and ch. 56, 58, in his Dissertatio de Litferis Heb. (ibid. 1662); ch. 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 20, 48, by Morin, in his Exercitationes Biblicoe (Paris, 1638), p. 185, 188, 190, 191, 230, 287, 314, 342, 563; ch. 2, 8, 15, 16, 22, 45, 51, 56, 57, 59, by De Voisin, in his edition of Martini's Pusgio Fidei adversus Maurus et Judoeos, etc. (ibid. 1651), p. 75, 77, 113, 122, 127, 128, 129. 142, 144, 373; ch. 9; by Van Dale, in his Dissertatio super Aristeam, etc. (Amst. 1705), p. 174; ch. 9; 22; by Bartolocci, in his Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica (Rome, 1675-93), 1, 680; 2, 800; ch. 16 and 21, by Bochart, in his Hierozoicon (Leyden, 1712), pt. 1, ch. 6; 2, 569; and ch. 56, by Hottinger, in his Cippi Hebroei (Heidelb. 1662), p. 123. The sixteenth chapter has been translated into English by Raphall, in the Hebrew Review and Magazine, 2, 170 (treating “of the gnat which entered the skull of Titus, “as related in the Talmud); while the sixtieth chapter has been translated by bishop Lowth, in the preliminary dissertation to his transl. of Isaiah (Lond. 1835), p. 28, etc. De Rossi has criticized his material in so liberal a manner that many of the Jews proscribed the work, while others wrote in refutation of some of his liberal criticisms. Prominent among these were R. Moses Provenuale, of Mantua, and R. Isaac Finzi, of Pesaro. De Rossi subjoined to some copies of the Meor Esnayim itself a reply to the former, and wrote a separate work entitled ס8 מִצְרֵ לִכֶּסֶ, The Refining pot for Silver, after Pro 17:3.

This work, which is an essential supplement to the Meor Enayim, has recently been published by Filipowski (Edinb. 1854), and by L. Zunz, with the Meor Enayime (Wilna, 1863-66, 3 vols.). De Rossi also wrote Poems and Epigraphs, ם וְחִרוּזַי ם שַׁירַי (Venice, 1586). Three years before his death, De Rossi had a dream. A man stood by him, and voices cried, “Dost thou not see the personage looking on thee? He is a prophet.” “If so,” said Azariah, addressing the stranger, “if thou art indeed inspired, let me know how long I have to live.” “Three years yet,” was the answer. By the wayside of Mantua the bones of the illustrious writer rested, and on his grave a significant inscription was placed, when the dream proved true, in Kislev, 5338 (i.e. 1577). The stone shared the fate of him who lay buried beneath. Both were rudely cast away to some unknown spot by the Italian monks, who sought for more space to build up monasteries.  See Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 171 sq.; De Rossi, Dizionario Storico, p. 280 sq. (Germ. transl.); Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibl. Bodl. col. 747; Ginsburg in Kitto, s.v.; the same, Levita's Massoreth hal-Malssoreth, p. 52 sq., and Essenes, p. 59 sq.; Wolf, Bibl. Hebr. 1, 944; 3, 871; Etheridge, Introd. to Heb. Literature, p. 455; Cassel, Leitfaden fur Gesch. u. Literatur, p. 97; (Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, 9, 432 sq. 435.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenth. u. s. Secten, 3, 123; Da Costa, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 488; Zunz, Literaturgesch. zur synagogalen Poesie, p. 417; id. Biography of De Rossi in Kerem Chemed (Prague, 1841-42), 5, 131-138; 7, 119-124; id. Zur Gesch. d. Literatur, p. 233, 249, 536; Rapaport in Kerem Chemed (ibid. 1842), 5, 159-162; Jewish Messenger (N.Y. March, 1875). (B.P.)

## Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo de[[@Headword:Rossi, Giovanni Bernardo de]]

             an eminent Italian Orientalist, was born at Castel-Nuovo, in Piedmont, Oct. 25, 1742. In 1766 he was ordained priest at Turin, and in the same year received the degree of doctor of theology. For several years he devoted himself to the study of the Oriental languages, and he was also acquainted with the greater part of those of Europe. In 1769 he was employed in the Museum of Turin, and soon after was called to the chair of Oriental languages at Parma, which position he held until 1821. During the remainder of his life he was employed in writing and editing philological  and bibliographical works. Many of these were printed in the most elegant style, and are today considered models of typography. His collection of rare Hebrew manuscripts was sold to Maria Louisa in 1816. De Rossi died at Parma in March, 1831. Among his works are, Canticum seu Poema Hebraicum (Turin, 1764): — Della Liqegua Propi ia di Cristo e deyli Ebrei della Palestina da' Tempi de' Maccabei (Parma, 1772): — Della Vana A spettazione degli Ebrei del loro Messia (ibid. 1773): — Vainoe Lectiones Veteris Testamenti (ibid. 1784-88), a most valuable contribution to Biblical criticism (q.v.): — Introduzione alla Sacra Scrittura (ibid. 1817).

## Rossi, Pasquale[[@Headword:Rossi, Pasquale]]

             called Pasqualino, a painter of the Roman school, was born at Vicenza in 1641, and died about 1718. His works are to be found in the principal galleries. Among them are, Christ in the Garden: — The Baptism of Christ: — St. Gregory Celebrating A Mass: — and the Adoration of the Shepherds.

## Rossignol, Jean Joseph[[@Headword:Rossignol, Jean Joseph]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at Pisse, among the Upper Alps, July 3, 1726. He joined the Order of St. Ignatius in 1742, and taught philosophy at Embrun, near Marseilles. In 1761 he went to Wilna, Poland, and there taught mathematics and astronomy, and constructed the observatory of the city. In 1764 he took the chair of mathematics in the College of the Nobles at Milan, and here he published his Oeuvres. On the suppression of his order, he settled at Embrun; but on account of the violent opposition which he showed to the civil constitution of the clergy, he was obliged to establish himself at Turin. Here he was maintained by the liberality of count de Melzi, a former pupil. Rossignol died in 1817. His works were numerous, and are said to have exceeded one hundred, but they are very rare. The principal ones are, Theses Generates de Theologie, de Philosophie, de Mathematiqeues (1757): — Theses de Physique, d'Astronomie, et d'Histoire Naturelle (1759): — Vues Philosophiques sur Eucharistie (Embrun, 1776). See Feuille Hebdomadaire de Turin.

## Rossignoli, Bernardino[[@Headword:Rossignoli, Bernardino]]

             an Italian theologian, was born at Ormea in 1563.. At the age of sixteen he joined the Society of Jesus, subsequently taught theology at Milan, was  rector of several colleges, and was provincial at Rome. At the time of his death, June 5, 1613. he was rector of a college at Turin. Rossignoli's writings are, De Disciplina Christianca Perfectionis Lib. V (Ingolstadt, 1600 ): — De Actionibus Virtutis Lib. II (Venice, 1603). These two works passed through many editions, and the first was translated into French (Paris, 1606). Several other works have been attributed to Rossignoli, but it is probable that he was merely the translator. At the time of the interest excited in the De Imitatione Christi, Rossignoli was the first to attract attention to the MS. of this work, bearing the name of abbe Jean Gerson. See Rossotto, Syllabus Script. Pedemontii.

## Rossler, Carl Gottfried[[@Headword:Rossler, Carl Gottfried]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born in Leipsic. He was first deacon at Merseburg, and afterwards superintendent at the same place, where he died, Aug. 16, 1837. He published Predigten und Gelegenheitsreden (Merseburg, 1829): — De Scripturoe Sacroe Versione a Luthero Temporibus inde ad nostra usque in Ecclesia Evangelico-Lutherana constanter caute passim E'nendanda (Lips. 1836). See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1088; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 103, 738. (B.P.)

## Rosso (In French, Roux), Giovanni Batista Del[[@Headword:Rosso (In French, Roux), Giovanni Batista Del]]

             an architect and painter of the Florentine school, was born at Florence in 1496. It is not known whether he ever studied under any of the masters of his time, but his style was probably formed from copying the works of Angelo and Parmigiaio. His life was one of agitation, and, during his earlier years, a continued disappointment. Finding that his work was not appreciated in his native city, he left for Rome. Here his success was somewhat greater; but, after the sack of the city in 1527, he fell into the hands of soldiers, who robbed him of all he possessed. He went to Perugia, and after the city was quieted, returned to Rome. In 1530 he went to France, where he was well received by Francis I; and his troubles seemed at an end. He was superintendent of the works at Fontainebleau, and many of the frescos are by his own hand. During the triumphal passage of Charles V through France, the arches which were erected in his honor were designed by Rosso. As a reward for his work, Francis added to the pension of the artist and gave him a canonicate in the Sainte Chapelle. He lived in luxury and high favor at court but an unfortunate affair, involving his honesty, so wrought upon his mind that he poisoned himself in 1541. The  pictures of Rosso are not often seen in galleries, but there are a few which may be mentioned . Moses Defending the Daughters of Jethro: — The Four Seasons: — Christ in the Tomb: — Madonna, with St. Sebastian and other Saints: — and the Marriage of the Virgin.

## Rostagno, Francisco Gurico[[@Headword:Rostagno, Francisco Gurico]]

             a minister of the Waldensian Church, was born in the year 1838 in the village of Prali, in the mountains of The Valleys. Delicate health prevented his going to school till he was about fifteen years of age; but, being a diligent student, he soon acquired the necessary requirements to make him a useful minister of the Gospel. Being thoroughly acquainted with the Italian language and literature, he wrote many articles for the Revista Cristiana, his last being on the “Religion of Alessandro Manzoni.” In the year 1866 he was ordained for the Waldensian ministry, and a year afterwards he was put in charge of the small congregations of Verona and Mantua, where he labored until 1872. He was then called to Leghorn; and at this important and difficult post he not only supplied the spiritual wants of his own coreligionists, but also arranged to give a course of addresses especially to Jews upon the subject of the need of the Messiah — “What say the Scriptures about His Coming?” “Jesus of Nazareth Borne Testimony to in the Old Testament, in the Prophecies, and the Types.” But soon he was removed from his earthly post, and died in January, 1874. See Jewish Intelligencer, 1874, p. 85 sq. (B.P.)

## Rosweyde, Herbert[[@Headword:Rosweyde, Herbert]]

             a Dutch Jesuit and historian, was born at Utrecht, Jan. 22, 1569. At the age of twenty he entered the Society of Jesus, taught philosophy at Douai and Antwerp, and finally gave his whole time to the study of ecclesiastical antiquities, exploring the libraries of all Belgium to gain information on the subject. Rosweyde died at Antwerp, Oct. 5, 1629. His works are numerous, and were all published at Antwerp. Among them are, Fasti Sanctorum (1607):Vitae Patrum) (1615): — Historia Ecclesiastica (1623): Vitoe Sanctorum u Virginum (1626). See Foppens, Bibl. Belgica; Dupin, Bibl. des Auteurs Ecclesiastiques.

## Roswitha[[@Headword:Roswitha]]

             a nun of Gandersheim, in Brunswick, Germany, who lived at the close of the 10th century, and is noteworthy because of certain poetical  compositions from her pen which have come down to our time. They are written in rhymed hexameters, and include panegyrics on the Virgin, St. Gangolf, St. Dionysius, St. Agnes, the Ascensio Domini, etc. She also wrote Christian comedies in prose, after the manner of Terence, in which she celebrated the victory of heavenly over fleshly love, and of Christian martyrdom over heathen passion, and two historical poems in hexameter — one of which rehearses the history of her convent, and the other that of the emperor Otho I (Carmen de Gestis Ottonis I Imperatoris). The latter possesses some historical interest, though based on the statements of the friends of Otho and showing marks of her ignorance of the world. It contains much fine description, and is written in superior language. Its form approaches that of the Latin epos, particularly of Virgil. The Carmen de Primoerdiis Coenobii Gandersheimensis includes the family history of the house of Saxony, and thus becomes somewhat important to general German history.

Roswitha's works were first published by Conra Celtes (Nuremberg, 1501, fol.). Pertz, Mon. Germ., Hist. Script. 4, 306-335, contains the two historical poems and a life of Roswitha. A complete edition was given by Dr. Barrach, of the Germanisches Museum (1857). See Gfrorer, Kirchengeschichte. 3, 3, 1357; Contzen, Geschichtschreiber der sachsischen Kaiserzeit (Regensburg and Augsburg, 1837), p. 109 sq.; Giesebrecht, Geschichte der deutsch. Kaiserzeit, 1, 742.

## Roszel, Stephen Asbury[[@Headword:Roszel, Stephen Asbury]]

             son of the following, was born in Georgetown, D.C., Feb. 18, 1811. At the age of seventeen he had made himself acquainted with the whole course of English and classical literature required for graduation from the best colleges. His conversion took place in his sixteenth year, and about the same time he became associated with his brother in a classical school in Baltimore. He studied law and was admitted to the Baltimore bar, but soon decided to give up the profession. He acted for several years as principal of the grammar school of Dickinson College, and in 1838 was admitted to the Baltimore Conference on trial. He dissolved his connection with the institution in 1839, sustained a supernumerary relation for a year, and then resumed active work. He was elected in 1848 a delegate to the General Conference held at Pittsburgh, Pa., and was for eight years secretary of his own conference. He died in Alexandria, Va., Feb. 20, 1852. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1852, p. 10.

## Roszel, Stephen G.[[@Headword:Roszel, Stephen G.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in London County, Va., April 8, 1770. He was converted at the age of sixteen and soon after united with the Church. He entered the traveling connection in 1789, although, for some reason, his name is not found on the minutes until the following year, when he appears among those who remain on trial. He served the Church as preacher in charge, presiding elder, as agent for Dickinson College, and in the General Conference, until his death, which took place at Leesburg, Va., May 14, 1841. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 179; Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1842.

## Roszell, Stephen Samuel, D.D[[@Headword:Roszell, Stephen Samuel, D.D]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born at Philadelphia, October 29, 1812. He graduated early from Augusta College, Kentucky, taught in Baltimore, Maryland, became professor in Dickinson College, joined the Baltimore Conference in 1838, and continued one of its distinguished preachers until laid aside by infirmity. He died April 27, 1882. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church South, 1883, page 13.

## Roszfeld (In Latin, Rosinus), Johann[[@Headword:Roszfeld (In Latin, Rosinus), Johann]]

             a German antiquary, was born at Eisenach in 1551. He studied at Jena, and in 1579 became sub-director of the gymnasium at Ratisbon, but after a few years he gave up this position to enter the evangelical ministry, and preached at Naumburg, in Saxony, until his death by the plague, Oct. 5, 1626. His principal works are: Antiquitatum Romanarum Corpus Absolutissimum (Basle, 1583; Lyons, 1585): — Exempla Pietatis Illustris (Jena, 1602).

## Rota[[@Headword:Rota]]

             in Lapp mythology, was an evil god of hell, the ruler of the place of punishment for the souls of transgressors.

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

             in Norse mythology, was one of the Walkures, or Odin's messengers, to select the victims who were to fall in death.

## Rota Romana[[@Headword:Rota Romana]]

             (or SACRA ROTA), the supreme papal tribunal at Rome, was instituted by pope John XXII in A.D. 1326, and improved by Sixtus IV and Benedict XIV. The name is variously derived from the circular arrangement of the judges' seats, or the form in which the calendars are arranged, etc.; comp. Dom. Bernino, Il Tribunale della S. Rota Rom. (Rome, 1717) for etymology of the title and history of the court. The Rota was long the supreme court of the entire Roman Catholic Church; but legal causes in the Church in foreign parts are now generally tried by judices in partibus who  have been delegated by the pope. The Rota is divided into two colleges, or senates, one of which forms a lower court of appeal, while the other has supreme jurisdiction. Each senate is composed of at least five judges, namely, a referendary (termed a ponens), who presides, and four associates (correspondentes). The action of the higher senate may, however, be subjected to the process of restitutio in integrum, on which the matter is referred to the plenum of the Rota. This plenum consists of twelve members (Uditori Romani, or Auditores Rotoe), each of whom is assisted by a lawyer (adjutante di studio). The senior judge is denominated dean, and takes the chair. Sessions are held on Monday and Friday of every week, except in the vacation during August and September, in the Vatican. The decisions of this court have been gathered into different collections, the first in 1470, etc. A more recent edition containing selected trials is Decis. S. Rotoe R. Recentiores Selectoe (Venet. 1697, 25 parts in 19 vols. fol.). They are also published in full in annual issues. SEE CURIA ROMANA.

## Rote[[@Headword:Rote]]

             a mediaeval musical instrument, not unlike the ancient psalterium.

## Rotger (Ruotger, Rutger)[[@Headword:Rotger (Ruotger, Rutger)]]

             archbishop of Treves from 918 to 928. He was chosen, without intervention of the king, by the clergy and people of the Church of Treves, and by the wisdom and energy of his administration justified their choice. He induced Giselbert, the duke of Lorraine, to restore the abbey of St. Servetius at Maestricht, which he had seized, to the archbishopric of Treves, and was the leading agent in overcoming the faction of nobles who sought to transfer Lorraine to the usurper Rudolph of Burgundy after that province had been forever ceded (923) to Henry, king of Germany. He also sustained a literary intercourse with Flodoard of Rheims, the learned author of the Hist. Rhemens., and induced him to write a large poetical work on the triumphs of Christ and various Palestinian and Italian saints, the manuscript of which was still preserved in the library of the cathedral at Treves in the 17th century. His principal ambition, however, was to regulate the affairs of the Church in the province of Treves, and to administer the canons in the spirit of the councils. He accordingly instituted a collection of canons from the fathers and the popes, and submitted it to a provincial synod of the suffragans of Metz, Verdun, and Tull at Treves in  927. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.; and comp. Hist. de la France, 7, 201-203; Brower, Annal. Trev. lib. 9, n. 64-79.

## Rotger, Gottfried Sebastian[[@Headword:Rotger, Gottfried Sebastian]]

             a German doctor of theology, was born at Klein-Germersleben, not far from Magdeburg, April 5, 1749, and died May 16, 1831, as director of the cloister school and provost of Magdeburg. He wrote: Versuch einer magdeburgischen Refformationsgeschichte (Magdeburg, 1792): — Kirchliche Gebetsubungen (Bonn, 1824). See Winer, Handbuch der theolog. Literatur, 1, 806; 2, 283, 389, 738. (B.P.)

## Roth, Abraham[[@Headword:Roth, Abraham]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1633 at Herwigsdorf, Silesia, studied at Leipsic, and died at Soran, April 26, 1699, court- preacher and superintendent. He wrote, De Cerva Aurorae ad Psalms 22 : — De Cultu Dei Rejectitio Mat 15:9 : — De Nicolaitis, Apocal. 2:15: — De Essenis: — De Molocholatria Judaeorum: — De Judaeorum Ligamentis Precatoriis. See Grosser, Lausitze; Merkwurdigkeiten; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v., (B.P.)

## Roth, Karl Johann Friedrich Von[[@Headword:Roth, Karl Johann Friedrich Von]]

             juris utriusque doctor, and during twenty years president of the Protestant high consistory at Munich, fills an important place in connection with the history of the Church in Bavaria from 1828 to 1848. He was born at Vaihingen, in Wurtemberg, Jan. 23, 1780, and trained in the study of the ancient languages from early childhood. In his youth he shared in the enthusiasm of the times for theories set afloat by Voltaire and still more by Rousseau, and consequently chose the law for his profession instead of theology, as both his father and himself had originally intended. Entering the University of Tubingen in 1797, he found a judicious guide in Malblanc, and, through the study of the sources of Roman law, acquired the historical faculty which distinguished him through life. At the age of twenty-one he published a treatise, De Re Romanorum Municipali, which won for him the doctorate of laws and secured the approval of prominent legal minds. He became jurisconsult to the then free city of Nuremberg, in which position he was led to study the subject of finance, which he had not previously examined; and when the city was transferred to Bavaria he entered the service of that kingdom in the finance department. He was elected to membership in the Royal Academy of Sciences in 1813; and the publication in 1817 of the Weisheit Dr. Martin Luther's — extracted apothegms from the reformer's writings — and of Hamann's Werke in 1825 gave evidence that his conversion to orthodox views in religion had progressed side by side with his growing attainments in scientific culture. In 1828 king Louis I appointed Roth to the presidency of the high consistory.

When Roth received this appointment, the reaction against rationalism had begun, and a number of clergymen were conducting a brave battle for its overthrow. The attitude of Roth, who made it his  business to foster the good wherever it might exist, gave them the encouragement they needed for a successful prosecution of their task. In other respects his work was marked out for him. His department was thoroughly organized into a high consistory, three consistories, and a number of deaneries, with district and general synods having advisory jurisdiction and the right to propose measures. It was requisite that this machinery should be quietly but energetically worked, and Roth succeeded in his task to a degree that made the Bavarian Church a model of systematized powers and effective discipline. In the matter of training theologians for the future, Roth was likewise earnestly employed. He discovered men like Hofling, Thomasius, and Harless, and had them appointed to the faculty of Erlangen, the local university. He also originated the ephorate to supervise the progress of theological students and report directly to the ministry of the interior, and founded the Preachers' Seminary at Munich to receive a number of candidates who had passed the first examination, and afford them two additional years of practical training under the direction of the high consistory. The accession of Von Abel in 1837 to the ministry of the interior began a new sera, in which the Protestants of the kingdom were systematically oppressed and the Roman Catholics favored.

An order by which all soldiers, including those of the Landwehr, which consists of citizens, were obliged to kneel whenever the Romish Sanctissimum should be carried about excited great dissatisfaction; and Roth was censured in this business because it was believed that he had been timid or indifferent in contending for the rights of Protestants. Later events have shown that he was acting from prudential motives which would not permit him to risk all while striving to secure a particular end; but the feeling against him rose to such a height as to compel his retirement from the high consistory in March, 1848. The ephorate was likewise rejected by the students in that year of revolts. The result of the persecution was, however, beneficial to the cause of Protestantism in the end, because it united its adherents, increased their spirituality, and settled their determination to insist on a recognition of their rights; and at the proper moment a letter to the king from Roth secured a revocation of the military order which was so greatly resented. Roth was, soon after his retirement, called to a seat in the council of state; but, after completing the fiftieth year of his official life, he sought and obtained a dismissal to private life. He died Jan. 21, 1852. A collection of Roth's writings was published by himself at Frankfort, consisting chiefly of panegyrics and addresses. He also edited the Gelehrten Anzeigen, issued  by the Academy of Sciences, from 1835 to 1850, enriching them with articles of his own and with reviews of English, French, and other foreign works.

## Rothaan, John Philip[[@Headword:Rothaan, John Philip]]

             a Dutch Jesuit, was born Nov. 23, 1785, at Amsterdam, entered, Feb. 3, 1804, at Dunaburg, in Russia, the Society of Jesus, and became professor of rhetoric, Greek, and Hebrew at Polotsk, in Russia. When the Jesuits had to leave the Russian empire, he retired into Switzerland, and in 1829 was elected vicar-general of the order. Being obliged to leave Rome on account of the Italian revolution, he visited a great part of the European provinces of the Jesuits, returned again to Rome, and called together a general congregation of the order; but before it convened he died, May 8, 1853. He published, Exercitia S. P. Ignatii Loyoloe (Rome, 1835; Paris, 1865; German translation, Regensburg, 1855): — De Ratione Meditandi (Rome, 1847; German translation, Regensburg, 1853; Vienna, 1857). (B.P.)

## Rothe, Johann Andreas[[@Headword:Rothe, Johann Andreas]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born May 12, 1688, at Lissa, Silesia, and studied at Leipsic. Count Zinzendorf selected him to fill the office of pastor at Berthelsdorf, the duties of which Roth discharged to the admiration of all who knew him. He died July 6, 1758. Rothe is the author of several hymns, the best known of which is his Ich habe nun den Grund gefunden (Engl. transl. "I now have found, for hope of heaven," in Mills, Horae Germanicaem No. 32). See Koch, Geschichte des deutschen Kirchenliedes, 5:240 sq. (B.P.)

## Rothe, Richard[[@Headword:Rothe, Richard]]

             an eminent German divine, was born at Poseh, Jan. 28, 1799, and became successively member, professor, director, and ephorus of the Theological Seminary of Wittenberg. He was for five years chaplain of the Prussian embassy at Rome, conducted a theological seminary at Heidelberg for twelve years, and was a professor of theology at Bonn and Heidelberg, where he died, Aug. 20, 1867. His religious views are tinged with the philosophy of Schleiermacher and Hegel. He published, Die Anfange der christlichen Kirche und ihre Verfassung (1837): — Zur Dogmatik (1863): — and Theologische Ethik (1845-48, 3 vols.; revised by Holtzman, 1867- 71, 5 vols., with the author's posthumous notes). Since his death there have appeared his university lectures, Dogmatik (1870); essays, Stille Stunden (1872), and his lectures on Church history (1875, edited by Weingarten). For the best account of his life, see Nippold, Richard Rothe (Wittenberg, 1873). See also the Studien und Kritiken, 1869, No. 3; Meth. Quar. Rev. July, 1872; Bib. Sacra, July and Oct. 1874. SEE ETHICS.

## Rothem[[@Headword:Rothem]]

             SEE JUNIPER.

## Rothenburg, Meir[[@Headword:Rothenburg, Meir]]

             SEE MEIR BEN-BARUCH.

## Rotheram (Or Rotherham), John[[@Headword:Rotheram (Or Rotherham), John]]

             an English divine, was born in Cumberland, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He became fellow of University College, Oxford, rector of Houghton-le-Spring, and in 1769 vicar of Seaham. Rotheram died in 1788. Among his published works are, Sketch of the One Great Argument for the Truth of Christianity (Oxford, 175254, 8vo): — Force of the Argument for the Truth of Christianity from Prophecy (2d ed. 1753, 8vo): — Origin of Faith (1761, 8vo): — Apology for the Athanasian Creed (Lond. 1762, 2 vols. 8vo): — On Faith (1766-68, 8vo) — besides Sermons and Essays.

## Rothwell, Richard[[@Headword:Rothwell, Richard]]

             an English divine, was born in Lancashire, near Bolton-in-the-Moors, about 1563. He received his education at Cambridge, and, after spending a number of years in the university, was ordained presbyter by Dr. Whitgift, archbishop of Canterbury. He was made chaplain to a regiment under the earl of Essex in Ireland; and afterwards, refusing several benefices, was for a time lecturer at chapel in Lancashire, and domestic chaplain to the earl of Devonshire. Still later, he spent most of his time in the bishopric of Durham, having gone there at the proposal of lady Bowes. His death took place in 1627.

## Rotuman Version[[@Headword:Rotuman Version]]

             About 300 miles north of Fiji is an island called Rotumah, with a population of less than 3000, and until lately wholly enveloped in heathen darkness. In 1865 the Rev. W. Fletcher, of the Wesleyan Missionary Society, commenced missionary work among the people, and his three years' labor in that place resulted in bringing a large proportion of the population under the influence of the Gospel. In the year 1869 Mr. Fletcher commenced a translation of the New Test. in the Rotuman dialect, which was printed at Sydney, and has been in circulation since 1871. Mr. Fletcher, in consequence of the extremely trying character of the climate, was compelled to leave the island, but his translation was prepared with all possible promptitude. European missionaries are not allowed to reside permanently in Rotumah, and the future progress of the mission must depend mainly on the efforts of native teachers and the presence among the people of the Word of God in their own vernacular. (B.P.)

## Rouel (Or Rowel) Light[[@Headword:Rouel (Or Rowel) Light]]

             is a device for moving the star in the Epiphany play of The Three Kings with a pulley wheel (roue), as the spiked wheel in a spur is called rowel.

## Rougemont, Francois De[[@Headword:Rougemont, Francois De]]

             a French Jesuit missionary, was born at Maestricht in 1624. In 1641 he joined the Jesuits, and, as was customary, was for a time employed in teaching, but at his urgent request was finally sent as a missionary to China with several of his brethren. They arrived in that country in 1659, and for some years Rougemont had charge of several churches and missionary stations in the province of Nankin. During the persecution of 1664 he was, with many others, carried in chains to Pekin, and thence to Canton, where he was for a long time held prisoner. But an edict of the emperor Kanghi gave him liberty in 1671, and he returned to his work of preaching and teaching. Rougemont died at Taitsang-tchow in 1676. His writings are, Historia Tartaro-sinica Nova (Louvain, 1673); this was written in the prison at Canton: — Abrege de la Doctrine Chretienne: — Questions sur les Moeurs du Siecle. The last two were written in Chinese, and have never been translated. See Sotwel, Bibl. Scriptor. Soc. Jesu.

## Rougemont, Frederic De[[@Headword:Rougemont, Frederic De]]

             a Protestant theologian of Switzerland, who died at Neufchatel in 1876, was a very prolific writer, whose works have for the greater part been translated into German. Of his publications we men tion, Du Monde dans ses Rapports avec Dieu (1841): — Essai sur le Pietismse (1842): —  Histoire de la Terre d'Apres la Bible et la Geologie (1856, Germ. transl. by Fabarius, Stuttgard, cod.): — La Peuple Primitif (1855-57): — L'Age de Bronze ou les Semites en Occident (1867): — La Vie Humaine avec et sans la Foi (1869): — Theorie de la Redemption (1876): — Revelation de Saint Jean Expliquee (1838): — Les xii Derniers Livres Prophetiques de l'Ancien Testament (1841): — Philosophie de l'Histoire (1874, 2 volumes): — Christ et ses Temoins (1859): — La Divinite et l'Infirmite de l'Ancien Testament (1869), etc. See Godet, Journal Religieux, 1876, Nos. 16, 17; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rouille, Pierre Julien[[@Headword:Rouille, Pierre Julien]]

             a French Jesuit, was born at Tours in 1681, and died in 1740. He was one of the authors or compilers of Memoires de Trevoux.

## Roumania[[@Headword:Roumania]]

             SEE RUSSIA; SEE TURKEY.

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

             comprises 4,598,219 inhabitants belonging to the Greek Church, 115,420 to the Church of Rome, 8803 to the Armenian Church, 7790 to the Evangelical Church, 401,051 Jews, 25,033 Mohammedans, and 16,058 who call themselves Lipowanians. The Greek Church is the State Church, organized on strictly hierarchical principles. At the head of the clergy is the archbishop or metropolitan and primate of Roumania, at Bucharest, and the archbishop of Moldavia, at Jassy. The lower clergy are educated at seminaries, and supported by the congregation, whereas the higher clergy, from the archbishops to the protopopes, are paid by the state. What is demanded from the lower clergy is the ability of reading the prescribed formularies and performing the ceremonies. The Roman Catholic Church has two bishops, one at Bucharest and another at Jassy. The Evangelical congregations, with the exception of that at Bucharest, are in connection with the State Church of Prussia, anti receive their preachers from the Prussian consistory. These congregations have, however, their own government, but are required to send a very careful report through their ministers to the Prussian ecclesiastical authority. At present there exist eight Evangelical congregations at Jassy, Bucharest, Galatz, Braila, Pitesti, Crajova, Turnu-Severin, and Atmadscha (Dobruldscha). Each congregation has its own parochial school, with male and female teachers. The latter are from the Kaiserswert house of deaconesses. See Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyclop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Roumanian (Or Wallachian) Version[[@Headword:Roumanian (Or Wallachian) Version]]

             The people for whom this version was made are descendants of the Dacians, and of the Roman colonists who settled in the country after its subjugation by Trajan. In consequence of their Roman origin, the Wallachians style themselves Rumanje, and are commonly known to other nations as the Rouman race. The language spoken by that people contains a large number of pure Latin words, but about half of the Wallachian words are borrowed from the Greek, the Turkish, and the Slavonian. The first translation of the Scriptures into that language was made by the metropolitan Theodotius, and was printed in 1668 at Bucharest; while prior  to this, in 1648, the New Test. had been published in Belgrade. Another edition was published in 1714, and a third, at Blaje, in Transylvania, in 1795. In the year 1816 the Russian Bible Society undertook an edition of 5000 copies of the Wallachian New Test., which was soon followed by other editions. In 1838 the British Bible Society published a revised edition of the New Test., and since that the entire Bible has been translated and published in that language at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. See Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands, p. 45; Bible of Every Land, p. 279 sq. (B.P.)

## Round Churches[[@Headword:Round Churches]]

             were imitations of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, the nave being round and forming the vestibule of an oblong chancel, as in the Templars' churches at Laon, Metz, and Segovia, 1208. Other examples are found in Ludlow Castle, Cambridge, Northampton, of the end of the 12th century; Little Maplestead (built by the Hospitallers), St. Gereon's, Cologne, of the 13th century; Treves, Bonn, Aix-la-Chapelle (a copy of St. Vitalis, Ravenna, and more remotely of St. Sophia, Constantinople), Salamanca, St. Benignus at Dijon, London, built in 1185; Neuvy St. Sepulchre, cir. 1170; Lanleff; Rieu Minervois, of the close of the 11th century; Brescia, Pisa, Rome, Bergamo, Bologna, Thorsager, and several other churches in Scandinavia. In many cases the shape may have been merely a mechanical contrivance to carry a dome. Circular churches occur of all dates, and distributed over most parts of Europe, either insulated as baptisteries, in a mystical allusion to the Holy Sepulchre, attached as chapels to churches, or existing as independent buildings. They are sometimes of a simple round or polygonal form, either without recesses, except an apse or porch, such as the church of Ophir, Orkney, and the baptistery of Canterbury, or with radiating recesses, rectangular or apsidal, as the baptisteries of Novara and Frejus. Sometimes a circular or polygonal center is supported by pillars, and surrounded by an aisle of corresponding form: this aisle is repeated at St. Stephen's, Rome, and Charroux. The Crusaders, or pilgrims, imitated the plan of the Sepulchre of Jerusalem, surrounded by a circular church, and the Martyrdom, or place of the crucifixion, by a chancel eastward of a round nave. At Bury St. Edmund's, at the close of the 11th century, the abbot removed the body of St. Edmund from the “round chapel” to the new church; and this circular termination is still seen in Becket's Crown at Canterbury, at Sens, Burgos, Batalha, Murcia, and Drontheim. After the middle of the 13th century round churches were no longer built. Almost all  the German churches of the time of Charlemagne were circular, like Aix, Nimeguen, Petersburg, and Magdeburg.

## Round Towers[[@Headword:Round Towers]]

             occur of the time of Justinian, attached to the Church of St. Apollinaris-ad- Classem, in Verona; two in the same city, cir. 1047; others of minaret like shape, and divided by string courses, at St. Mary's and St. Vitalis', Ravenna; also at Pisa, Bury, near Beauvais, and at St. Desert, near Chalons-sur-Saone. The French round towers appear to have come from the north of Italy. In the 9th century they were erected at Centula, Charroux, Bury, and Notre Dame (Poictiers), Gernrode, and Worms. Those of Ireland are mainly of the 11th or 12th century, though some are of an unknown date, and were at once treasuries, belfries, refuges, and places of burial. Round towers are found in East Anglia, at Rickingale Inferior, at Welford and Shefford, Bucks; Welford, Gloucestershire (13th century); in the Isle of Man, at Bremless, Breconshire, Brechin, built by Irish ecclesiastics (cir. 1020); Abemethy, and Tchernigod, near Kief (cir. 1024). The East Anglian form, and those of Piddinghoe and Lewes, have been attributed to the peculiar character of the material employed, and a desire to evade the use of coins. At Brixworth a round is attached in front of a square tower.

## Rounds, Nelson[[@Headword:Rounds, Nelson]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Winfield, Herkimer Co., N.Y., May 4, 1807. He was converted at the age of nine years, and graduated at Union College, New York, in 1829. On June 24, 1831, he was licensed to preach; and July 1, 1831, he was admitted on trial in the Oneida Conference. In 1836 and 1837 he was professor of ancient languages in Cazenovia Seminary; then served as presiding elder of Cayuga District two years, and of the Chenango District four years. In 1844 he was elected editor of the Northern Christian Advocate, where he served four years. When the Wyoming Conference was formed, he became a member of it, and labored within its bounds until 1867, when he became superannuated. The next year he took an effective relation and was soon transferred to the Oregon Conference, and elected president of the Willamette University at Salem, which position he held for two years. In 1871 he was elected by the Legislature of Washington Territory as superintendent of public instruction, which office he filled until within two  months of his death, in Clark County, Wash. T., Jan. 2, 1874. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1874, p. 83.

## Rous (Rouse, or Rowse), Francis[[@Headword:Rous (Rouse, or Rowse), Francis]]

             a fanatical supporter of the English commonwealth, was born at Healton, Cornwall, in 1579, and educated at Broadgate Hall (now Pembroke College), Oxford. He afterwards studied law, and was a member of  Parliament under Charles I. He was one of the few laymen appointed by the Commons to sit in the Westminster Assembly of Divines, and became provost of Eton in 1643. He died in 1659. His writings were printed in London in 1657, and include a utopian scheme of government modelled after the Jewish, and a metrical version of the Psalms. See Rose, Biog. Dict. s.v.

## Rousa, Edward D.[[@Headword:Rousa, Edward D.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Ithaca, Tompkins Co., N.Y., Jan. 19, 1832. He joined the Church in 1848, and studied at Lima, N.Y. In 1852 he was received on trial in the East Genesee Conference, from which he was transferred, in 1863, to the Upper Iowa Conference, In 1866 he received a supernumerary relation, and located in 1868. In October, 1872, he entered the Central New York Conference, and died in Westfield, Tioga Co., Pa., May 6, 1873. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, p. 130.

## Rouse, Peter P.[[@Headword:Rouse, Peter P.]]

             a clergyman of the Reformed Church in America, and the son of a respectable farmer, was born at Catskill, N.Y., March 29, 1799. He graduated at Union College in 1818, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1821; was settled in Florida, N.Y., from 1822 to 1828; and in the First Reformed Church, Brooklyn, from 1828 to 1833. He was a good scholar, an animated, instructive, and eloquent preacher, and a thorough pastor. His brief ministry was closed by death, from hemorrhage of the lungs, in June, 1833; the immediate result of intense feeling produced by a pastoral visit to an afflicted parishioner. His memory is cherished with great affection in the ancient Church and denomination of which he was an ornament. He departed this life in Christian triumph. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 203. (W.J.R.T.)

## Rousseau, Jean Jacques[[@Headword:Rousseau, Jean Jacques]]

             the brilliant genius who divided with Voltaire the rule over the almost boundless republic of French culture in the 18th century. His life was restless and full of contradictions, but it is possible to distinguish in it three periods.

1. The Period of Early Adventure (from his childhood to 1749). — Rousseau was born at Geneva, June 28, 1712. His mother died in giving him birth, and his father early turned him over to the care of an uncle. He became first a copyist to an attorney, and then apprentice to an engraver on copper. He was from early childhood an insatiable reader of romances, and  an enthusiastic admirer of nature; nor is it unimportant to notice that at the age of nine years he had already devoured Plutarch. The charms of nature and of a circulating library were too strong for his fidelity to duty. He neglected his business, was punished by his master, and ran away. At this time he first made the acquaintance of Madame de Warens at Annecy (his “mamma,” as he was wont to term her), and was by her persuaded to become a Romanist. Compelled to earn his bread, he entered the service of a noble lady, and in that condition committed offenses which he had the baseness to charge on an innocent girl. He soon returned to Madame de Warens, whose favor secured him admission to a seminary for priests, where he renewed the musical studies of his earlier years, but did nothing else. Thence he went to Lyons with a music teacher, and afterwards to Lausanne and Neufchatel, in which places he endeavored to establish himself in the same profession. Various other situations were occupied by him in swift succession, but in the end he is found once more with Madame de Warens, who now lived at Chambery, and permitted Rousseau to lead an idyllic life on her farm at Charmettes, while at the same time sustaining improper relations with him. His growth towards culture had in the meantime been steady. He was acquainted with much of the current literature, even of England, and had given thought to religious questions. He now added the study of Latin and mathematics, and also of philosophy in the works of Locke, Leibnitz, Malebranche, Descartes, etc. His earliest comedies and operas were written in this period, which, however, soon came to an end by reason of the failure of his health. His relation with Madame de Warens was definitely broken off by his removal to Montpellier in 1737. After a brief sojourn in Lyons, he went to Paris, where he arrived in 1741, hoping to make his fortune through a new system of musical notation; but though his treatise was read before the Academy of Sciences, it was not approved. His next venture was an opera entitled Les Muses Galantes, which likewise proved less successful than he expected. In 1743 he was made private secretary to Count de Montaign, whom he accompanied to Venice, returning to Paris after an absence of eighteen months. With his entrance on a lawless relation with Theresa Le Vasseur, a thoroughly uncultivated character of low antecedents and utter ignorance, whom he did not profess to love, but whom he made his wife after years of illicit connection, and whose parents he received into his care, the first division of his life may close.

2. The Period of his Triumphs (1749-62). — The Academy of Dijon in 1749 offered a prize for the best essay on the question, “Whether the reestablishment of the sciences and arts has helped to purify manners?” for which Rousseau competed with success. He assumed that nature must ennoble mind, instead of mind being needed to redeem and improve nature, and argued the pessimist view with such force and brilliancy of style that he was at once assigned a place as a writer of prose by the side of Voltaire. The book was thoroughly adapted to the times, when hearts throbbed with intense yearning for deliverance from the unnatural conditions that prevailed in culture and in practical life, and when longings had been stimulated by the appearance of books like Robinson Crusoe, Thomson's Seasons, etc., in which the bliss of a state of nature was celebrated. The gospel of nature was in vogue, and Rousseau became its leading prophet. Yet it was at this time that he chose to add one more to the many paradoxes of his life, by availing himself of the celebrity he had attained to secure employment in copying music as a means of livelihood. In 1752 he published the opera, Le Devin du Village, by which his musical reputation became established; and in 1753 he discussed a second prize question presented by the Academy of Dijon, and relating to the inequalities existing in the conditions of mankind. His book, the Discours sur l'Origine et les Fondemens de l'Inegalite parmi les Hommes, takes the ground that human society, considered in the abstract, is exclusively natural, and cannot therefore sustain a relation independent of nature, i.e. so as to divide nature and appropriate it to individuals. Rousseau does not place all men on the same level, as if they were merely so many animals. He admits the existence of physical, mental, and spiritual differences. But he declares that the first man to fence off a piece of land and claim that it belonged to him, and find people to concede his claim, was the founder of society. He evidently regards property as an egotistical robbery of the community of men, and has no conception of property as both required and conditioned by morality. This book also was in harmony with the spirit of the time, though its effect was not fully displayed until a later day; and Rousseau himself was so fully in sympathy with its teachings that he felt driven to forsake the gilded and varnished glory of Paris for a season of communion with nature in his native town, though the growing coolness between himself and his friends — to which his letters on French music contributed largely was not without influence in bringing him to that determination. He recovered his forfeited citizenship at Geneva by returning to the Reformed faith, and delighted to call himself “Citoyen de Geneve.” He found,  however, that he could not remain away from Paris, especially after his adversary Voltaire had established himself at Ferney; and his return was signalized in 1760 by the publication of the romance La Nouvelle Heloise, in which the ideas of his two previous works are combined, and in which great brilliancies of style conceal grave faults of composition. It was also significant because of moral, social, and religious reflections in its pages, which foreshadowed Rousseau's later positions.

The two constructive works from Rousseau's pen, Le Contrat Social and Emile, appeared in close succession in 1762. The latter book was directed against abuses in the training of the young, and effected a complete revolution in European pedagogics; but while it antagonized many real errors, it at the same time assailed the fundamental conditions upon which all youthful training must rest. Nature again is the keynote to which the argument is attuned. Each child, so runs the demand, should develop its own nature from the beginning, without being placed under adult human guidance — that nature being its individualistic qualities. The object is to train the man, who exists for himself, and is contrasted with the training of the citizen, who exists for society, though the contrary object is enforced in the Contrat Social. This egoistic nature is represented as an ideal nature which needs only development, but not redemption and regeneration. Emile finds his religious perfection in deism, not in Christianity. In the Profession de Foi du Vicaire Savoyard, Rousseau nevertheless assails the materialism and atheism of his former friends, and insists on the three fundamental theistic truths — God, liberty, and immortality. He contends against revelation, but yet utters sentiments of reverence for the Gospel on account of its exalted character, and declares that “if Socrates died like a philosopher, Christ died like a God.”

The effects produced by the Contrat Social in the political world were less rapid, but more profound, than that occasioned by the Emile in pedagogics. The ideas which ripened into the French Revolution were sown in the days of the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and during the reign of Louis XIV; but they found in Rousseau's book a spark which kindled them into a flame, ultimating in that furious blaze. The Contrat Social determined the scope of ideas at the beginning of the Revolution, conducted affairs to more far-reaching consequences, and furnished the watchwords — above all, the cry — of “Liberty and equality.” The book has no conception of the historical and rightful relation of the individual citizen to national and political authority, and of the supreme law of right above even such  authority. The citizen is taught in it, not to take his place as a person under the divinely instituted order of things in this world, but to cultivate the idea that the state rests simply on an original agreement between individuals, according to which the community stands pledged to protect the person and property of the individual, while the individual has bound himself to live in entire subordination to the community. The citizen is accordingly altogether dependent on the community. He ought therefore to accept the religion appointed by the state or suffer banishment, or, in case of resistance, death. As Rousseau recognizes no representation of the people, nor yet ally form of government that may not at any moment be overturned by the community of citizens, he really passes beyond every limit of a radicalism which yet admits the legal relation of authority and subject, and of political and religious conditions, and draws the first lineaments of socialism. Yet he was too much a dreamer to suspect the consequences that must spring from such ideas. In 1766 he declared to a pseudonymous Cassius who offered to reduce to practice these principles in the liberation of the people, that he abominated every such undertaking; and when disorders broke out on the occasion of the burning of his Emile at Geneva, he pacified the people himself.

Of Rousseau's minor works, the Lettre a M. d'Alembert sur les Spectacles is a determined protest against the establishing of a theater at Geneva; the celebrated Lettre a Christopher de Beaumont was a response to a prohibition of the Emile by the archbishop of Paris, and the Lettres de la Montagne form a similar rejoinder to the magistracy of Geneva. These letters have been compared with those of Junius, or of Lessing against Gotze.

The troubles of Rousseau began to germinate at the time of his highest prosperity. His ardent and sensitive nature was out of place in the circle of cold and cynical mockers by whom he was surrounded, and the frankness with which he uncovered his inmost experiences to their gaze made him an object of their merciless witticisms and sarcasms; and when he proceeded to assail their cherished idols and to contend for God, virtue, and immortality, he brought on himself the full weight of their hatred in the form of incessant malicious sneers. Other matters contributed to fully disgust him with the situation. He burned with illicit love for Madame d'Houdelot, whose relations to her husband were not happy, but who adored the poet Lambert instead of Rousseau. He broke decidedly with Diderot. He participated in false gossip derogatory to Madame d'Epinay,  who had been his patroness and had permitted him to occupy her summer house in the forest of Montmorency since 1756. He lived from 1758 to 1762 in another house near Montmorency, and in the latter year encountered the storm which broke out against his Emile. This event forms the proper opening of a new period.

3. The Period of Unsettled Wandering and Morbid Fears. — It is remarkable that a government which tolerated an entire school of atheistical mockers of religion in Paris should have condemned as godless the earnest deist who was alone in daring to contend for God in those circles; and equally strange that the decree of the Parisian Parliament should have condemned the Emile, instead of the far more dangerous Contrat Social. Perhaps the government which had just expelled the Jesuits may have found it convenient to persecute Rousseau, the Swiss, who had gone back to Calvinism, and who had dared to represent a Romish priest as affording a charming illustration of deism. To avoid arrest, he fled to Yverdun, in Switzerland; but the Genevan senate had likewise condemned him before a copy of his book had reached that city. He renounced his citizenship and turned aside to the canton Neufchatel, where he lived from 1762 to 1765 under the protection of Frederick the Great of Prussia. He wrote the Lettres de la Montagne, pursued studies in legislation in behalf of the Corsicans, and botanized — botany and music constituting his favorite employments. The gossiping tongue of his mistress, Theresa, succeeded, however, in rendering him suspected of irreligion by the pastor and peasants of Motiers-Travers, where he resided. He imagined himself no longer safe, and fled the canton. In 1765 he accepted an invitation from Hume to visit England, but even here his mania of suspicion controlled him. He included Hume in the number of his foes, and removed to the house of a new friend, Davenport, whence the objection of individual Englishmen to his relation with Theresa drove him back to France in 1767. He went under the assumed name of Renon to Castle Trye, a possession of prince Conti, and, after further travels, back to Paris in 1770. Seven or eight years more of life remained to him, which he passed in the Rue Platriere (now known by his name), tormented by melancholy fancies, oppressed by poverty, alienated from Theresa, and gradually failing in health. He sustained himself by copying notes, and finished his Confessions, which he had begun at Motiers. He died suddenly at Ermenonville, near Paris, July 2, 1778 whether of disease or of poison  administered by himself is not known. He was received into the Pantheon Oct. 11, 1794.

The European and even world-wide reputation which Rousseau had achieved is illustrated by the fact that he was induced in the last period of his life to compose the Lettres sur Legislation des Corses and the Considerations sur le Gouvernenent de Pologne (1772); and his mental force is apparent in the ability to write his Confessiosle at a time when his soul was darkened with the clouds of morbid and imaginary fears. His native frankness is very evident in that book, but faults and errors are so interwoven with virtues and attractive features that the result of the whole is a glorification of himself. The book may be regarded both as a companion picture and a contrast to the Confessions of Augustine. Such contradictions are characteristic of the man in every relation. He was immeasurably vain, selfish, changeful, and ungrateful — easily provoked, always suspicious, and morbidly misanthropic. As a reformer, his merit consists in having opposed to the godless humanism of his day the crying needs of the human heart; but he identified the empirical sinful heart with the ideal heart, individual participation in nature with personal conformity to nature, the beautiful soul with the moral spirit, the utilitarian with the practical, declamation with confession, and he therefore remained involved in contradictions to the end. In contrast with Calvin, he brought out the ideas of individual rights and of the personal dignity of man — elements of Christian truth often violated by Calvin; but he nevertheless gave his ideal state power over the religious worship and profession of its subjects. Compared with Voltaire, the sardonic mocker of all existing things, Rousseau commands respect by the frankness and manliness of his protests, even when they are directed against holy things. He was incapable of comprehending the syntheses nature and culture, liberty and authority, individuality and society, reason and revelation, the human and the divine. In its pedagogical aspects, his work compares with that of Pestalozzi as does the dawn with the noonday sun. In politics he points forward to both Mirabeau and Saint-Simon; and in philosophy, as a preacher of deism, he may be compared with Kant. For both good and evil, Rousseau was a mighty exponent of the spirit of his time, and deserves, in justice, to be studied from both points of view.

Rousseau's works were very numerous, the botanical and musical writings, among others, being especially worthy of recognition. Editions of his writings are likewise numerous (Geneva, 1782-90, 17 vols. 4to, or 35 vols.  8vo; Paris, 1793-1800, 18 vols. 4to, etc. German editions by Cramer, Gleich, and others). Additional matter was furnished by Musset-Pathay, in Oeuvres Inedites de J. J. Rousseau (Paris, 1825), and by Mars Michel Rey, in Lettres Inedites de J. J. Rousseau (Amst. and Paris, 1858). Musset- Pathay also wrote a Histoire de la Vie et des Ouvrages de J. J. Rousseau (ibid. 1821). See also Girardin, Sur la Mort de J. J. Rousseau (ibid. 1824); Villemain, Cours de Litterature Francaise (Vingt deuxieme Lecon); the Works on the history of literature by Vinet, Demogeot, etc.; Schmidt- Weissenfels, Geschichte der franzosischen Revolutions literatur (Prague, 1859), p. 16 sq.

## Roussel, Gerard[[@Headword:Roussel, Gerard]]

             (Lat. Gerardas Rufus), bishop of Oleron, in France, and reformer, was born at Vaquerie, near Amiens, and became a student at Paris, where Lefevre d'Etaples convinced him that man is saved only through faith in God's mercy, but that such faith may consist with the practice of the external forms of Romanism, they being regarded as indifferent matters. When Lefevre was accused of heresy and obliged to flee to bishop Briconnet of Meaux in 1521, Roussel followed, and remained at Meaux until compelled to seek a refuge against imprisonment for heresy himself, when he established himself in the house of Capito at Strasburg. In 1526 Francis I recalled the fugitives, and Roussel became court preacher to Margaret of Orleans, in that position faithfully preaching evangelical doctrines, but retaining the usages of Rome. On the marriage of Margaret with the king of Navarre (1527), Roussel became her confessor. In 1530 he obtained the rich abbey of Clairac. In 1533 his patroness invited him to preach in the Louvre, which he did amid great popular agitation. Many Romanists were expelled the city, and Roussel, on the other hand, was imprisoned, but afterwards released and forbidden to preach. He returned with his protectress to Bdarn, and soon afterwards obtained the bishopric of Oleron, for accepting which Calvin censured him strongly, because his new position would compel him to tolerate abuses which he had formerly condemned. Roussel, however, did what he could for the welfare of his diocese, while holding an intermediate position between Rome and the Reformation. He explained the Bible in his sermons, celebrated mass in the vernacular, administered the communion under both kinds, made provision for the Christian training of the young, and devoted his rich revenues to the support of the poor. He also wrote Expositions, in dialogue form, of the Apostles' Creed, the Decalogue, and the Lord's Prayer, as guides to his  clergy in the conduct of catechetical instruction. In this work Roussel occupied thoroughly evangelical ground, if a few concessions in regard to ceremonies be set aside. The only appeal is to the Bible; Christ is represented as the only head of the Church; faith in him as the only condition of salvation. The Church triumphant is the only perfect Church, and of visible churches that alone is a true Church in which the Gospel is preached in its purity, and in which the sacraments, of which there are but two, are properly administered. A subsequent tract on the Lord's supper taught the impartation of Christ's glorified body in the sense of Calvin, with whose theology the views of Roussel had much in common, particularly in the feature of an absolute predestination. The Sorbonne extracted a number of propositions from these works and condemned them as heretical, as it had already done the sermon in the Louvre; but before the sentence was pronounced Roussel had ended his career. In the spring of 1550 he had preached a sermon before a synod held at Mauleon, in which he advocated a reduction in the number of saints' days, which excited the rage of the Romish fanatics present to such a degree that they broke down the pulpit in which he stood, and injured him so severely in the process that he died soon afterwards. In addition to the works referred to, Roussel published, in early life, a Latin translation of Aristotle's Ethics, and a Commentary accompanying an edition of the arithmetic of Bontius, which was designed to elucidate the mystical signification of numbers. See C. Schmidt, Gerard Roussel, Predicateur de la Reine Marguerite de Navarre (Strasburg. 1845).

## Roussel, Napolion[[@Headword:Roussel, Napolion]]

             a French Protestant theologian, was born at Sauve in 1805. He studied at Geneva, was in 1831 pastor at Saint Etienne, but at the instance of the consistory he had to resign in 1835 because his sermons "bore the stamp of Methodism." In vain did the majority of the Church protest against the intolerance of the consistory. Roussel resigned, and founded an independent chapel. In 1835 he was pastor at Marseilles, in 1838 he went to Paris, where he started a journal called l'Esperance, the organ of the orthodox party. He was the means of founding churches at AngoulAme, Villefavard, Limoges, Balledant, etc. In 1863 Roussel weit to Lyons, but- resigned his pastorate in 1867. He then retired to Geneva, and died June 8, 1878. Besides his Comment il ne faut pas Precher, he published a great many brochures and tracts. See Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses, s.v. (B.P.)

## Roustan, Antoine Jacques[[@Headword:Roustan, Antoine Jacques]]

             a Swiss Protestant minister and writer, was born at Geneva in 1734. For twenty-six years (1764-90) he was minister of a Swiss church in London. He wrote Lettres sur l'Etat Present de Christianisme, etc. (Lond. 1763, 12mo; in English, 1775, 8vo).

## Routh, Martin Joseph[[@Headword:Routh, Martin Joseph]]

             an English clergyman and educator, was born at South Elmham, Suffolk, Sept. 15, 1755. He matriculated as a battler at Queen's College, Oxford, May 31, 1770; in July, 1771, was elected a demy of St. Mary Magdalen College, and fellow in July, 1776. He was appointed college librarian in 1781, senior proctor in 1783, junior dean of arts in 1784 and 1785, was made bachelor of divinity July 15, 1786, and college bursar in 1791. He  became president of Magdalen College, April 11, 1791, which position he retained until his death (Dec. 22, 1854). In 1810 he became rector of Tylehurst, near Reading, where he retired for rest at certain seasons of the year. His works were distinguished by profound scholarship and great critical acumen. His works are: Platonis Euthydemas et Gorgias, etc. (Oxford, 1784, 8vo): — Reliquioe Sacroe (1814-18, 4 vols.; later ed. 1846-48, 5 vols.): — Bishop Burnet's History of His Own Time (1823, 6 vols. 8vo), annotated.

## Roux Lavergne, Pierre Celestin[[@Headword:Roux Lavergne, Pierre Celestin]]

             a French writer, who died Feb. 16, 1874, was for some time editor of the Univers. When quite advanced in age, he became a priest, and for many years labored as professor of theology at the seminary in Nismes. He died at Rennes as member of the cathedral. He wrote, De la Philosophie de l'Histoire (1850): — Philosophia juxta Divi Thomoe Dogmata (1850-59). See the Literarischer Handweiser, 1874, p. 176. (B.P.)

## Row Heresy[[@Headword:Row Heresy]]

             In 1831, Mr. Campbell, minister of Row, Scotland, was deposed by the General Assembly for holding, among other errors, the doctrine of universal pardon, and a peculiar view of the nature of faith, quite similar to that of the Sandemanians (q.v.). On some other points his views touched those of Edward Irving, but his doctrines did not spread to any extent. In 1856 he published the Nature of the Atonement, in which he declares that it was not a satisfaction, but only “an adequate repentance, in no sense substitutionary,” and that Christ's suffering arose “from seeing sin and sinners with God's eyes, and feeling in reference to them with God's heart.”

## Row, John (1)[[@Headword:Row, John (1)]]

             a Scottish divine, was born near Sterling about 1526. He was agent of the clergy of Scotland at the Vatican in 1550, and afterwards became a Protestant minister. He died in 1580. He was one of the six ministers who composed the Scottish Confession and First Book of Discipline.

## Row, John (2)[[@Headword:Row, John (2)]]

             a Presbyterian divine, and son of John Row the reformer, was born at Perth in 1568. He studied at the University of Edinburgh, and was minister of  Carnock, Fifeshire, from 1592 till 1644. His death took place in 1646. He wrote The Historie of the Kirk of Scotland (1558-1637), which, after lying in MS. for more than 200 years, has recently been twice privately printed, together with a continuation by his sons to 1639 (Edinb. Maitland Club, 1842, 2 vols. 4to; 2d ed. ibid. Wodrow Society, 1842, 4to).

## Row, John (3)[[@Headword:Row, John (3)]]

             a Presbyterian divine and Hebrew scholar, was born at Carnock about 1598, and was the son of the preceding. He became one of the ministers of Aberdeen in 1631, and in 1644 he was chosen moderator of the Provincial Assembly at Aberdeen. He was a Covenanter in the civil war, and in 1652 became principal of King's College, Aberdeen, but resigned in 1661. He was subsequently a schoolmaster in Aberdeen, but spent his last years in retirement in the parish of Kinellar, near Aberdeen. He was noted — and the same may be said of his father and grandfather — for an intimate acquaintance with the Hebrew language. His death took place about 1672. He published, Hebraicam Linguoe Institutiones (Glasg. 1634, 12mo): — Xibias Hebraica seu Vocabularium, etc. (1644, 12mo): — Εὐχαριστία Βασιλική, etc. (Abredon. 1660, 4to). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rowan, Arthur Blennerhassett, D.D.[[@Headword:Rowan, Arthur Blennerhassett, D.D.]]

             an Irish divine, was for more than thirty years curate of Blennerville, subsequently archdeacon of Ardfert, rector of Kilgobbin and Balinooher, and surrogate of the Consistorial Court of Ardfert and Aghadoe. He died at Belmont, Kerry, Ireland, Aug. 12, 1861. Among his publications are, Romanism in the Church, etc. (1847, 8vo): — Newman's Popular Fallacies Considered (Dublin, 1852, 8vo): — Casuistry and Conscience (1854, 8vo): besides Sermons and Sketches. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rowan, Stephen, D.D.[[@Headword:Rowan, Stephen, D.D.]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born at Salem, N.Y., 1787. After having graduated at Union College in 1804, he studied theology with Drs. J.H. Meyer and Jeremiah Romeyn, and then entered the ministry in 1806. He was a popular preacher of the Reformed Church settled in the then suburban village of Greenwich, now in Bleecker Street, New York. His labors were much blessed, until difficulties arose which led to his leaving  the denomination and the establishment of the Eighth Presbyterian Church in Chrystie Street in 1819. Here he ministered until 1825, when he became secretary of the American Society for Meliorating the Condition of the Jews. He visited Europe in this behalf, and was an efficient officer. His fine pulpit abilities and winning manners made him many warm friends, and great success attended his pastoral labors. But his trials were oppressive, and overclouded his work sadly. He died in 1835, chastened in spirit, in firm faith, and leaving rich testimonies for the grace that supported him. See Corwin, Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 192. (W.J.R.T.)

## Rowbotham, John[[@Headword:Rowbotham, John]]

             an English clergyman of Upminster. Essex, during the latter part of the 17th century, ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He wrote, Preciousness of Christ to Believers (Lond. 1647, 12mo): Exposition of the Canticles (ibid. 1651, 4to): — Mystery of the Two Witnesses Unveiled (ibid. 1654, 12mo): — Disquisitio in Hypothesin Baxterianam de Foedere Gratioe ab Initio, etc. (ibid. 1694-98, 8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rowden, Philip, D.D[[@Headword:Rowden, Philip, D.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born in England in 1828, and in early life came to New York city. Not long after he was converted, and joined the Church in Newark, N.J. Having subsequently entered the ministry, his pastorates were successively in Newark, Bronson, Michigan, and in Chili, Indiana. His ministry was attended with powerful revivals." He was a man of studious habits and deep research." He died in Rochester, Indiana, April 4, 1875. Sec Cathcart, Baptist Encyclop. page 1012. (J. C. S.)

## Rowe, Elizabeth[[@Headword:Rowe, Elizabeth]]

             an Englishwoman noted for her personal accomplishments and elegant writings, was the daughter of Walter Singer, a Dissenting minister, and was born at Ilchester, Somersetshire, in 1674. She was very charitable, freely distributing to those in need. Her death occurred in 1737. Among her published works are, Friendship in Death (1728): — Devout Exercises of the Heart, in Meditation, etc. (1738, 8vo; Phila. 1850, 24mo): — Miscellaneous Works (1739, 2 vols. 8vo).

## Rowe, John[[@Headword:Rowe, John]]

             a Nonconformist minister, was born at Tiverton, England, in 1627. He was educated at New Inn Hall, Oxford, and obtained a fellowship in Corpus Christi College. He became preacher at Witney and Tiverton, and, in 1654, at Westminster Abbey. In 1662 he was ejected for nonconformity, and afterwards had a congregation in Bartholomew Close, London. He wrote, Heavenly-mindedness and Earthly-mindedness (1672, 2 pts 12mo): — Saints' Temptations (1674, 1675, 8vo): — Emanuel (1680, 8vo): — Sermons, etc.

## Rowe, Samuel[[@Headword:Rowe, Samuel]]

             an English clergyman, was born in 1793. He became a bookseller, but graduated al Jesus College, Oxford, in 1826. In 1833 he was made vicar of Crediton and perpetual curate of Postbury, St Luke, which offices he held until his death. He published, Appeal to the Rubric (Lond. 1841, small 8vo), Church Psalm-book (several editions): — also Panorame of Plymouth, and Perambulations in the Forest of Dartmoor (Plymouth, 1848, 8vo).

## Rowe, Wesley[[@Headword:Rowe, Wesley]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Frankfort, Ross Co., O. April 4, 1809. He made a formal profession of religion and united with the Church in his nineteenth year. In 1832 he was licensed to preach, and in 1834 was admitted on trial into the Ohio Annual Conference, in which, and in the Cincinnati Conference, he labored until within a few days of his death, Feb. 8, 1862. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1862, p. 185.

## Rowites[[@Headword:Rowites]]

             the name applied to the followers of Mr. Campbell, of Row, Scotland. SEE ROW

 HERESY.

## Rowland, Daniel[[@Headword:Rowland, Daniel]]

             an eminent Welsh divine, chaplain to the duke of Leinster during the latter part of the last century. He published Eight Sermons, etc. (Lond. 1774, 12mo): — Three Sermons (1778, 12mo).

## Rowland, Henry Augustus, D.D.[[@Headword:Rowland, Henry Augustus, D.D.]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born at Windsor, Conn., Sept. 19, 1804. His father was pastor of the Congregational Church at Windsor, and his mother was a relative of Rev. Jonathan Edwards, D.D. He graduated at Yale College in 1823, finished his theological course at Andover Seminary in 1827, was licensed by the Hampden Association, and ordained by the New York Presbytery Nov. 24, 1830. He began his ministry in the Presbyterian Church at Fayetteville, N.C. In 1834 he became pastor of Pearl Street Church, New York; in 1843, of the Church at Honesdale, Pa.; and in 1856 accepted a call and was installed pastor of the Park Presbyterian Church,  Newark, N.J., where he labored until his death, Sept. 4, 1859. Dr. Rowland was a successful pastor and an earnest, eloquent preacher. He labored efficiently with his pen, and in the pulpit, to promote the interests of the Redeemer's kingdom for more than one third of a century. He was fond of literature, and wrote much for the periodical press; also several volumes, viz.: On the Common Maxims of Infidelity (1850, 12mo): — The Path of Life (1851, 18mo): — Light in the Dark Valley (1852, 24mo): -- The Way of Peace (1853, 16mo): — Tracts on Christian Baptism: — The Elect Saved by Faith: — and A Conversiation on Decrees and Free Agency. Also many single sermons and articles in the New York Evangelist, New York Observer, etc. See Memorial of the Life and Services of the late Henry A. Rowland, D.D.; Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 163. (J.L.S.)

## Rowland, Thomas[[@Headword:Rowland, Thomas]]

             a minister of the United Methodist Free Churches, England, was born in Manchester in 1792. He entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1813, and continued to labor until 1850, when he became involved in the questions connected with the Reform movement. Refusing to apologize to the Conference for some of his writings, he was at first made supernumerary, and afterwards expelled. He joined the Wesleyan Reformers, and preached among them for several years. He attended the First Annual Assembly of the United Methodist Free Churches, held at Rochdale, 1857, and died in 1858. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Rowlandson, Michael, D.D[[@Headword:Rowlandson, Michael, D.D]]

             an English divine, was born about 1759, and educated at Queen's College Oxford. At the time of his death, July 8,1824, he was vicar of Warminster. He was a man whose exemplary life and unceasing fidelity in the work of the ministry w on for him the esteem and love of all who knew him. See (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, August 1824, page 503.

## Rowley, George, D.D[[@Headword:Rowley, George, D.D]]

             an English educator and divine, was born in 1782, and educated at University College, Oxford, of which he became successively fellow, tutor, and public examiner. In 1821 he was elected to the mastership of his college, and in 1832 was appointed to the vice-chancellorship of the University of Oxford; which he held till his death, October 5, 1836. In his official duties he was noted for his punctuality and decision; and in private life he was distinguished for kindness of disposition and unselfishness of character. See (Lond.) Christian Remembrancer, November 1836, page 700.

## Rowrawa[[@Headword:Rowrawa]]

             one of the eight Narakas (q.v.), or principal places of torment, in the system of Buddhism.

## Roxburgh, Hugo De[[@Headword:Roxburgh, Hugo De]]

             a Scotch prelate, was rector of Tullibody, and clerk to Nicolaus, the chancellor of Scotland. He was afterwards archdeacon of St. Andrews. In 1189 he was made chancellor of Glasgow, and in 1199 bishop, but sat only one year. He died in 1200. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 236.

## Roy, Julian David Le[[@Headword:Roy, Julian David Le]]

             a French architect and antiquary, was born in Paris in 1728, and died in 1803. He wrote, Ruizes des Plus Beaux Monumens de la Greoe (1758, corrected 1770): — Histoire de la Disposition et des Formes Differentes des Temples des Chretiens: — Observations sur les Edifices des Anciens Peuples.

## Royaards, Herman John[[@Headword:Royaards, Herman John]]

             professor of theology in the University of Utrecht for more than thirty years, beginning with 1823, was born in that city Oct. 3, 1794. In 1818 he obtained the degree of doctor in theology, and in the following year became pastor of the Reformed Church at Meerkerk, at which place he wrote a successful prize essay on the Book of Daniel (1821). His special department in the university was that of historical theology, to which he added that of Christian ethics. He aided in founding (1839) the journal Archief voor Kerkelyke Geschiedenis, and contributed various very important papers to its pages. The history of the Church in the Netherlands engaged his mind predominantly, and he rendered services of real value in its treatment, though almost a pioneer in that field. In 1842 he published a prize treatise entitled Invoering en Vestiging van het Christendom in Nederland, etc., and subsequently a complementary work under the title Geschiedenis van het Christendom en de Christelyke Kerk in Nederland gedurende de Middeneeuwen (pt. 1, 1849; pt. 2, 1853). He desired to write a history of the Reformation and of the Roman Catholic Church in the Netherlands, but did not live to execute his purpose. He, however, rendered meritorious service in a different direction, viz. in ecclesiastical jurisprudence, having published (1834 and 1837) a work on this subject entitled Hedendaagsch Kerkregt by de Hervormden in Nederland, and having taken active part in the repeated discussions relating to a concordat with the papal chair. He also prepared a Chrestomathia Patristica (pt. 1, 1831; pt. 2, 1837), intended to aid in the study of the Church fathers, and a Compendium Hist. Eccl. Christ. for use in academical instruction. He died Jan. 2, 1854. See Bournann, Natratio de H.J. Royaard's, in his Charta Theologioe (lraj. ad Rh. 1857), p. 1-90.

## Royce, Lorenzo D.[[@Headword:Royce, Lorenzo D.]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Sharon, Vt., Oct. 5, 1820. He graduated from Waterville College, Maine, in the class of 1844, and from the Newton Theological Institution in the class of 1847. He was ordained as pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Thomaston, Me. His ministry was a brief one, his death occurring Sept. 3, 1850. He was among the most highly cultivated young ministers of his denomination, and had his life been spared would not have failed to make his mark deep on the generation in which he lived. (J.C.S.)

## Roye, Gui De[[@Headword:Roye, Gui De]]

             a French prelate, was born at Muret about 1345. He was canon of Noyon, and in 1376 was made bishop of Verdun. He never went to his diocese, but remained with Gregory XI, accompanying him to Rome, and afterwards attached himself to Clement VII, by whom he was consecrated. Resigning his see in 1379, he became in succession administrator of the bishopric of Dol, bishop of Castres (1383), archbishop of Tours, archbishop of Sens (1385), and, finally, resigning all these, was on the 22d of June, 1390, consecrated archbishop of Rheims. Gui took the part of Benedict XIII, and was a member of the Council of Paris in 1404, but refused to join the National Council of 1406, which was convened for the extinction of the clerical privileges during the schism. In 1408 he presided over the Provincial Council at Rheims, and the next year set out for Italy, but was killed, during the journey, in a quarrel among his retainers, June 8, 1409. He is the author of a work entitled Doctrinal de la Sapience (Genera, 1478), which passed through several editions. See Gallia Christiana, vol. 9; Brunet, Manuel de Libraire.

## Royko, Caspar[[@Headword:Royko, Caspar]]

             doctor of theology, a Roman Catholic divine of Germany, was born Jan. 1, 1744, at Marburg, in Steyermark, and died April 20, 1819, as professor of pastoral theology and cathedral preacher at Prague. He is the author of Einleitung in die christliche Religions und Kirchengeschichte (Prague, 1771): — Synopsis Histor. Religionis Christianoe Methodo System. Adumbrata (ibid. 1785): — Christliche Religions- u. Kirchengeschichte (ibid. 1788-95, 4 vols.): — Geschichte der grossen allgemeinen Kirchenversammlung zu Costnitz (ibid. 1780-96, 4 pts.). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 529, 541, 666; 2, 741; Niedner, Lehrbuch der christl. Kirchengeschichte, p. 864. (B.P.)

## Ruar, Martin[[@Headword:Ruar, Martin]]

             a learned German writer and Protestant minister, was born in Holstein in 1588, and died near Dantzic in 1657. “His Epistles throw much light on the theological opinions of the age” (Hallam, Lit. of Europe).

## Rubble, Rubble Work, Rough Walling[[@Headword:Rubble, Rubble Work, Rough Walling]]

             coarse walling constructed of rough stones, not large, but of great irregularity both in size and shape, and not so flat bedded as in rag work. In some districts it is often formed of flints: in large buildings, in neighborhoods where better materials can be obtained for the outer face of the walls, it is in general only used for the insides, or backing; but in other districts the whole substance of the walls is not unfrequently of this construction. It is often found to have been plastered on both sides, but sometimes it was only pointed externally.

## Rubens, Peter Paul, Sir[[@Headword:Rubens, Peter Paul, Sir]]

             the illustrious Flemish painter, was born at Siegen. Germany (according to some, at Cologne), June 29, 1577. After the death of his father in 1587, he went with his mother to Antwerp, where his parents had formerly resided. He became page to Marguerite de Ligne, countess de Lalaing, but soon left her to study art, chiefly under A. van Noort and O. van Veen (or Venius). In 1600 he visited Italy, going first to Venice and Mantua and thence to Rome, where he devoted himself to the study of the pictures of Titian and Paul Veronese. In 1605 the duke Vincenzo Gonzaga sent him on a special mission to Philip III of Spain. Again visiting Italy, he resided at Rome, Milan, and Genoa, painting many pictures, until 1608, when, hearing of his mother's illness, he returned to Antwerp. He was appointed court painter to the archduke Albert, and married Isabella Brant (or Brandt) in 1609. When, in 1627, Charles I declared war against France, Rubens was intrusted to negotiate with Gerbier, Charles's agent at the Hague. In the autumn of the same year he was sent to Madrid, and in 1629 was ambassador to England. He was employed on a mission to Holland in 1633, died May 30, 1640, and was buried in the Church of St. Jacques, Antwerp. The pictures ascribed wholly or in part to Rubens, according to Smith's Catalogue Raisonne, number 1800. They comprise history, portraits, landscapes; animal, fruit, and flower pieces. The finest are in the cathedral in Antwerp — The Descent from the Cross, and The Elevation of the Cross, the former being generally considered his masterpiece. The Belvedere in Vienna contains a noble altar piece with wings representing  The Virgin Presenting a Splendid Robe to St. Ildefonso: — St. Ambrose Refusing to Admit the Emperor Theodosius into the Church; and two altar pieces representing the miracles performed by St. Ignatius Loyola and St. Francis Xavier. See Waagen, in Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch (Leips. 1833; Lond. 1840); Michel, Rubens et l'Ecole d'Anvers (Paris, 1854); Waagen, Treasures of Art in Great Britain (Lond. 185457, 4 vols.).

## Rubezahl[[@Headword:Rubezahl]]

             in Silesian legend, was a good natured spirit of the Riesengebirge who assisted the good, the needy, and the wandering traveler, but who also teased and punished the wicked. He was able to assume any form whatever, and appeared sometimes as a rabbit running between the feet of pedestrians, sometimes as a turtle, sometimes in the form of a hawk, snatching the hat from a sleeper's head, and sometimes so confused the senses that the tiles on a roof seemed to be of gold, or that a person seemed to see his own double, etc. He never carried his sport so far, however, as to work real injury to his victim. The name Rubezahl was a nickname, and greatly irritated him; but he loved to be called “The Lord of the Mountains.”

## Rubigo[[@Headword:Rubigo]]

             SEE ROBIGUS.

## Rubino, Joseph Carl Friedrich[[@Headword:Rubino, Joseph Carl Friedrich]]

             a German doctor and professor of philology and ancient history, was born Aug. 15. 1799, at Fritzlar, of Jewish parentage. Having completed his studies at Heidelberg and Göttingen, he lived from 1820 to 1831 in private at Cassel, where he became intimately acquainted with the most prominent men of his time. In 1831 he was appointed professor at Marburg, and April 24, 1842, he openly professed the Christian faith. Up to his death, April 10, 1864, he lectured at Marburg, having been invested several times with the highest offices of the university. His last words were, “For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ” (1Co 3:11). The great veneration in which Rubino was held is best shown in Dr. Grau's dedication of his work, Semiten und Indogermanen, to his fatherly friend Rubino. See Kalkar, Israel und die Kirche, p. 127; Delitzsch, Saat auf Hoffnung, II, 2, 52 sq.; Literarischer Handweiser, 1864, p. 342; Fürst, Bibl Jud. 3, 179. (B.P.)

## Rubrics[[@Headword:Rubrics]]

             (Lat. rubrica, from ruber, red), in classic use, meant the titles or headings of chapters in certain law books, and is derived from the red color of the ink in which these titles were written, in order to distinguish them from the text. In mediaeval and modern use the name is restricted to the directions which are found in the service books of the Church, as to the ordering of the several prayers, and the performance of the sometimes complicated ceremonial by which they were accompanied. The same name, together with the usage itself, is retained in the Church of England Prayer book; and in all these, even where the direction has ceased to be printed in red ink, the name rubric is still retained. Where red ink is not employed, the rubric is distinguished from the text by italics, or some other variety of print. In the Catholic Church a considerable controversy exists as to whether the rubrics of the missal, the ritual, and the breviary are to be considered preceptive or only directive — a question into which it would be out of place to enter. A similar controversy has existed at various times in the English Church. The science of rubrics is with Catholics a special branch of study, the chief authorities on which are Gavanti, Merati, Cavalieri, and other more compendious writers.

## Rubruquis, Guillaume De[[@Headword:Rubruquis, Guillaume De]]

             SEE RUYSBROEK.

## Ruby[[@Headword:Ruby]]

             (only plur. פְּנַינַי םpeninim; once [Proverbs 315, Kethib] פְּנַיַּי ם, peniyim; Sept. λίθοι, or λίθοι πολυτελεῖς; Vulg. cunctoe opes, cuncta pretiosissima, gemmoe, de ultimis finibus, ebor antiquum), a gem concerning which there is much difference of opinion and great uncertainty. It occurs in the following passages: “The price of wisdom is above peninim” (Job 28:18; so also Pro 3:15; Pro 8:11; Pro 31:10); “A multitude of peninim” (20:15). In Lam 4:7, it is said, “the Nazarites were purer than snow, they were whiter than milk, they were more ruddy in body than peninim.” Boote (Animad. Sac. 4, 3), on account of the ruddiness mentioned in the last passage, supposed “coral” to be intended, for which, however, there appears to be another Hebrew word. SEE CORAL. Michaelis (Suppl. p. 2023) is of the same opinion, and compares the Heb. פְּנַנָּה; with the Arab. panah, “a branch.” Gesenius  (Thesaur. s.v.) defends this argument. Bochart (Hieroz. 3, 601) contends that the Hebrew term denotes pearls, and explains the “ruddiness” alluded to above by supposing that the original word (אָדְמוּ) signifies merely “bright in color,” or “color of a reddish tinge.” This opinion is supported by Rosenmüller (Schol. in Thren.) and others, but opposed by Maurer (Comment.) and Gesenius. Certainly it would be no compliment to the great people of the land to say that their bodies were as red as coral or rubies, unless we adopt Maurer's explanation, who refers the “ruddiness” to the blood which flowed in their veins. SEE RUDDY. On the whole, considering that the Hebrew word is always used in the plural, we are inclined to adopt Bochart's explanation, and understand pearls to be intended. SEE PEARL.

The ruby is, however, generally supposed to be represented by the word כּ דְכֹּד, kad-kod', which occurs in Eze 27:6, and Isa 54:12, where the A.V. renders it “agate” (q.v.). An Arabic word of similar sound (kadskadsat) signifies “vivid redness;” and as the Hebrew word may be derived from a root of like signification, it is inferred that it denotes the Oriental ruby, which is distinguished for its vivid red color, and was regarded as the most valuable of precious stones next after the diamond. This mode of identification, however, seems rather precarious. The Greek translator of Eze 27:16 does not appear to have known what it meant, for he preserves the original word; and although the translator of Isa 54:12 has jasper (Gr. iaspis, ἴασπις), he is not regarded as any authority in such matters when he stands alone. The ruby was doubtless known to the Hebrews, but it is by no means certain that kad-kod was its name. Some have supposed that the word ekdach, אֶקְדָּח, which from its etymology should signify a sparkling, flaming gem, is to be regarded as a species of ruby. It occurs only in Isa 54:12; hence the Sept. and A.V. make it a “carbuncle” (q.v.).

The ruby of mineralogists is a red sapphire (q.v.) or spinel. It is a gem highly prized, and only inferior in value to the diamond. The finest are the Oriental, which are chiefly brought from Ceylon and Burmah. They are found in alluvial deposits. The ruby, like other gems, had a host of occult virtues attributed to it by the Cabalists. It was supposed to give valor to the soldier in battle; to decide and concentrate affection; to foretell evil by growing pale, and to indicate that the danger was past by recovering its vivid color. SEE GEM.

## Ruchat, Abraham[[@Headword:Ruchat, Abraham]]

             a Swiss ecclesiastical writer, was born about 1680. He was for a time pastor at Aubonne, but after 1721 taught belles lettres and philosophy in the Academy of Lausanne. He died Sept. 29, 1750. His principal works are, Grammatica Hebraica (Leyden, 1707): — Abrege de l'Histoire Ecclesiastique du Pays de Vaud (Berne, 1707): — Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse (Geneva, 1740, 6 vols.). See Rousset, Eloge de Ruchat.--Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Ruchrath, Johann[[@Headword:Ruchrath, Johann]]

             called Von Wesel, a German reformer, was born at Oberwesel, on the Rhine, about 1410. He was professor of divinity at Erfurt, and afterwards preached at Worms for seventeen years. He was accused of heresy and tried before the Inquisition in 1479, but, to escape death or torture, recanted. Ruchrath died in 1481. He wrote a Treatise against Indulgences, and Concerning the Authority, Duty, and Power of Pastors. See Hodgson, Reformers and Martyrs (Phila. 1867).

## Ruckersfelder, August Friedrich[[@Headword:Ruckersfelder, August Friedrich]]

             a German Orientalist, who died Oct. 15, 1799, at Bremen, where he retired in 1753 from his position as doctor and professor of theology and Oriental languages at the gymnasium in Deventer, is the author of Dissertatio Inaug. Exegetica ad Psalmos 78:21-23 (Deventer, 1755): — Descriptio Codicis Hebroei Manuscripti Daventriensis in his Sylloge Commentationum et Observationum (ibid. 1762 ): — Commentar. Harmon. in I V Evang. sec. Singulor. Ordinem Proprium Dispiositum (being a translation of M'Knight's Harmony of the Four Gospels [ibid. 1772-79, 3 vols.]). See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 244, 280; 2, 142; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1093; Furst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 180. (B.P.)

## Ruckert, Friedrich[[@Headword:Ruckert, Friedrich]]

             an Orientalist, and one of the greatest German poets of the 19th century, was born at Schweinfurt, May 16, 1789. He studied at Jena, commenced his academical career in 1811, was professor of Oriental languages at Erlangen in 1826, and in 1841 at Berlin. He retired in 1846 to his country seat at Neusess, and died January 31, 1866. He published, Hebraische Prophetens ubersetzt und erlautert (Leipsic, 1831): — Leben Jesu, Evangelien-Harmonie in gebundener Rede (Stuttgard, 1839): — Hesoden der Gosse (1844). Some of his religious poems have been translated into English, as Dein Konig kommt in niederen Hullen (in Schaff, Christ in Son, page 33: "He comes, no royal vesture wearing"): Er ist in Bethlehem geboren (ibid. page 93: "In Bethlehem, the Lord of glory"): — Das Paradies muss schoner seib (ibid. page 657: "Oh Paradise must fairer be"): — Um Mitternacht bin ich erwacht (Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, page 337: "At dead of night Sleep took her flight"). (B.P.)

## Ruckert, Leopold Immanuel[[@Headword:Ruckert, Leopold Immanuel]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1797 at Grosshennersdorf, near Herrnhut, Upper Lusatia. He studied theology and philosophy at Leipsic, was for some time deacon at his native place, and  published, in 1821, De Ratione Tractandae Theologiae Dogmaticae. In 1825 he was appointed teacher at the Gymnasium of Zittau, and while there published, Kommentar uber den Brief Pauli an die Romer (Leipsic, 1831; 2d ed. 1839): — Kommentar uber den Brief Paul an die Galater (1833): — An die Epheser (1834): — An die Korinther (1836-37). Riickert wsas made doctor of theology in 1836 by the theological faculty of Copenhagen, and in 1844 he was called to Jena, where he wrote, Theologie (Leipsic, 1851, 2 volumes): — Das Abendmahl. Sein Wesen und seine Geschichte in der alten Kirche (1856): — Buchlein von der Kirche (1857): — Der Rationalismus (1859). Ruckert died April 9, 1871. See Protestantische Kirchenzeitung, 1871, page 309-311; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v.; Lichtenberger, Encyclop. des Sciences Religieuses,. s.v.; Plitt- Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rudbeck, John[[@Headword:Rudbeck, John]]

             a learned Swedish prelate and reformer, was born at Orebro about 1580. He was chaplain to Gustavus Adolphus, and bishop of Westeras. His death occurred in 1646. He was father of Olas (or Olaf) Rudbeck, Sr., the eminent anatomist and botanist.

## Rudborne (Or Rodburne), Thomas[[@Headword:Rudborne (Or Rodburne), Thomas]]

             an English bishop and architect, was a native of Hertfordshire. He studied at Merton College, Oxford, and was afterwards chaplain to Henry V previous to the battle of Agincourt. He received the prebend of Horton, Salisbury, the living of East Deping, Lincolnshire, and the archdeaconry of Sudbury. He served the office of proctor in the university, and was elected chancellor. In 1426 he was warden of Merton College, resigning the next year. In 1433 he was promoted to the see of St. David's, and died about 1442. The tower and chapel of Merton will long remain monuments of his skill and taste. He wrote, according to Bale, a Chronicle, and some Epistles ad Thomam Waldenem et Alios.

## Rudd, John Churchill, D.D.[[@Headword:Rudd, John Churchill, D.D.]]

             an Episcopal clergyman, was born at Norwich, Conn., May 24, 1779. By adverse circumstances he was prevented from taking a collegiate course, and. although brought up a Congregationalist, united with the Episcopal Church. He was admitted to deacon's orders by bishop Moore, April 28, 1805, and in 1806 to priest's orders by the same prelate. In December, 1805, he took charge of St. John's Parish, Elizabethtown, N.J., and in May following was instituted its rector. Owing to ill health, he resigned, May 26, 1826, and removed to Auburn, N.Y., and took charge of St. Peter's Church in that city for seven years. In 1827 he was induced by bishop Hobart to commence The Gospel Messenger, which he continued to edit until the close of his life, Nov. 15, 1848. The following are some of Dr. Rudd's publications: Monitorial Schools (1825), an address: — The Resurrection (1833), a sermon: Christ, the Chief Corner-stone (1833), a sermon: — besides a number of other Addresses and Sermons. Dr. Rudd edited the Churchman's Magazine, several years previous to 1812. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 5, 501.

## Rudd, Sayer[[@Headword:Rudd, Sayer]]

             a minister of Walmer, Kent, England, in the middle of the last century, published a number of Poems, Sermons, and Theological Treatises, of which the best known is his Essay on the Resurrection, Millennium, and Judgment (Lond. 1734, 8vo). His Prodromus, or Observations on the English Letters, was published in 1755 (8vo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rudder[[@Headword:Rudder]]

             (πηδάλιον, Act 27:20, strictly a footlet; “helm,” Jam 3:4), an oar (hence the English paddle) used by the ancients for steering vessels, being passed through an eye or rowlock at the stern; when at anchor they were unshipped, and secured from slipping through the rudder port by lashings (ζευκτήρια, “bands”). There were usually two of these rudders (hence the plural), one on each quarter of the vessel. SEE SHIP.

## Rudder, William, D.D[[@Headword:Rudder, William, D.D]]

             a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born in British Guiana; graduated from Trinity College and from the General Theological Seminary; was ordained deacon by bishop Brownell in 1851; officiated successively in St. Paul's Church, Flatbush, L.I.; Calvary Church, New York, as an assistant minister; St. Paul's Church, Albany, as rector; and in St. Stephen's, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, as assistant. On the death of the Reverend Dr. Ducacliet, rector of St. Stephen's, in 1865, Dr. Rudder assumed the rectorship, and remained in this pastorate until his death, January 29, 1880, aged fifty-seven years. See Whittaker, Almanac and Directory, 1881, page 174.

## Ruddy[[@Headword:Ruddy]]

             (אִדְמוֹנַי, admoni, reddish; Sept. πυῤῥάκης; Vulg. rufus). Many interpreters think that the word means red-haired. and it is so rendered in the ancient versions, although ours understands a ruddy complexion. It would then appear that Esau (Gen 25:25) and David (1Sa 16:12) had red hair, a peculiarity so uncommon in the East that it forms a particular distinction, as in the Scriptural instances; but it is by no means unknown, especially in mountainous countries. It has been observed in Persia, accompanied with the usual fresh complexion. Such hair and complexion together seem to have been regarded as a beauty among the Jews. The personal characters of Esau and David appear to agree well with the temperament which red hair usually indicates. That interpretation, however, is by no means established, and the contempt of Goliath for David as a youth of a fair, bright skin is more probable. SEE DAVID. This view is confirmed by the application of kindred words, as adam (אִדִ ם), in Lam 4:7, to the Nazarites in general; and adam (אָדֹ ם) to the bridegroom (Son 5:10), who is immediately described as black-haired (Son 5:11).

## Rudel, Carl Ernst Gottlieb[[@Headword:Rudel, Carl Ernst Gottlieb]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1769. He commenced his pastoral career at Leipsic in 1801, and died there in 1842, doctor of theology. He published, Predigten (1816): — Festpredigten und Amtsreden ( 1828-32, 2 volumes): — Abendmahls- und Confirmationsreden (1827-36, 6 volumes), etc. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 2:98, 149, 159, 179; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

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

             a Danish theologian, was born at Copenhagen in 1792. He became superintendent at Glauchau, Saxony, in 1829, and died in 1862. He published a number of dogmatic works, in which he advocates the orthodox Lutheran creed. Rudenture, the molding, in form like a rope or staff, filling the flutings of columns, usually one third of the height. It is sometimes plain, sometimes ornamental.

## Rudes[[@Headword:Rudes]]

             (uncultivated), one of the names given to the catechumens in the early Church, because they were unacquainted with the doctrines of Christianity, into which the baptized or faithful were initiated.

## Rudiger, Franz Joseph[[@Headword:Rudiger, Franz Joseph]]

             a Roman Catholic prelate of Austria, was born April 6, 1811, at Partheuen. In 1853 he was made bishop of Linz, and died November 24, 1884. Ridiger was one of those prelates who opposed all measures of the Austrian government which tended towards depriving the Church of any of her prerogatives. Riidiger only knew one government, the supremacy of the Church. When the dogma, of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed he celebrated that event by building a splendid cathedral at Linz, and erecting monasteries throughout his diocese. (B.P.)

## Rudiger, Johann Bartholomius[[@Headword:Rudiger, Johann Bartholomius]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Grunberg, Hesse, October 10, 1660. He studied at Giessen, was in 1691 preacher at Wetzlar, in 1697 professor at Giessen, in 1707 doctor of theology, and died July 3, 1729. He  wrote, De Pace inter Lutheros et Reformatos (Giessen, 1684): — De Tnfinitate Dei (1700): — De Presentia Dei Repletiva (1701): — De Natura Dei Perfectissime Simplici (1706): — De Angelorum Cospore Subtili et Assumto (1707): — De Justificatione Abrahae ex Gen 15:6 (1707): — De Conscientia Scrupulosa (1714): — De Agno Occiso ab Origine Mundi (1719): — De Radicatione Fidelium in Christo (1722): — De Christo per Primam vet Ultimam Sacra Scripture Vocem (1724). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rudinger (Also Rudiger And Rudinger), Esrom[[@Headword:Rudinger (Also Rudiger And Rudinger), Esrom]]

             a German theologian and author, was born at Bamberg, Bavaria, May 19, 1523. He was a pupil of Joachim Camerarius in his early years, and subsequently (1548) became his son-in-law. In 1549 he became rector of the gymnasium at Zwickau, and greatly promoted the efficiency of that school; but, as his relations with the superintendent became unpleasant by reason of his advocacy of the “necessity of good works,” he gladly accepted a call to Wittenberg in 1557. In 1562 he became rector, and in 1570 dean, of the theological faculty of that university. By this time his peculiar views had become known. He did not acknowledge the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament, nor a real partaking of the res sacramenti by unbelievers. He was commanded to renounce such opinions, and was even arrested (1574); but he refused and fled, eventually establishing a school among the Moravians, in connection with whose curriculum he wrought out his valuable exposition of the book of Psalms. He died at Nuremberg in 1591, though Altorf is sometimes given as the place of his decease.

Rudinger left many works in manuscript, besides others which were published. His theological writings are the following: Synesii Cyrenoei Aegyptii, seu de Providentia Disputatio, etc. (Basle, 1557): — Exegesis . . . de Coena Dom. (Leipsic and Heidelberg, 1575; the latter edition naming Cureus as the author): — Libri Psalmorum Paraphrasis Latina: — Ε᾿νδέξιον, Tunica Funebris ex Tela Paradisi ad Dextram Crucis Christi (Luk 23:43): — De Origine Ubiquitatis Pii et Eruditi ... Tractatio (Geneva, 1597), a posthumous work usually credited to him: — De Jesu Martyre Anna Burgio, etc., in Miegii Monumenta, etc., 2, 61 sq.: — De Fratribus Orthodoxis in Bohemia et Moravia, etc., in Camerarius's Narratio de Fratr. Orthod. Ecclesiis in Boh. (Heidelberg, 1605). See Will, Nurnbergisches Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v., and the supplementary volume to the same work by Nopitsch, s.v.

## Rudolph (Rudolf Or Rodolf) II[[@Headword:Rudolph (Rudolf Or Rodolf) II]]

             emperor OF GERMANY, eldest son of Maximilian II, was born in 1552. He was educated at the Spanish court by the Jesuits. Upon the death of his father (October, 1576), he ascended the throne. He prohibited the exercise of the Protestant religion, and gave all the principal offices to the Catholics. This bigotry and intolerance led the Protestants to ally themselves with their coreligionists in the Low Countries and in France in 1608, of which confederation the elector-palatine Frederick IV was the head. Between 1608 and 1611 his brother Matthias extorted from Rudolph successively the sovereignty of Austria, Moravia, Hungary, Bohemia, etc. He died without issue in January, 1612, and was succeeded by Matthias. Rudolph was devoted to the study of astrology and the occult sciences, and extended his patronage to Kepler and Tycho Brahe. The Rudolphine Tables derive their name from Rudolph, who originally undertook to defray the expenses incidental to the undertaking, but failed for want of means. See Kurtz, Geschichte Oestreichs unter Kaiser Rudolph (Linz, 1821).

## Rudolph, St.[[@Headword:Rudolph, St.]]

             a monk OF FULDA in the 9th century, was a pupil of Rhabanus Maurus (q.v.), director of the convent school, and spiritual counsellor and favorite preacher to Louis II. He wrote a number of works, among which a continuation of the Annals of Fulda (839-863) holds the first place. By direction of his abbot, Maurus, he composed a life of Lioba, abbess of Bischofsheim, which is given in Surius and Mabillon (Acta Ord. S. Ben. Saec. 3, 2). A short history of the Saxons, which has been incorporated into Meginhard's narrative of the translation of St. Alexander (comp. the art. “Felicitas u. ihre 7 Sohne” in Pertz, 2, 673-681), is also from his pen; and to this list must be added a tract known by the erroneous title Vita B. Rabani Archiep. Moguntiocensis, given by the Bollandists, vol. 1, Feb. p. 500; Mabillon, Acta Ord. S. Ben. vol. 4, pt. 2, p. 1, etc. Canisius (Lect. Antiq. 2, 168, ed. Basnage) contains a letter of Ermenrich, subsequently abbot at Ellwangen, with which he transmits to Rudolph, his former instructor, a life of the priest St. Sola for improvement. See Pertz, 1, 338, 339, in the preface to the Annals of Fulda.

## Rudra[[@Headword:Rudra]]

             (the bloody one), a Hindu deity of the Vaidic period, described in the Veda as the father of the winds. At a later period he is identified with Siva (q.v.)

## Rudy, John[[@Headword:Rudy, John]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Switzerland in 1791, and studied under the Rev. Dr. Helffenstein in Philadelphia. He entered the ministry of the German Reformed Church in 1821, and after serving Christ in North Carolina for three years, at Guilford (1821-24), he transferred his relations to the Reformed Dutch Church. From 1825 to 1835 he was pastor at Germantown, N.Y. In the latter year he resolved to leave the English- speaking Church and people and came to New York city as a missionary to the Germans, and in 1838 took pastoral charge of the German Evangelical Mission Church in Houston Street, where he rendered apostolic service until his death, in 1842. He built up this Church from a little gathering in a hired hall to a membership of 300, and secured the erection of their commodious edifice. He was a man of deep piety, filled with the Spirit, and burdened with the labors of a New Testament evangelist. His distinguishing traits were a sound mind, good judgment, untiring zeal, and faithfulness unto death. He was an efficient coworker with the American Tract Society in the preparation and circulation of evangelical truth among the Germans. He gave himself up to the missionary service among his countrymen with tact and success. His last illness was contracted while engaged in arduous pastoral work. (W.J.R.T.)

## Rue[[@Headword:Rue]]

             (πηγάνον; Vulg. ruta) occurs in the A.V. only in Luk 11:42, “But woe unto you, Pharisees! for ye tithe mint, and rue, and all manner of herbs, and pass over judgment,” etc. In the parallel passage (Mat 23:23) dill (ἄνηθον, translated “anise”) is mentioned instead of rue. Both dill and rue were cultivated in the gardens of Eastern countries in ancient times, as they are at the present day. Dioscorides (3, 45) describes two kinds, Ruta montanta and Ruta hortensis; the latter of which he says is the best for the table. They are distinict species, and the first is common in the south of Europe and the north of Africa. The other is usually called Ruta graveolens, and by some R. hortensis, which is found in the south of  Europe, and is the kind commonly cultivated in gardens. It is a native of the Mediterranean coasts, and has been found by Hasselquist on Mount Tabor. Several species grow wild in Palestine, but R. graveolens is cultivated (Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 478). Josephus speaks of a rue of extraordinary size as growing at Macheerus (War, 7, 6, 3). Rue was highly esteemed as a medicine, even as early as the time of Hippocrates. Pliny says, “Rue is an herbe as medicinaole as the best. That of the garden hath a broader leafe, and brauncheth more than the wild, which is more hotte, vehement, and rigorous in all operations; also that is it sowed usually in Februarie, when the western wind, Favonius, bloweth. Certes we find that in old time rue was in some great account, and especiall reckoning above other hearbs, for I read in auncient histories, That Cornelius Cethegus, at what time as he was chosen Consull with Quintius Flaminius, presently upon the said election, gave a largesse to the people of new wine, aromatized with rue. The fig tree and rue are in a great league and amitie, insomuch as this herb, sow and set it where you will, in no place prospereth better than under that tree; for planted it may be of a slip in spring” (Holland's Pliny, 19, 8). That it was employed as an ingredient in diet, and as a condiment, is abundantly evident from Apicius, as noticed by Celsius, and is not more extraordinary than the fondness of some Eastern nations for assafoetida as a seasoning to food (see Columela, R. Rust. 12, 7, 5). That one kind was cultivated by the Israelites is evident from its being mentioned as one of the articles of which the Pharisees paid their tithes, though they neglected the weightier matters of the law. Rosenmiiller states that in the Talmud (Shebuoth, 9, 1) the rue is indeed mentioned among kitchen herbs (asparagus portulacoe et coriandro); but, at the same time, it is there expressly stated that it is tithe free, it being one of those herbs which are not cultivated in gardens, according to the general rule established in the Talmud. Celsius long previously observed with reference to this fact that in making rue free from tithes they show how far they have left their ancestors' customs; by which, as God's Word assures us, it was tithed (Hierobot. 2, 253). See Beckman, Ad Antiq. Caryst. p. 69 sq.

Rue is a small shrub with a bushy stem, bark gray towards the base, with doubly pinnated leaves of a deep dark green, and yellowish flowers. The whole plant has a peculiar and very powerful odor, and its juice is so acrid that if not diluted it would blister the skin. Notwithstanding this coarseness, it was popular with the ancients, and it is still prized in the East. The Egyptians have a proverb, “The presents of our friends come on  leaves of rue,” meaning that they derive a pleasant perfume from the goodwill of the sender, and just as verbena and mignonette are grown in our windows, the Turks and Arabs keep pots of rue in their drawing rooms (Burckhardt, Arabic Proverbs, p. 695). Among the Greeks and Romans it was valued not only as tonic and medicinal, but a special efficacy was ascribed to it as a safeguard from serpents (Pliny, Hist. Nat. 20, 13) — a popular belief embodied in the modern Arabic phrase, “More hateful than is the scent of rue to serpents.” In the Middle Ages of Europe it acquired a certain sacredness from small bunches of it being used by the priests to sprinkle holy water on the people (Burnett, Useful Plants, vol. 1), and it is called “herb of grace” by Shakespeare (Richard II, 3, 4).

## Rue, Charles De La[[@Headword:Rue, Charles De La]]

             a Benedictine monk, was born at Corbie, Picardy, in 1684 (5). He became very learned in the Greek and Hebrew languages, and died in 1739. He published three volumes of the Works of Origen (1733-39), and his nephew Vincent de la Rue, born in 1707, published the fourth volume in 1759.

## Ruechat, Abraham[[@Headword:Ruechat, Abraham]]

             a theologian and historical writer of Switzerland, was born Sept. 15. 1678, at Grandcour in the canton of Vaud. He early manifested a taste for archaeological and historical inquiry, and also great facility in the acquiring of languages, so that he was able to apply for a professorship of Greek and Latin at Berne when twenty-one years of age; and soon afterwards mastered English and German, attending for the purpose of perfecting himself in the latter tongue, various universities, e.g. Berlin and Leyden. On his return he was made pastor of Aubonne and Rolle, then professor of belles lettres and president of the Upper Gymnasium at Lausanne (July, 1721), and finally professor of theology in the same institution, which latter station he occupied until his death, Sept. 29, 1750.

Ruechat distinguished himself chiefly as a historian of the Church in his native land. In 1707 he published an Abregi de l'Histoire Eccl. du Pays-de- Vaud. His principal work, Histoire de la Reformation de la Suisse (Geneva, 6 vols.), appeared in 1727 and 1728. It was placed on the Index at Rome, and was assailed by Jesuit priests, to whom Ruechat replied in a letter addressed to the editor of the Biblioth. Germanique, 20, 213. His work had been published no farther than 1537, the remainder not being  given to the public until more than a century after the first issue. The first complete edition is by Valliemin (Lausanne and Paris, 7 vols.), with Notioe sur Abraham Ruechat appended. Of Ruechat's works a number have not yet been printed. The list of his printed works includes a Hebrew Grammar (Leyden, 1707): — Examen de l'Origenisme (against M. Huber [q.v.]): — a translation of the epistles of the apostolical fathers Clement, Ignatius, ansd Polycarp (1721): — a treatise on Bible weights and measures (1743): — and various dissertations.

## Ruet, Francisco De Paula[[@Headword:Ruet, Francisco De Paula]]

             a Spanish Protestant minister, was born at Barcelona in 1826. When nineteen years of age he became deeply impressed with the evangelical truth under the preaching of De Sanctis at Turin, and he at once decided for the Protestant faith. Having been ordained at Gibraltar, he at once betook himself to the preaching of the Gospel in his own native place with that ardor and zeal which characterizes the nature of the Spaniard. The fanaticism of the Romish Church, however, brought about his expulsion from his country for the remainder of his life. He went to Gibraltar, and from that place he labored for the evangelization of his country with great effect, and was the means of bringing Matamoros to the Gospel truth. The revolution which broke out in 1868 once more brought him back to his country, and from that time he labored at Madrid in the most intimate connection with the brothers Fliedner, preaching at the Jesus' chapel in Calatrava Street until he died, Nov. 18, 1878. Ruet was the senior among the Protestant clergy of Spain, and also the first who had suffered imprisonment and exile for the sake of the evangelical faith. (B.P.)

## Ruff[[@Headword:Ruff]]

             an ecclesiastical garment:

(1) a piece of plaited linen worn round the neck; (2) a falling collar; (3) an academical robe of silk worn over the gown of certain graduates; (4) a name sometimes given in the 17th century to the hood or tippet worn by clerics in Church.

## Ruffinus[[@Headword:Ruffinus]]

             SEE RUFINUS.

## Ruffner, Henry, D.D., Ll.D.[[@Headword:Ruffner, Henry, D.D., Ll.D.]]

             a Presbyterian divine, was born in the valley of Virginia, in what is now Page County, Jan. 19, 1789. His father was of German origin, his mother of Swiss. In his early youth his father removed to Kanawha County, Va.; and, schools being very scarce in that section, he was sent to Lewisburg, Va., to the school of Rev. John McElhenny, who was also pastor of the Church in that place. While here he was hopefully converted, and joined the Church. He graduated at Washington College, Lexington, Va., in 1817, studied theology with his friend George A. Baxter, D.D., and was licensed by Lexington Presbytery in 1819. The same year he was elected professor in Washington College, and was ordained by Lexington Presbytery and took charge of the Church of Timber Ridge, Va. During the thirty years of his connection with Washington College, he successively filled every professor's chair, and was its president for ten or twelve years. In 1848 he was compelled to resign his position by reason of ill health; but after a few years of rest he took charge of the Church in Malden, on the Kanawha River, where he continued to labor till a year before his death, which occurred Dec. 17, 1861. Dr. Ruffner was an untiring and enthusiastic student all his life. In learning he had few equals, and for many years he was probably the most learned man in the Southern country, if not f in the United States. He was always an instructive a preacher; at times his eloquence was overpowering, his manner always demanding attention. He was the author of Judith Bensaddi (a romance): — The Fathers of the Desert (2 vols.): — The Predestinarian: — also a number of Pamphlets and Addresses. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1863, p. 202; N. Amer. Revelations 45, 241; (South. Lit. Mess. 4, 792; Review of Duyckink's Cyclop. of Amer. Lit. p. 28; Amer. Annual Cyclop. 1861, p. 545. (J.L.S.)

## Ruffo, Dionigi Fabrizio[[@Headword:Ruffo, Dionigi Fabrizio]]

             an Italian cardinal and general, was born at Naples (or Calabria) about 1744. He raised in Calabria the Army of the Holy Faith, a large body of royalists which, under his command, expelled the French and the republicans from the country in 1799 and restored king Ferdinand IV to the throne. A number of republican chiefs taken by him at Naples, as prisoners of war, were put to death by order of the king. He died in 1827.

## Ruffo, Luigi[[@Headword:Ruffo, Luigi]]

             cardinal and archbishop of Naples, was born at San Onofrio, Calabria, Aug. 25, 1750. He was made cardinal-priest, and in 1801 archbishop of Naples. On the accession of Joseph Bonaparte to the throne, Ruffo was exiled, and remained in Rome till 1815, when he was allowed to return to his diocese. Under Ferdinand IV he was director of the university, but was replaced by Rosini, bishop of Pozzuoli. Ruffo died at Rome Nov. 17, 1832.

## Rufina, St.[[@Headword:Rufina, St.]]

             a Christian martyr, under Valerian, at Rome. Her suitor, to avoid danger, renounced Christianity, and endeavored to dissuade Rufina from her profession. She remained steadfast, and her suitor, finding her unyielding. informed against her and occasioned her arrest. Although tortured several times, she remained inflexible, and was beheaded A.D. 257.

## Rufinus Tyrannius[[@Headword:Rufinus Tyrannius]]

             monk, presbyter, the friend, and later the adversary, of Jerome, was born at Concordia, Italy, about A.D. 330. Forty years later he was converted to Christianity at Aquileia and became a monk in which character he visited the East and became acquainted with the monastic institution as found in the Nitrian desert and elsewhere. He witnessed and wrote an account of the persecution under the emperor Valens, though it is not certain that he endured any of the troubles of martyrdom. In 378 he went to Jerusalem in company with Melania, a strict ascetic and friend of Jerome, and was made presbyter by the bishop John of Jerusalem in 390. The breaking out of the Origenistic controversy (q.v.) soon afterwards destroyed his friendship with Jerome, the latter taking sides against that father. In 397 Rufinus, again accompanied by Melania, who shared his views, journeyed to Rome, where he enjoyed the protection of bishop Siricius; but he was summoned before Anastasius, the succeeding bishop, to answer for his Origenistic errors. He sent a written defense from Aquileia, but was formally condemned in 399. Subsequently the incursions of the Goths under Alaric compelled him to flee. He died in 410 in Sicily, while on the way to Palestine. The theological importance of Rufinus arises from his having brought the writings of the Greeks within the reach of the Western Church. He translated the Church History of Eusebius in response to the wish of bishop Chromatius of Aquileia, though taking rather arbitrary liberties with the text (comp. Vales. on Euseb.; Huetius, De Claris Interpretibus, p. 202;  Kimmel, De Rufino Eus. Interprete [1838]), and continued the history to the reign of Theodosius the Great, the continuation being afterwards translated into Greek. He also wrote a Vitoe Pafrum S. Histor. Eremitica for bishop Patronius of Cologia, who furnished the material and was long considered to be the author, though many attributed the work to Jerome instead. Rufinus's translation of Origen was intended to demonstrate the orthodoxy of that ather, but was not impartially done, and gave rise to acrimonious disputes with Jerome, against whom he now wrote his two books known as Invectivoe. His exposition of the Apostles' Creed deserves mention also. It was composed at the request of bishop Laurentius, was much esteemed in ancient times, and is still important to the history of doctrines. Several other works once credited to him are now rejected as spurious. The chief edition of his writings is by Vallarsi (Verona, 1745). The Church History was first printed at Basle in 1544, but was afterwards improved by the Carmelite Peter Th. Oacciari, and published in 1740. See Fontanini, Hist. Lit. Aquileiens; De Rubeis [F. J. Maria], Monum. Eccl. Aquil. (Arg. 1740); De Rufina (Ven. 1754); Marzunnitti, E. H. de Tyr. Ruf. Fide et Religione (Patav. 1835); Schröckh, 10, 121 sq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. vol. 1.

## Rufus[[@Headword:Rufus]]

             (Lat. for red, Graecized ῾Ροῦφος) is mentioned in Mar 15:21, along with Alexander, as a son of Simon the Cyrenmean, whom the Jews compelled to bear the cross of Jesus on the way to Golgotha (Luk 23:26). A.D. 29. As the evangelist informs his readers who Simon was by naming the sons, it is evident that the latter were better known than the father in the circle of Christians where Mark lived. Again, in Rom 16:13, the apostle Paul salutes a Rufus whom he designates as “elect in the Lord” (ἐκλεκτὸν ἐν Κυρίῳ), and whose mother he gracefully recognizes as having earned a mother's claim upon himself by acts of kindness shown to him. A.D. 55. It is generally supposed that this Rufus was identical with the one to whom Mark refers; and in that case, as Mark wrote his gospel in all probability at Rome, it was natural that he should describe to his readers the father (who, since the mother was at Rome, while he, apparently, was not there, may have died or have come later to that city), from his relationship to two well known members of the same community. It is some proof at least of the early existence of this view that in the Acta Andrew et Petri both Rufus and Alexander appear as companions of Peter in Rome. Assuming, then, that the same person is meant in the two  passages, we have before us an interesting group of believers — a father (for we can hardly doubt that Simon became a Christian, if he was not already such, at the time of the crucifixion), a mother, and two brothers, all in the same family. Yet we are to bear in mind that Rufus was not an uncommon name (Wettstein, Nov. Test. 1, 634); and possibly, therefore, Mark and Paul may have had in view different individuals. — Smith. The name is Roman, but the man was probably of Hebrew origin. He is said to have been one of the seventy disciples, and eventually to have had charge of the Church at Thebes.

## Rugen[[@Headword:Rugen]]

             in Hindu mythology, was a prince belonging to the race of children of the moon, father of the Birmaseenes, and grandfather of the Pradibes.

## Rugger, Prosper[[@Headword:Rugger, Prosper]]

             (originally Salono Meir ben-Moses), a Jewish scholar, was born at Novara in 1606. At the age of thirteen he was already known as a good Hebraist, and was afterwards appointed rabbi at Jerusalem. On June 25, 1664, he joined the Christian Church and received the name Prosper Ruggerius. The date of his death is not known. While yet a member of the synagogue he wrote, שבע שמהות, on the advent of the Messiah, which was to take place in 1676: — a commentary on Pirke Shira: — a biography of Joseph Karo, Joseph della Rena, and Nahaman Kathofa. The works which he wrote after his conversion are still in manuscript. See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 180; Delitzsch, Kunst, Wissenschaft u. Judenthum, p. 297; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexicon, 3, 379, s.v. “Meir ben-Mose Novara.” (B.P.)

## Ruggles, Henry Edwin[[@Headword:Ruggles, Henry Edwin]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born at Newbury, Vt., Nov. 27, 1822. He entered Dartmouth College, where he graduated in 1845. He spent a year in teaching the classics at Lyndon, Vt., and also at Hoosic Falls, where he remained two years, at the end of which time he entered the Union Theological Seminary, N.Y., where in due course of time he graduated, and was appointed city missionary in New York. At the end of his service in this field he went South, and was appointed stated supply over a Church in St. Louis, Mo., which position he occupied for one year, and was ordained with a view of becoming pastor of the Presbyterian Church at St. Charles, Mo. Thence he came to New York, and was pastor of a  Congregational Church at Eaton village, where he remained but one year on account of sickness, which obliged him to return to his native place, where he died, Dec. 24, 1856. (W.P.S.)

## Ruggles, William, LL.D.[[@Headword:Ruggles, William, LL.D.]]

             a Baptist educator, was born in Rochester, Mass., Sept. 5, 1797, and was a graduate of Brown University in the class of 1820. Shortly after graduating, he went to Washington, D.C., and was appointed a tutor in Columbian College in 1822, his name being retained in the list of its faculty for forty-five years. He was appointed professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in 1827, and discharged the duties of that office with marked ability and success till 1859, when, at his own request, he was appointed professor of political economy. He discontinued active service after 1873. During four interims he was the acting president of the college. He died Sept. 10, 1877.

Prof. Ruggles was a most generous giver to the benevolent organizations of the denomination (the Baptist) with which he sympathized. “His relations with some of the Baptist missionaries in Burmah had led him to take particular interest in their labors. This was especially true of the Karen Theological School established by the late Dr. Binney, who had been his associate in Washington. In his last will and testament, after certain personal bequests, he bestowed his estate upon the Baptist Missionary Union and the Baptist Home Missionary Society, with a residuary provision for the college in whose service he had spent his entire active life.” (J.C.S.)

## Rugiwit[[@Headword:Rugiwit]]

             in Wendish mythology, was a war god of the ancient Rugians, and presumably the same as Karewit, since the latter is represented in a similar character (at Karenz, on the island of Rugen). Frequent colossal statues of stone or wood were erected to him in the different towns, in which he appeared as a being having seven faces on a single head, and as bearing a naked sword in his hand, while seven other swords were suspended from his person. The swallow appears to have been sacred to him, since that bird was allowed to build its nests in the eyes, mouths, and other lines of the different faces, and also in the folds of the scarlet cloth in which the god was usually enveloped for the purpose of preventing access to his person. At Rhetra an image of this god was found which was almost naked and had  six heads, four male and two female, besides the head of a lion on the breast. It has been supposed that a twofold deity, representing both Rugiwit and Karewit, is set forth in this image; but the two are but a single god of war.

## Ruhamah[[@Headword:Ruhamah]]

             [some Ru, ‘hamah] (Heb. Ruchamah', רֻחָמָה, finding mercy; part. of רָחִ ם, to be merciful; Sept. translates ἐλεημένη, and so Vulg. misericordium consecuta), a figurative title of Israel. When God directed Hosea to prophesy against the wickedness of Israel and Judah, he commanded him to take to wife a harlot, the symbol of idolatry, the spiritual harlotry of the Jews; and of her were born a daughter, named, after God's direction, Lo-ruhamah, “Not obtaining mercy,” and a son named Lo-ammi, “Not my people” (Hos 1:6; Hos 1:9). Israel is represented by Lo-ruhamah, Judah by Lo-ammi. Perhaps Israel is typified by the female because that kingdom was the weaker of the two, and the more completely overthrown; and Judah by the male because from Judah the Messiah was to descend according to the flesh. Subsequently Hosea says (ii, 1), “Say ye unto your brethren, Ammi [my people]; and to your sisters, Ruhamah” [having obtained mercy], thus promising God's reconciliation to the people on their repenting and seeking him; saying that he will have mercy, and they shall be his people, thus indicating the restoration of the Jewish nation after much affliction. As the promises of grace to the obstinate Jews are transferred meanwhile to the believing Christians, Peter applied them to the Gentile proselytes, to whom he addresses his first epistle, telling them that in time past they “were not a people, but are now the people of God, which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy” (1Pe 2:10). Paul also distinctly applies the prophecy not to the Jews only, but to the Gentiles: “That he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy... even on us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles. As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people which were not my people, and her beloved which was not beloved” (Rom 9:23-25). The wording in Hos 1:2 indicates the admission of the Gentiles into the participation of the promises made to the Jews. In the first instance, in the threats against Israel and Judah, it is a son, Lo-ammi, and a daughter, Lo-ruhamah. When the promises are given, the plural number is  used; then it is brethren and sisters: not Jew only, but Jew and Gentile. SEE LO-RUHAMAH.

## Ruhmani[[@Headword:Ruhmani]]

             in Hinda mythology, was the first consort of the god Vishnu in the incarnation of Krishna.

## Ruin[[@Headword:Ruin]]

             The words used in the Hebrew thus rendered in the A.V. are very expressive. The ruin of a city by dilapidation, separating all its stones: Isa 25:2, “Thou hast made of a fenced city a ruin” (or separation,

מִפֵּלָה; so of a country, Isa 23:13; מִפָּלָה, Isa 17:1; מִפֶּלֶת Eze 13:13; Eze 27:27). Ruin of strongholds by breaking them up: Psa 89:40, “Thou hast brought his strongholds to ruin” (i.e. to a breaking, מִחְתָּה). This word elsewhere means terror, and expresses the alarm attendant on the taking of a fortified place. Demolished structures: Eze 36:35-36 (the root is הָרִס, to tear down, as in Amo 9:11; like κατασκάπτω, Act 15:16; but in Luk 6:49, it is ῥῆγμα, a tearing).

Figuratively, ruin, a fall, or stumbling, from some cause of, or temptation to, sin: 2Ch 28:23, “They [the gods of Damascus] were the ruin (מִכַשֵׁלָה, a stumbling-block) of him [Ahaz] and of all Israel;” so מַכַשׁוֹל, Eze 18:30; Eze 21:15. Ruin, destruction: Pro 24:22, “Their calamity shall rise suddenly; who knoweth the ruin (פַּיד, destruction) of them both?” Ruin, a cause for repentance: 26:28, “A flattering mouth worketh ruin” (מַדְחֶה, contrition or repentance).

## Ruinart, Thierre[[@Headword:Ruinart, Thierre]]

             a monk of the congregation of St. Maur, and a learned writer of martyrological and historical works, was born at Rheims in 1657, and entered the Order of St. Maur in the abbey St. Faron, at Meaux, in 1674. He was sent to the abbey St. Pierre at Corbie, to study philosophy and theology, and while there was chosen to assist Mabillon (q.v.) because of his interest in Christian archaeology. He traveled for literary purposes to Alsace and Lorraine, and afterwards to Champagne, and, in consequence of exposure, destroyed his health. He died Sept. 27, 1709. His works are, 4  eta Primorum Martyrum, etc. (Par. 1689, 2 vols.); improved and accompanied with a brief Life of the author, in a posthumous edition (Amst. 1713). The work contains, among other things, a refutation of Dodwell's opinion that the number of martyrs in the first three centuries was inconsiderable: — Hist. Vandal. Persecutionis (Par. 1694), in two parts, only the first of which was entirely composed by him: — Gregor. Episc. Turonensis Opera Omnia (ibid. 1699), preceded by the Annales Francorum, and containing the additions of Fredegard and others. This work was admitted by Dom Bouquet into his collection of the historical works of France: Acta SS. O. Benedict. (1701, 2 vols.), by Mabillon and himself, embracing the 6th century of the order: — An Apologie de la Mission de St. Maur (ibid. 1702), designed to prove that Benedict of Nursia and St. Maur of Ganfeuil founder of the Order of St. Maur, were one and the same person: — In defense of Mabillon he wrote Eccl. Paris. Vindicata adv. R. P. Barth. Germon., etc. (ibid. 1706-12): — He also wrote in honor of his master a Vie de D. Jean Mabillon (ibid. 1709), and issued a second edition of that autthor's De Re Diplomatica. Ruinart's Iter Literarium in Alsatiam et Lotharingiam; Disquisitio Hist. de Pallio Archiepiscopali; and Beati Urbani Papoe II Vita appeared after the author's death. See Tassin, Hist. Lit. de la Congreg. de St. Maur.

## Ruiswick, Herman[[@Headword:Ruiswick, Herman]]

             a Hollander who was found guilty of circulating grossly heretical doctrines of the Manichaean type at about the close of the 15th and the beginning of the 16th century. He was apprehended in 1499, but again liberated after he had recanted. He, however, renewed the effort to introduce his views, was accused and tried before the inquisitor Jacob of Hoogstraten, and died at the Hague by fire A.D. 1512. He was charged with denying the existence of created angels, the immortality of the human soul, and a hell, and with asserting that matter is coeternal with God. He taught that Christ was not the Son of God; that Moses did not receive the law from God; that the Bible in both Testaments is simply a fable and a series of falsehoods, etc. See Feller, Dict. Hist.; Ross [Alex.l, Der Welt Gottesdienste, p. 439; Allgem. Encyklopadie, by Ersch u. Gruber, s.v.

## Ruiz, Juan[[@Headword:Ruiz, Juan]]

             archpresbyter of Hita, in Spain, probably flourished during the reign of Alphonso XI. He is known to have been imprisoned by the bishop of  Toledo about 1333 for his zeal in attacking the laxity of discipline and worldly manners of the clergy. The most of his life was spent in Guadalajara and Hita. He wrote a humorous poem describing his adventures, which is a mixture of all kinds of measures, containing hymns, pastoral poems, and epilogues, in the confusion of which the original plan of the work is entirely lost. The style of this work has been compared in some respects to that of Chaucer. See Ticknor, History of Spanish Liternature; Puymaigre, Les Vieux Auteurs Castillans.

## Rukmini[[@Headword:Rukmini]]

             (golden), the name of an avatar of Lakshni, who under this form was the favorite wife of Krishna, an avatar of Vishnu. SEE AVATAR.

## Ruland, Anton[[@Headword:Ruland, Anton]]

             a German doctor of theology and Roman Catholic divine, was born at Würzburg in 1809, where he also received holy orders in 1832. Having labored for some time at Kitzingen, he was called in 1836 as librarian of the Würzburg University, but in 1837 he was appointed pastor of Arnstein. For thirteen years he labored in this place, when, in 1850, he was recalled to Würzburg as first librarian. From 1848 till his death, which took place January 8, 1874, he was a member of the Bavarian House of Representatives. He wrote: Practischer Unterricht zum erstmaligen Empfang der heiligen Communion (2d ed. Würzburg, 1866). See the Literarischer Handweiser, 1872, p. 161; 1874, p. 48. (B.P.)

## Rule[[@Headword:Rule]]

             (Heb. kav, קִו, a line for measuring. as elsewhere rendered) is mentioned (Isa 44:13) among the tools of the carpenter (חָרִשׁ עֵצים, hewer of wood), the associated implements being the "line" (Heb. sered, ַֹשרֶד, probably a graver), the "plane " (Heb. maktsu'ah, מִקְצוּעָה, probably a chisel), and the "compass" (Heb, mechugah, מְחוּגָה, probably compasses). SEE HANDICRAFT.

## Rule of Faith[[@Headword:Rule of Faith]]

             SEE FAITH, RULE OF.

## Rule the Choir[[@Headword:Rule the Choir]]

             the duty of the precentor as director of the musical services on greater doubles, and of the hebdomadary on simple feasts. The choir was ruled for the invitatory on Sundays, doubles, feasts of nine lections, and other principal feasts. Canons present at the service were said to keep choir.

## Rule, Gilbert[[@Headword:Rule, Gilbert]]

             a Nonconformist divine, was subprincipal of King's College, Aberdeen, in 1651. He afterwards became curate of Alnwick, Northumberland, from  which he was ejected in 1662. After the Revolution he was appointed principal of the University of Edinburgh. He died about 1703. He published, the Rational Defense of Nonconformity (1689, 4to): — Vindication of the Church of Scotland (1691, 4to): — The Cyprianick Bishop, etc. (1696, 4to): — Good Old Way (1697, 4to): — Presbyterian Government, etc. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliog. s.v.

## Ruler Of The Feast[[@Headword:Ruler Of The Feast]]

             SEE ARCHITRICLINUS.

## Ruler Of The Synagogue[[@Headword:Ruler Of The Synagogue]]

             SEE ARCHISYNAGOGUS.

## Ruling Elders[[@Headword:Ruling Elders]]

             Among Presbyterian churches there are generally two classes of elders teaching and ruling elders. SEE ELDER; SEE PRESBYTERIAN

 CHURCH.

## Rullmann, Georg Wilhelm[[@Headword:Rullmann, Georg Wilhelm]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born March 16, 1757, and studied at Rinteln and Gottingen. In 1778 he was appointed con-rector at Rinteln, in 1782 professor of theology, in 1788 doctor of theology, and died June 16, 1804. He wrote, De Insiqni Psychologis in Theologia Revelata Usu (Rinteln, 1779): — Versuch eines Lehrbuchs ler roinischen Alterthumer (1782; 2d ed. 1787): — De Apostolis Primariis Religionis Christianae Doctoribus (1788): — Tabula Harmonian IV Evangelistorum Exhibens (1790): — De Prophetis Vovi Testamenti (eod.): — Die heiligen Schriften es Neuen Bundes ubersetzt und mit Anmerkunen versehen (1790-91, 3  volumes): — Observationes Criticas Exegeticae in Loca Quaedam Epistloram-Pauli, etc. (1795): — Die christliche Religionslehre (1803). See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rulrman, Merswin[[@Headword:Rulrman, Merswin]]

             one of the "Friends of God," of the 14th century, was born, at Strasburg in 1307. He was a wealthy merchant and banker, when, in 1347, he gave up business, joined the Friends of God, and led a life of severe asceticism, under the guidance of Tauler. In 1366 Rulman acquired the island of Der grune Wort, in the Ill, near Strasburg, and retired thither. He died July 18, 1382. Rulman's writings are, Das Bannerbuchlein (edited by Jundt, Les Amis de Dieu Paris,. 1879): — Das Buch von den neun Felsen (ed. by Schmidt, Leipsic, 1859), and an old Dutch version of the same, Dat Boeck van den Oorspronck, by G.H. van Boossum Waalkes, Lenwarden, 1882). See Schmidt, in Revue d'Alsace (1856); in Reuss und Cunitz, Beitrage zu der theol. Wissenschaft, volume 5 (Jena 1854), and Nikslaus von Basel (Vienna, 1866); Jundt, Les Amis de Dieu, page 140 sq.; Plitt-Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rumah[[@Headword:Rumah]]

             (Heb. Rumah', יוּמָה, high; Sept. ῾Ρουμά; Vulg. Ruma; Josephus, Α᾿βούμα, Ant. 10, 5, 2), a city named only in 2Ki 23:36 as the home of Pedaiah, father of Jehoiakim's mother, Zebudah. It is probably the same with Arumah (Jdg 9:41), which is identified by Schwarz (Palest. p. 158) with the modern Ramin, two miles west of Samaria. SEE ARUMAH. Josephus mentions a Rumash in Galilee (War, 2, 7, 21). Others with less probability regard this as identical with Dumah, one of the towns in the mountains of Judah, near Hebron (Jos 15:52), not far distant from Libnah, the native town of another of Josiah's wives.

## Rumelin, Georg Burkhard[[@Headword:Rumelin, Georg Burkhard]]

             a German divine, was born in 1680 at Tübingen, where, also, he studied, and was made magister in 1699. in 1706 he labored as pastor at Ober- Owisheim, in 1707 as deacon at Unter Owisheim, and from 1735 until his death (Jan. 29, 1746) he was pastor at Waltdorff, near Tübingen. He wrote, Lexicon Biblicum in quo Omnes quoe V. T. lequntur Voces, Verba scilicet ac Nomina, etc., Recensentur (Frankf. 1716): Lexicon Critico-  sacrum in Duas Partes Distinctum, etc. (Tübingen, 1730). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 180; Jocher, Gelehrten-Lexicon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rumilia (Rumia, Or Rumina)[[@Headword:Rumilia (Rumia, Or Rumina)]]

             in Roman mythology, was the goddess of nursing mothers, whose office it was to cause infants to readily receive their nourishment. She was also supposed to have been nurse to Romulus and Remus.

## Ruminus[[@Headword:Ruminus]]

             in Roman mythology, was an appellative of Jupiter, signifying “the nourisher.”

## Rumoldus, St.[[@Headword:Rumoldus, St.]]

             was a martyr and patron of Mechlin. His life was first written by the abbot Theodoric about A.D. 1100, and was based on popular traditions, while the death of Rumoldus is said to have occurred in the year 775. He is represented as a native of Scotia, who led a pious life and resolved to convert the heathen. A later addition to the story makes him a son of king David and a Sicilian princess. He journeyed to Rome and returned to Brabant, where he gained many converts in the neighborhood of Antwerp, Lyra, and Mechlin. Count Ado received him kindly. It is not certain that he ever became a bishop. Two murderers surprised him while reciting the Psalms, and killed him to obtain money, throwing the body into a stream. Celestial lights marked the place where it lay, and led to its receiving honorable burial, while miracles before and after death attested the sanctity of the man. In about 1050 a convent of canons of St. Rumoldus was established at Mechlin, and the cathedral in that town was dedicated to him. He is commemorated June 1. See Acta SS. Junii, i. 169-266; Gestel, Hist. Archiep. Mechlin. (1725); Hist. Litter- de la Fiance, 9, 338.

## Rump[[@Headword:Rump]]

             (or rather tail [אִלְיָה, alydh]) OF THE SACRIFICES. Moses ordained that the rump and fat of the sheep offered for peace offerings should be given to the fire of the altar (Exo 29:22; Lev 3:9; Lev 7:3; Lev 8:25; Lev 9:19). The rump was esteemed the most delicate part of the animal, being the fattest (see Bochart, Hieroz. 1, 491 sq.). Travelers, ancient and modern, speak of the rumps or tails of certain breeds of sheep in Syria and Arabia as weighing twenty or thirty pounds (Russell, Aleppo, 2, 147).  Herodotus says (3, 113) that some may be seen three cubits, or four feet and a half, long; they drag upon the ground; and for fear they should be hurt, or the skin torn, the shepherds put under the tails of these sheep little carriages, which the animals draw after them. The pagans had also such regard for the rumps or tails that they always made them a part of their sacrifices (Diod. Sic. 2, 24). In the Description de l'Egypte (Paris, 1820, large fol.) is inserted a plate of an Egyptian ram. remarkable for the enormous size of the tail, the weight of which exceeded forty-four pounds. SEE SHEEP.

## Rumpe, Heinrich[[@Headword:Rumpe, Heinrich]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born at Hamburg in 1561, studied at different universities, was in 1592 professor of Hebrew at Helmstadt, in 1597 at Hamburg, and died Aug. 16,1626. He wrote, Vaticinia Aliquot de Messia: — Isagoge in Linguas Orientales Primarias, etc. See Moller, Cimbria Litterata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v.; Furst, Bibl. Jud. s.v. (B.P.)

## Runcarii[[@Headword:Runcarii]]

             the name of an Antinomian sect of the Waldenses, which is mentioned by Reiner as agreeing for the most part with the Paterins, but as holding that no part of the body below the waist can commit mortal sin, because such sin proceeds “out of the heart.” They probably took their name from the town of Runcalia or Runkel. See Reiner, Contr. Waldens. in Bibl. Max. Lugd. 25, 266 sq.

## Rundell, William W.[[@Headword:Rundell, William W.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Norwich, Chenango Co., N.Y., and joined the Genesee Conference in 1818. He began his labors in Canada, where his name is still mentioned with great respect. He traveled in the itinerant ranks for thirty years, and was superannuated twenty-seven. He was a member of the Northern New York Conference at the time of his death, which occurred in Mexico, Oswego Co., N.Y., March 28, 1876. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p. 65.

## Rundi[[@Headword:Rundi]]

             in Hindu mythology, was the daughter of prince Dritarashtra and Kanderi, and the form in which the goddess Maritshi chose to appear among men. Her mother became famous as having won the love of Krishna; but Rundi was not the daughter of that god, having been born before Vishnu was incarnated in that form.

## Rundle, Thomas, LL.D.[[@Headword:Rundle, Thomas, LL.D.]]

             an English prelate, was born in the parish of Milton Abbot, Devonshire, about 1686. In 1702 he entered Exeter College, Oxford, and was introduced to Mr. Edward Talbot, son of Dr. William Talbot, bishop of Oxford — an event of great importance, as it secured to him the friendship and patronage of the Talbot family. He was ordained by bishop Talbot in 1718, in 1720 was made archdeacon of Wilts, and in the same year was constituted treasurer of the church of Sarum. On Jan. 23, 1721, he was collated to the first stall in Durham Cathedral, but on Nov. 12 in the following year was removed to the twelfth prebend. He had also the mastership of Sherburne Hospital (July 5. 1723), and became associate chaplain at the palace in Durham. He was consecrated bishop of Derry, in Ireland, February, 1734 (or 1735), and died at his palace in Dublin, April 14, 1743. Of his works we have nothing except four Sermons (1734-36), and The Letters of the Late Thomas Rundle to Mrs. Barba Sandys (Oxf. 1790, 2 vols. 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.; Chalmers, Biog. Dict. s. 5,

## Runge, David[[@Headword:Runge, David]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born in 1564 at Greifswalde, where he was professor of Hebrew in 1589. In 1601 he attended the Colloquy of Ratisbon, and died July 7, 1604. He wrote, Dissertationes viii de Calvinismo: — De Articulo Primo Symboli Apostolici: — De Verbis: non Fascies Tibi Sculptile, Exo 20:4 : — De Baptismo, etc. See Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Runge, Johann[[@Headword:Runge, Johann]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Sweden, was born in 1666, studied at Abo, was preacher there in 1691, in 1697 professor of theology, in 1701 doctor of theology and superintendent at Narva. Runge died August 3, 1704. He wrote, Comment. in 9, 10 et 11 cap. ad Romanos; — De Sede Animae in Homine Praecipua. See Stirnmann, Aboa Literata; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Runina[[@Headword:Runina]]

             in Roman mythology, was a goddess who presided over the reaping of grain.

## Runner[[@Headword:Runner]]

             a word that does not occur in the A.V., although “running” frequently does (usually as a rendering of רוּוֹ, ruts, τρέχω). The Old Test. furnishes many illustrations of speed of foot. SEE FOOTMEN. We have a very curious specimen of the manners of the times, and a singular instance of Oriental or Jewish craft in Ahimaaz, who, it appears, was a professed runner — and a very swift one, too — which one would hardly have expected in the son of the high priest. It belongs, however, to a simple state of society that bodily powers of any kind should be highly valued, and exercised by the possessor of them in the most natural way (comp. Homer's favorite epithet of “Achilles swift of foot”). Ahimaaz was probably naturally swift, and so became famous for his running (2Sa 18:27). So we are told of Asahel, Joab's brother, that “he was as light of foot as a wild roe” (2:18). And that quick running was not deemed inconsistent with the utmost dignity and gravity of character appears from what we read of Elijah the Tishbite, that “he girded up his loins and ran before Ahab [who was in his chariot] to the entrance of Jezreel” (1Ki 18:46). The kings of Israel had running footmen to precede them when they went in their chariots  (2Sa 15:1; 1Ki 1:5), and their guards were called רָצַי ם, runners. It appears by 2Ch 30:6; 2Ch 30:10, that in Hezekiah's reign there was an establishment of running messengers, who were also called רָצַי ם. The same name is given to the Persian posts in Est 3:13; Est 3:15; Est 8:14, though it appears from the latter passage that in the time of Xerxes the service was performed with mules and camels. The Greek name, borrowed from the Persian, was ἄγγαροι. As regards Ahimaaz's craftiness, we read that when Absalom was killed by Joab and his armor bearers, Ahimaaz was very urgent with Joab to be employed as the messenger to run and carry the tidings to David. See a POST.

In the New Test. we have frequent reference to running, in the allusions to the Grecian races (1Co 9:24; (Heb 12:1; comp. Psa 19:5; Ecc 9:11). SEE GAME.

## Rupert (Or Ruprecht, I.E. Robert), St.[[@Headword:Rupert (Or Ruprecht, I.E. Robert), St.]]

             the apostle OF BAVARIA. The exact period in which this personage lived is not known, and is the subject of continued dispute, the limits being from about A.D. 580 to 700 sq. The authorities are the Salzburg Chronicles from the 12th to the 14th century, on the one hand; and the Vita Primigenia, composed about 873 (see Kleinmayr, Nachr. vom Zustande d. Gegend u. Stadt Juvavia [Salzb. 1784, suppl. p. 7 sq.]), the so called Congestum of bishop Arno of Salzburg, the Breves Notitioe of the time of bishop Virgil (died 784), etc., on the other. The preponderance of opinion is towards the later date, according to which Rupert entered on his work of conversion in 696, after a beginning had already been made by other agents. Concerning his life, it is related that he sprang from the royal family of the Franks, became bishop of Worms, and was invited by duke Theodo to preach the cross in his Bavarian dominions. Having consented, he was received at Ratisbon with great solemnity, and baptized the duke, many nobles, and large numbers of the common people. He was also permitted to select a place for his settlement anywhere in the country, and for this purpose traversed the land, everywhere preaching the Gospel; and after a temporary experiment elsewhere, he finally chose the spot covered by the splendid ruins of a Roman city on the Juvavum (Salzach), and there built an episcopal residence, church, and convents. This was the beginning of the town and diocese of Salzburg (about A.D. 700), which in the time of Arno, the tenth successor of Rupert, was raised into a metropolitan see. Rupert placed twelve pupils from Worms in the monastery, and assigned the  nunnery to the virgin Erindrud. After further tours for preaching, the founding of other churches, and the appointing of a successor, he returned to his proper see (propria sedes), and there died on Easter Sunday. So the Vita Primigenia, though Arnold of Vochburg lets him die at Salzburg. See Rudhard, in the München. Gelehrte-Anzeigen, 1837, Nos. 196222; 1845, Nos. 80-83; Aelteste Gesch. Bayezns (Hamb. 1841); Rettberg, Kirch. Gesch. 2, 193 sq.; Kurtz, Handb. der allgem. Kirchengesch. 2, 1, 120 sq.

## Rupert, Abbot Of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis)[[@Headword:Rupert, Abbot Of Deutz (Rupertus Tuitiensis)]]

             a contemporary of St. Bernard, and in his theological relation a mystic, was one of the most prolific among the exegetical writers of his time. Neither his country nor the exact time of his birth is known; but it is certain that he spent his early years in the Benedictine convent of St. Laurent at Liege in preparation for a monastic life. He was consecrated to the priesthood in 1101 or 1102, and began his literary career somewhat later. The earliest work from his pen, if we disregard some Latin verses but little known, is entitled De Divinis Officiis, in which he endeavors to explain the entire symbolism of the public worship to the common understanding. His first exegetical work was an abridgment of the Moralia in Jobum of Gregory the Great. These publications involved him in controversies. chief among which was that waged against the schools of William of Champeaux and Anselm of Laon. One of their adherents had advanced the idea in Rupert's convent at Liege that God willed the evil and that Adam sinned in accordance with God's will. Rupert characterized the doctrine as impious, and advocated instead the Augustinian (infralapsarian) view that God simply permits the evil. Being protected by his abbot Berengar, and after the death of that patron in 1113 by Cuno, abbot of Siegburg, and later bishop of Ratisbon, he resisted the virulent attacks of the body of adherents belonging to those schools. He embodied his views in the treatise De Voluntate Dei, and when his opponents asserted that the idea of a permission of evil is destructive to the doctrine of God's omnipotence, he added the book De Omnipotentia Dei (about 1117), and followed up his effort by meeting William of Champeaux in a public disputation at Chalons, which ended by leaving each disputant confident of the success of his cause, and exposed Rupert to the subsequent malicious attacks of William's pupils while he lived.

The energy of Rupert's devotion to the Scriptures is apparent from the fact that it was in this period of exciting conflict that he issued the first of his  independent exegetical works. a Tractatus in Evangelium Johannis (in 14 books). The exposition follows the text, giving the literal meaning, reconciling difficulties — which are regarded as only apparent — and frequently adding an allegorical interpretation. The authority of the fathers prevails everywhere, and all manner of dogmatical questions are woven into the exposition. A second, the largest and most original of his exegetical works — the Commentarius de Operibus Sanctoe Trinitatis (in 42 books) — appeared in 1117. Its purpose was to explain the entire plan of salvation from the beginning to its consummation. Its title is derived from the systematic plan by which the dispensation of each Person in the Trinity is distinguished. The work is dominated by the systematizing tendency of Middle-Age theology, and as it lacks the advantage growing out of a knowledge of the original languages of Scriptures, is obliged to present the traditional results of earlier investigations; but it luxuriates in the use of the unregulated hermeneutics of the time and in the development of mystical and anagogical meanings from the Scriptures, and thereby illustrates the qualities which distinguish Rupert as a theologian, namely, the religious fervor and enthusiasm of the mystic.

In 1119 Rupert returned to Cuno of Siegburg, and would seem to have formed an intimate relation with the archbishop Frederick of Cologne, to whom he dedicated a Commentary on the Apocalypse (in 12 books), which is peculiar as regarding the visions and statements of that book as relating to past experiences of the Church from the Creation to the times of the New Test., rather than as prophecies having reference to the future. His next work was a Commentary on the Song of Solomon (in 7 books), which expounds the book as being a prophetical celebration of the incarnation of Christ, though the execution of the plan results instead in inspired laudations of the Virgin Mother. The book is nevertheless a witness to show that the 12th century did not accept the dogma of the “immaculate conception.” A Commentary on the Twelve Minor Prophets followed which was interrupted by the composition of a work entitled De Victoria Verbi Dei (in 13 books), showing how God executes his counsels, despite the opposition of Satan, by an examination of the Bible narratives, the mystical treatment being altogether ignored — but was eventually completed.

In 1120 Rupert was chosen abbot of Deutz, and was compelled to lay aside his pen to arrange difficulties relating to the property of his convent and involving a number of actions at law (comp. Ruperti, De Incendio Tuitiensi  Liber Aureas, cap. 8, 9). He eventually placed the management of the secular business of the convent in the hands of a committee of monks, and reserved for himself the administration of discipline and the spiritual care of his subordinates. His Commentary on Matthew (in 13 books), allegorical throughout, appeared not earlier than 1126. A work entitled De Glorioso Rege David (in 15 books) appeared at about the same time. It is based on the books of Kings, and, like all of Rupert's writings, refers everything to Christ in some form of typical relation. He also gave attention to practical subjects, and wrote De Regula Sancti Benedicti (in 4 books), and an Annulus (in 3 books), written in dialogue form and designed to promote the conversion of the Jews by proving that the Messiah had appeared. This composition does not appear, however, in editions of Rupert's works, and was not discovered until after 1669, by Gerberon, who included it in his edition of Anselm's works. The book De Glorificatione Trinitatis et Processione Spiritus Sancti likewise aims to help the Jews to embrace Christianity. The Liber Aureus de Incendio Tuitiensi commemorates a fire which on the night of Sept. 1, 1128, destroyed the surroundings of Deutz, but left the convent and church unharmed. Two books De Meditatione Maortis give evidence that the author believed his end approaching; and with a Commentary on Ecclesiastes, in which he develops, more than in any other work, the literal sense alone, he brought his exegetical labors to a close. A few additional writings, lives of saints, etc., do not require special mention. Rupert died peaceably in his abbey of Deutz, March 4, 1135.

The earliest edition of Rupert's works was issued under the direction of Cochleeus at Cologne (1526-28; enlarged ed. ibid. 1577, 3 vols. fol.; again enlarged, 1602, 2 vols.; once more enlarged, Mayence, 1631; the latter edition reprinted, but carelessly, Paris, 1638). Separate editions of particular works are numerous. The latest complete edition is that of Venice (1751, 4 vols. fol.). See Gerberon, Apologia pro Ruperto Tuitiensi (Par. 1669); Mabillon, Annales Ordinis S. Benedicti, tom. 5, 6 passim; Histoire Litteraire de la France (ibid. 1841), 11, 422-587.

## Ruperti, Georg Alexander, D.D.[[@Headword:Ruperti, Georg Alexander, D.D.]]

             a Lutheran divine, was born at Bremervorde Dec. 19, 1758. Having been teacher for a number of years at Stade, he was appointed, in 1814, general superintendent of the duchies of Bremen and Verden, and died March 14, 1839. He wrote, Symboloe ad Interpretationem Sacri Codicis (GBtt. 1782): — Theologumena (Hamb. 1824, 2 vols.): — Theologische  Miscellen (ibid. 1816-19, 4 vols.): — Des h. Abendmahls ursprungliche Feier (Hanover, 1821). See Fürst, Bibl. Jud. 3, 181; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 13, 16, 195, 454, 868; 2, 743. (B.P.)

## Rupitee (Or Rupitani)[[@Headword:Rupitee (Or Rupitani)]]

             a name given to the small Donatist congregation at Rome, from their being driven to shelter among the rocks for the purpose of celebrating their religious services.

## Rupp, Julius[[@Headword:Rupp, Julius]]

             a Protestant theologian of Germany, was born in 1809. He belonged to the so-called Friends of Light (q.v.), and founded in 1846 the first free congregation. He died July 11, 1884, doctor of philosophy. Rupp published, Gregor's, des Bischoff von Nyssa, Leben und Meinungen (Leipsic, 1834): — Der Symbolzwang und die protestantische Lehr- und Gewissensfreiheit (Konigsberg, 1843): — Christliche Predigten (1843- 45): — Erbautngsbu.ch fiir freie evangelische Gemeindei (1846):Von der Freiheit (1856, 2 volumes): — Das Sektenwesen und die freie Gemeinde (1859), etc. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. s.v. (B.P.)

## Rupstein, J.G.E. Friedrich[[@Headword:Rupstein, J.G.E. Friedrich]]

             a German doctor of theology and abbot of Loccum, was born Aug. 30, 1794, at Wunsdorf. From 1813 to 1816 he studied at Gottingen, in 1820 he was made chaplain of the Neustadter Church in Hanover, in 1822 he was appointed minister of the Schlosskirche, and in 1825 assessor of consistory. In 1830 he was made court preacher and member of consistory, in 1832 abbot of Loccum, and in 1866 first member of consistory, and died Oct. 7, 1876, in Hanover. He published, A uswahl von Predigten (Hanover, 1832, 2 vols.): — Dr. H. Ph. Sextro (ibid. 1839), a biography. See Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1100; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 2, 144, 743; Schneider, Theologisches Jahrbuch, 1878, p. 227. (B.P.)

## Rural Dean[[@Headword:Rural Dean]]

             a designation of a class of very ancient officers of the Church, who, being parish priests, executed the bishop's processes, inspected the lives and manners of the clergy and people within their district, and reported the same to the bishop. In order that they might have knowledge of the state of their respective deaneries, they had power to convene rural chapters. Much of their authority at the present day rests on custom and precedent. Their duties and powers vary in different dioceses. SEE DEAN.

## Rural Deanery[[@Headword:Rural Deanery]]

             a certain number of parishes placed under the supervision of a rural dean.

## Ruridecanal Chapter[[@Headword:Ruridecanal Chapter]]

             a chapter consisting of the parish priests of a rural deanery, assembled for consultation under the presidency of a rural dean. These chapters are of considerable antiquity, and were commonly assembled in mediaeval times  once a year, at or about Whitsuntide. After the Reformation they were seldom convened, and so for many generations they have practically ceased to exist. Since the Catholic revival in 1830, they have been restored in England according to ancient precedent, and in the great majority of English dioceses they are now in full working order. English Roman Catholics have likewise restored this ancient machinery, and now have their own ruridecanal chapters in several Anglo-Roman dioceses.

## Rus, Johann Reinhard[[@Headword:Rus, Johann Reinhard]]

             a Lutheran theologian of Germany, was born February 24, 1679, and studied at Giessen and Jena. In 1708 he was made adjunct to the philosophical faculty of Jena, in 1712 professor of theology, in 1730 doctor of theology, and died April 18, 1738. He wrote, De Usu Linguae Syriacae in Novo Testamento: — De Usu Accentuationis Hebraicae Pentade Dictorum Veteris Testamenti Demonstrato: — De Harmonia Vitae Davidis: — De Zacharia non Summo Pontifice ad Luke 1 : — De Serpente non Naturali sed solo Diabolo ad Genesis 3 : — De Evocationae Abrahami: — De Sceptro a Juda Ablato ad Genesis 49 : — De LXX Hebdomadibus Danielis: — De Lapidatione Stephani: — De Varrio Mosis in Montem Sinai Ascensu: — Bileam Votes Evangelicus ex Num 24:15-19 : — Introdictio in Novum Testamentum Generalis: — Harmonia Evangelistarum: — De Magis non Judaeis (d Matthew 2, etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v.; Winer, Handbuch der theol. Lit. 1:244, 590; Jocher, Allgemeines Gelehrten-Lexikon, s.v. (B.P.)

## Rush[[@Headword:Rush]]

             is the rendering in the A.V. of two Heb. words, both of which are occasionally translated “bulrush” (q.v.).

1. Agmon (אָגַמוֹן; Sept. κρίκος, ἄνθραξ, μικρός, τέλος; Vulg. circulus, fervens, referenans) occurs in Job 40:26 (A.V. 41:2), “Canst thou put agmon” (A.V. “hook”) into the nose of the crocodile? again, in 40:12 (A.V. 41:20), “Out of his nostrils goeth smoke as out of a seething pot or agmosen” (A.V. “caldron”). In Isa 9:14, it is said Jehovah “will cut off from Israel head and tail, branch and agmon” (A.V. “rush”). The agmon is mentioned also as an Egyptian plant, in a sentence similar to the last, in Isa 19:15 (A.V. “rush”); while from Isa 58:5 (A.V. “bulrush”) we learn that the agmon had a pendulous panicle. The term is allied closely to the Heb. agam (אָגָ ם), which, like the corresponding Arabic ajam, denotes a marshy pool or reed bed (see Jer 51:32, for this latter signification). Again is also considered to be derived from the same root as גּמֵא, gome, the papyrus (see No. 2 below). Some have even concluded that both names indicate the same thing, and have translated them by juncus, or rush. The expression “Canst thou put agmon” into the crocodile's nose? has been variously explained. The most probable interpretation is that which supposes allusion is made to the mode of passing a reed or a rush through the gills of fish in order to carry them home; but see the commentaries and notes of Rosenmüller, Schultens, Lee, Cary, Mason Good, etc. The agmon of Job 41:20 seems to be derived from an Arabic root signifying to “be burning;” hence the fervens of the Vulg. Rushes were used anciently for cords (Job 41:2) and for other purposes; nevertheless, they are proverbially without value. Figuratively the term is used of the least important class of people (Isa 9:14; Isa 19:15; Isa 58:5; Jer 51:32).

There is some doubt as to the specific identity of the agmon, some believing that the word denotes “a rush” as well as a “reed” (see Rosenmüller [Bibl. Bot. p. 184] and Winer [Realwörterb. 2, 484]). Celsius (Hierob. 1, 465 sq.) has argued in favor of the Arundo phragmites (now Phragmites communis). That the agmon denotes some specific plant is probable from the passages where it occurs, as well as from the fact that kaneh (קָנֶה) is the generic term for reeds in generalh Lobo, in his Voyage d'Abyssinie, says the Red Sea was seen to be literally red only in places where the gonemon was abundant. What this herb is does not elsewhere appear. Forskal applies the name of ghobeibe to a species of arundo, which he considered closely allied to A. phragmites. M. Bove, in his Voyage Botanique en Egypte, observed, especially on the borders of the Nile, quantities of Saccharum AEgyptiacum and of Arundo Egyptiaca, which is, perhaps, only a variety of A. donax, the cultivated Spanish or Cyprus reed, or, as it is usually called in the south of Europe, Canna ana Cana. In the neighborhood of Cairo he found Poa cynosuroides (the kusha, or cusa, or sacred grass of the Hindus), which, he says, serves “aux habitans pour faire des cordes, chauffer leurs fours, et cuire des briques et poteries. Le Saccharum cylindricum est employs aux memes usages.” The Egyptian species of arundo is probably the A. isiaca of Delile, which is closely allied to A. phragmites, and its uses may be supposed to be very similar to those of the latter. This species is often raised to the rank of a genus under the name of phragmites, so named from being employed for making partitions, etc. It is about six feet high, with annual stems, and is abundant about the banks of pools and rivers and in marshes. The panicle of flowers is very large, much subdivided, a little drooping and waving in the wind. The plant is used for thatching, making screens, garden fences, etc.; when split it is made into string, mats, and matches. It is the gemeines Rohr of the Germans, and the Canna or Cana palustre of the Italians and Spaniards. Any of the species of reed here enumerated will suit the different passages in which the word agmon occurs; but several species of saccharum, growing to a great size in moist situations and reed like in appearance, will also fulfil all the conditions required — as affording shelter for the behemoth or hippopotamus, being convertible into ropes, forming a contrast with their hollow stems to the solidity and strength of the branches of trees, and when dry easily set on fire; and when in flower their light and feathery inflorescence may be bent down by the slightest wind that blows. SEE REED.

2. Gome (גֹּמֶא; Sept. πάπειρος, βίβλινος, ἔλος; Vulg. scirpeus, scurpus, papyrus, juncus) is found four times in the Bible. Moses was hidden in a vessel made of the papyrus (Exo 2:3; A.V. “bulrushes”). Transit boats were made out of the same material by the Ethiopians (Isa 18:2; A.V. “bulrushes”). The gome (A.V. “rush”) is mentioned together with kaneh, the usual generic term for “a reed.” in Isa 35:7, and in Job 8:11, where it is asked, “Can the gome (A.V. “rush”) grow without mire?” The name gome, according to Celsius (Hierob. 2, 138), is derived from גמא, “absorbere, bibere, quia in aqua nascitur, et aquam semper imbibit” (comp. Lucan, Phars. 4, 136). Though other plants are adduced by translators and commentators as the gome of Scripture, yet it is evident that only the papyrus can be meant, and that it is well suited to all the passages. Being in some respects so obvious, it could not escape the notice of all translators. Hence, in the Arabic version and in the Annals of Eutychius, the word burdi, the modern Arab name of the papyrus, is given as the synonym of gome in Exo 2:3. In Arabic authors on materia medica we find the papyrus mentioned under the three heads of Fafir, Burdi, and Chartas. Fafir is said to be the Egyptian name of a kind of burdi (bur reed) of which paper (charta) is made; and of burdi, the word fafururs (evidently a corruption of papyrus) is given as the Greek synonym. SEE PAPER REED.

(1.) The papyrus is now well known; it belongs to the tribe of sedges, or Cyperaceoe, and is not a rush or bulrush, as in the A.V. It may be seen growing to the height of six or eight feet, even in tubs in the hot houses of England, and is described by the ancients as growing in the shallow parts of the Nile. The root is fleshy, thick, and spreading; the stems triangular, eight or ten feet in height, of which two or so are usually under water, thick below, but tapering towards the apex, and destitute of leaves. The base leaves are broad, straight, and sword shaped, but much shorter than the stem. This last is terminated by an involucel of about eight leaves, sword shaped and acute much shorter than the many-rayed umbel which they support. The secondary umbels are composed of only three or four short rays, with an involucel of three awl-shaped leaflets. The flowers are in a short spike at the extremity of each ray. Cassiodorus, as quoted by Carpenter, graphically described it as it appears on the banks of the Nile: “There rises to the view this forest without branches, this thicket without  leaves, this harvest of the waters, this ornament of the marshes.” It is found in stagnant pools as well as in running streams, in which latter case, according to Bruce, one of its angles is always opposed to the current of the stream.

The papyrus was well known to the ancients as a plant of the waters of Egypt: “Papyrsum nascitur in palustribus AEgypti, aut quiescentibus Nili aquis, ubi evagatae stagnant” (Pliny, 13, 11). Theophrastus, at a much earlier period, described it as growing not in the deep parts, but where the water was of the depth of two cubits or even less. It was found in almost every part of Egypt inundated by the Nile, in the Delta — especially in the Sebennytic nome — and in the neighborhood of Memphis, etc. By some it was thought peculiar to Egypt; hence the Nile is called by Ovid “amnis papyrifer.” So a modern author, Prosper Alpinus (De Plant. AEgypti, c. 36): “Papyrus, quam berd AEgyptii nominant, est planta fluminis Nili.” By others it was thought to be a native, also, of India, of the Euphrates near Babylon, of Syria, and of Sicily. The genus cyperus, indeed, to which it is usually referred, abounds in a great variety of large aquatic species, which it is difficult for the generality of observers to distinguish from one another; but there is no reason why it should not grow in the waters of hot countries, as, for instance, near Babylon or in India. In fact, modern botanists having divided the genus cyperus into several genera, one of them is called papyrus and the original species P. Nilotica. Of this genus papyrus there are several species in the waters of India (Wight, Contributions to the Botany of India, “Cyperees, “p. 88).

The papyrus reed is not now found in Egypt; it grows, however, in Syria. Dr. Hooker saw it on the banks of Lake Tiberias, a few miles north of the town. It appears to have existed there from the earliest times. Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 4, 8, § 4) says, “The papyrus grows also in Syria around the lake in which the sweet scented reed is found from which Antigonus used to make cordage for his ships.” This plant has been found also in a small stream two miles north of Jaffa. Dr. Hooker believes it is common in some parts of Syria. It does not occur anywhere else in Asia. It was seen by lady Callcott on the banks of the Anapus, near Syracuse, and Sir Joseph Banks possessed paper made of papyrus from the lake of Thrasymene (Script. Herb. p. 379).

(2.) A brief description of the uses of this plant, as given in the works of the ancients, is thus summed up by Parkinson in his Herbal, p. 1207: “The  plant, say the ancients, is sweete, and used by the Egyptians, before that bread of come was known unto them, for their food, and in their time was chawed and the sweetnesse sucked forth, the rest being spit out; the roote serveth them not only for fewell to burne, but to make many sorts of vessels to use, for it yielded much matter for the purpose. Papyrus ipse (say they), that is the stalke, is profitable to many uses, as to make ships, and of the barke to weave, and make sailes, mats, carpets, some kinds of garments, and ropes also.”

a. The lower part of the papyrus reed was used as food by the ancient Egyptians; “those who wish to eat the byblus dressed in the most delicate way stew it in a hot pan and then eat it” (Herod. 2, 92; see also Theophr. Hist. Plant. 4, 9). The statement of Theophrastus with regard to the sweetness and flavor of the sap has been I confirmed by some writers. The chevalier Landolina made papyrus from the pith of the plant which, says Heeren (Histor. Res. Afric. Nat. 2, 350, note), “is rather clearer than the Egyptian;” but other writers say the stem is neither juicy nor agreeable.

b. The construction of papyrus boats is mentioned by Theophrastus. So Pliny (Hist. Nat. 6, 24): “Papyraceis navibus armamentisque Nili;” and again (7:56): “Naves primum repertas in AEgypto in Nilo ex papyro.” Plutarch, as quoted by Rosenmüller, says, “Isis circumnavigated the marshes in a papyrus wherry for the purpose of collecting the pieces of Osiris's body. From Heliodorus's account it appears that the Ethiopians made use of similar boats, for he relates that the Ethiolpians passed in reed wherries over the Astaboras; and he adds that these reed wherries were swift sailing, being made of a light material, and not capable of carrying more than two or three men.” Bruce relates that a similar kind of boat was made in Abyssinia even in his time, having a keel of acacia wood, to which the papyrus plants, first sewed together, are fastened, being gathered up before and behind, and the ends of the plants thus tied together. Representations of some Egyptian boats are given in Kitto's Pictorial Bible (2, 135), where the editor remarks that when a boat is described as being of reeds or rushes or papyrus, as in Egypt, a covering Qf skin or bitumen is to be understood. Ludolf (Hist. Ethiop. 1, 8) speaks of the Tzamic lake being navigated “monoxylis lintribus ex typha praecrassa confertis, “a kind of sailing, he says, which is attended with considerable danger to the navigators. Wilkinson (Anc. Egypt. 2, 96, ed. 1854) says that the right of growing and selling the papyrus plants belonged to the government, who made a profit by its monopoly, and thinks other species  of the Cyperaceoe must be understood as affording all the various articles — such as baskets, canoes, sails, sandals, etc., which have been said to have been made from the real papyrus. Considering that Egypt abounds in Cyperaceoe, many kinds of which might have served for forming canoes, etc., it is improbable that the papyrus alone should have been used for such a purpose; but that the true papyrus was used for boats there can be no doubt, if the testimony of Theophrastus (Hist. Plant. 4, 8. 4), Pliny (Hist. Nat. 13, 11), Plutarch, and other ancient writers is to be believed.

c. From the soft cellular portion of the stem the ancient material called papyrus was made. “Papyri,” says Sir G. Wilkinson, “are of the most remote Pharaonic periods. The mode of making them was as follows: the interior of the stalks of the plant, after the rind had been removed, was cut into thin slices in the direction of their length; and these being laid on a flat board in succession, similar slices were placed over them at right angles; and their surfaces being cemented together by a sort of glue and subjected to a proper degree of pressure and well dried, the papyrus was completed. The length of the slices depended, of course, on the breadth of the intended sheet, as that of the sheet on the number of slices placed in succession beside each other, so that though the breadth was limited, the papyrus might be extended to an indefinite length.” SEE WRITING.

## Rush, Benjamin, M.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Rush, Benjamin, M.D., LL.D]]

             a distinguished American physician, was born near Bristol, in the vicinity of Philadelphia, Jan. 5, 1745. At nine years of age he was placed under the tuition of Dr. Samuel Finley, who was subsequently president of Princeton College. By him he was prepared for college, and entered the above-named institution under the presidency of Dr. Davies, and graduated in 1760. The following six years he devoted to the study of medicine under the preceptorship of Dr. John Rodman, of Philadelphia. To perfect himself in the science of medicine, he went to Europe, and attended medical lectures at the University of Edinburgh for two years, and afterwards spent some time in the London hospitals. In 1769 he returned to Philadelphia, with qualifications seldom surpassed, to enter upon the practice of his profession, and was not long in obtaining an extensive and lucrative practice. He was appointed professor of chemistry in the University of Pennsylvania in 1789, and in 1791 professor of the theory and practice of medicine, and subsequently of the institutes of medicine and clinics, which he held during life. He was elected member of Congress in 1776, and  signed the Declaration of Independence. He was appointed surgeon- general of the Middle Department of the army, and also physician-general. He resigned this post in 1778; and, after serving as delegate to the state convention which ratified the Constitution of the United States, he retired from political life and resumed the practice of his profession. His writings are mostly on medical subjects, and were published in five volumes. That on mental diseases, published in 1812, is especially valuable as to its bearing on medical jurisprudence. He was an enlightened and practical Christian, abounding in every good word and work. Dr. Rush died April 18, 1813. He published numerous pamphlets on moral, scientific, and social topics, for which and other literature, see Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v. (W. P.S.)

## Rush, William Marion[[@Headword:Rush, William Marion]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South, was born in Marion County, Missouri, about the year 1821. He joined the Missouri Conference in 1841, preaching until 1884. He died June 12, 1886. He was a member of every General Conference of his Church from 1866 to 1886. See Minutes of Annual Conferences of the M.E. Church, South, 1886, page 13.

## Rushton[[@Headword:Rushton]]

             SEE RISHTON.

## Rusk, James[[@Headword:Rusk, James]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Ireland of Scottish parents, and emigrated to America when twenty-one. He was licensed to exhort at Pleasantville, N.Y., became a teacher in Irving Institute at Tarrytown, and was by the Quarterly Conference of that place licensed to preach. He was admitted on trial in the New York Conference in 1851, and received a supernumerary relation at the Conference of 1857. He took up his residence at Cold Spring, where he died, April 4, 1859. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1859.

## Rusk, John Y.[[@Headword:Rusk, John Y.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Perry County, O., Jan. 10, 1842. He was educated at the Ohio Wesleyan University, graduating June 28, 1866; was licensed to preach by the Uniontown Quarterly Conference, Sept. 15; and was admitted on trial into the Ohio Annual Conference, Sept. 27. He was ordained deacon by bishop Morris in 1868, and was appointed to New Holland, where he died, Sept. 25, 1869. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1869, p. 229.

## Rusling, Joseph[[@Headword:Rusling, Joseph]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Epworth, Lincolnshire, England, May 12, 1788. He came to this country when about  seven years of age, and settled in New Jersey. He joined the Church in 1808, commenced preaching in 1812, and in 1814 was admitted on trial in the Philadelphia Conference, of which he remained an active member until his death, July 6, 1839. Mr. Rusling established the first Methodist book store in Philadelphia. He published a few Sermons, and Hymns or Sunday schools. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 551; Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Rusling, Sedgwick[[@Headword:Rusling, Sedgwick]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born near Hackettstown, N.J., April 24, 1799. He became an exhorter in 1826, and was licensed to preach in November of that year. In 1827 he was admitted on trial into the Philadelphia Conference. He labored actively until 1850, when he became supernumerary because of ill health. In 1852 he resumed regular work, but in 1855 became supernumerary again, filling, however, a vacancy in Elizabeth City. He died in Lawrenceville, Tioga Co., Pa.. March 7, 1876. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1876, p.47.

## Rusor[[@Headword:Rusor]]

             in Roman mythology, was an appellative of Pluto, “the god to whom everything returns.”

## Russalki[[@Headword:Russalki]]

             in Slavonic mythology, were nymphs of supernatural beauty, who resided in brooks, rivers, and seas. They oftened bathed in some sparkling fountain, sported on the grass of some sunny meadow, swung to and fro on the waving trees, or combed their long green hair, and might then be overheard; but woe to him who should so observe them, for they rarely gave their love to any favored swain, and he who had once seen them could afterwards discover no attractive features in a woman of earthly mold.

## Russel, James[[@Headword:Russel, James]]

             a distinguished minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mecklenburg County, N.C., about 1786. He was admitted on trial in the South Carolina Conference in 1805, but located, on account of ill health, in 1815, and died Jan. 16, 1825. Mr. Russel had great power in the pulpit. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 408.

## Russel, John, D.D.[[@Headword:Russel, John, D.D.]]

             an English clergyman, was educated at the Charter House, and thence was elected student of Christ Church, Oxford, graduating in 1806. He was ordained in 1810, was headmaster of the Charter House from 1811 to 1832; and canon of Canterbury in 1827. He became rector of St. Botolph's, Bishopsgate, in 1832, and secretary of the Clergy Orphan Corporation in 1849. His death occurred in 1863. He published, Rudiments of Latin: — English Grammar (Lond. 1832, 18mo). which has run through eleven editions: — The Spital Pulpit (1833, 4to): — Concio ad Clerum (1833): — besides Sermons, etc.

## Russel, Michael[[@Headword:Russel, Michael]]

             a Scottish prelate, was born at Edinburgh in 1781, and graduated from the University of Glasgow in 1806. He became minister at Alloa in 1808, and of St. James's Chapel, Leith, in 1809, in which charge he continued during life. He was made dean of Edinburgh in 1831, bishop of Glasgow and Galloway in 1837, and died in 1848. Russel wrote, View of Education in Scotland (1813, 8vo): — Connection of Sacred and Profane History, etc. (Lond. 3 vols. 8vo — vols. 1 and 2, 1827; vol. 3, 1837): — Discourses on the Millennium (1830, 12mo): — History of the Church in Scotland (Lond. 1834, 2 vols. sm. 8vo): — besides several other histories. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Russel, William[[@Headword:Russel, William]]

             a Scotch prelate, was a native of the Isle of Man and abbot of Rushen. He was consecrated bishop of the Isles in 1248, and held a synod at St. Michael's in 1350, in which five additional canons were made. He died April 4, 1374. See Keith, Scottish Bishops, page 303.

## Russell, Alexander[[@Headword:Russell, Alexander]]

             physician to the English factory at Aleppo, was born and educated at Edinburgh. After a residence of many years in the East, during which he made himself familiar with the Turkish language, and gained great celebrity by his practice, he returned to Europe, and published his Natural History of Aleppo, a valuable performance, which has been translated into various languages. In 1759 he was elected physician of St. Thomas's Hospital, which position he retained until his death, in 1770.

## Russell, Andrew, D.D[[@Headword:Russell, Andrew, D.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born at Winchburgh, Linlithgowshire, November 1, 1807. He was educated in letters at the University of Edinburgh, and in theology at the Glasgow Theological Academy. He was ordained pastor at Haddington in 1833, where he labored some eight years; next at Princes Street Chapel, Dundee, four years. The state of his health at this time requiring a change of climate, he removed to Stirling, where he enjoyed a long and successful pastorate. From Stirling he went to Bradford, Yorkshire, in 1859, and for some years took pastoral charge of the Chapel at Lister Hill's. During the last twelve and a half years of his life he was pastor of the Church at Holme Lane, Bradford. He died June 19, 1881, having filled with great honor several denominational offices. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1882, page 329.

## Russell, Charles William, D.D[[@Headword:Russell, Charles William, D.D]]

             a Roman Catholic divine, was born at Killough, County Down, Ireland, May 14, 1812. He was educated at Drogheda, at Downpatrick, and at Maynooth College; was elected to the Dunboyne Establishment in 1832, for ten years discharged his duties as professor at Maynooth, and in 1845, when the chair of ecclesiastical history was established, he was appointed thereto. He held this position until the death of Dr. Renehan in 1857, when he became president of the college, which office he filled until his death, on February 26, 1880. Dr. Russell was a regular contributor to the Dublin Review and Edinburgh Review. He published translations of the Tales of Canon von Schmid and Leibnitz's System of Theology. His Life of Cardinal Mezzofanti (1858) had its origin in an article on that wonderful linguist in the Edinburgh Review of 1855, and included notices of the most celebrated linguists of all countries. It was translated into Italian and published at Bologna in 1859. A second edition appeared in 1863. In 1869 Dr. Russell was appointed a member of the royal commission on historical manuscripts, and from 1872 he edited, in conjunction with Mr. Prendergast, several volumes of the Calendars of State Papers relating to Ireland, beginning with the reign of James I. Dr. Russell contributed also to the eighth edition of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, North British Review, the English Cyclopaedia, the Academy, and several other publications. See (N.Y.) Catholic Almanac, 1881, page 106.

## Russell, David, D.D[[@Headword:Russell, David, D.D]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born in Glasgow, October 10, 1779. He studied literature and the classics privately, and theology at the Edinburgh Theological Academy. In August 1805, he was sent to Aberdeen, where he supplied the pulpit five months. He then removed to Montrose for nine months, but. returned to Aberdeen, where he was ordained pastor in 1807. He went to Dundee in 1809, and became pastor of the Church then assembling in Sailor's Hall. In this charge he continued thirty-nine years, with great honor to all concerned. He died Sept. 23, 1848. Dr. Russell published, among other works. Letters, chiefly Practical and Consolatory: —On the Old and New Covenants: — The Way of Salvation: — Hints to Inquirers: — Infant Salvation, etc. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1848, page 237.

## Russell, David, D.D (2)[[@Headword:Russell, David, D.D (2)]]

             a Scotch Congregational minister, was born at Dundee, October 7, 1811. Graduating from the Glasgow Theological Academy in 1839, he was immediately ordained pastor of the Brown Street Chapel, Glasgow, which lie served until 1889, then retiring from the pastorate. From 1861 to 1877 he was secretary of the Congregational Union of Scotland, and in 1874 chairman; he was also first president of the Total Abstinence Society; in 1874 chairman of the Conference, serving as secretary from 1869 to 1876. He was one of the founders of the Supplementary Stipend Fund, and its secretary from 1872 to 1876. He also served as president of the Scottish Bible Society. He died May 15, 1892. For some years he was editor of the Congregational Magazine. See (Lond.) Cong. Yearbook, 1894.

## Russell, John, LL.D[[@Headword:Russell, John, LL.D]]

             a Baptist minister, was born at Cavendish, Vermont, July 1, 1793. He graduated from Middlebury College in 1812; was converted just before entering upon his senior year, and soon after his graduation went to Georgia, where he taught school for a time. From 1819 to 1826 he was tutor in a private family in Missouri, and subsequently taught in St. Louis, Yandalia, Alton Seminary, and later in life was principal of Spring Hill Academy, in East Feliciana, Louisiana. On February 9, 1833, he was licensed to preach by the Bluffdale Church, Illinois. He died January 21, 1863. Dr. Russell wrote, as an advocate of temperance, Venomous Worm; or, Worm of the Still. To counteract Universalism he preached a number of discourses, which were afterwards published under the title of The Serpent Uncoiled. He was an accomplished linguist and an able scholar. See Minutes of Illinois Anniversaries, 1863, page 13. (J.C.S.)

## Russell, Moses[[@Headword:Russell, Moses]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Greene County, near Xenia, O., Feb. 29, 1812. He was early operated upon by the influences of the Holy Spirit; he felt his call to the ministry, and God opened up a way for him to follow the desire of his heart. In 1833 he completed his preparatory studies, and in  1837 graduated from Miami University. He pursued a part of his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. John S. Galloway, of Springfield, O., and finished the course at Hanover and Allegheny seminaries. In 1840 he was licensed to preach, and in November of the same year was ordained and installed pastor of the Clifton Presbyterian Church, where he continued to labor until the day of his death, March 22.1864. During this pastorate of almost a quarter of a century the Church increased greatly in numbers and strength, and erected a large and commodious church edifice. Mr. Russell was an active, faithful minister of the Gospel. His preaching was doctrinal and practical. His sermons were rigidly systematic, formed after a Scripture model. During his life he preached over 3000 times, and has left over 1000 written sermons. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1865, p. 116. (J.L.S.)

## Russell, Patrick, D.D[[@Headword:Russell, Patrick, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was promoted to the see of Dublin August 2. 1683. In July 1685, he held a provincial council at Dublin, in which it was ordained that any priest, celebrating a marriage without license from the ordinary, or the parish priest of the place, should be excommunicated, etc. The council further confirmed the decrees of those held in 1614 by Dr. Eugene Matthews and in 1640 by Dr. Fleming. In 1686 Dr. Russell assisted at a session of the Roman Catholic clergy, held in Dublin. He also presided at a diocesan synod, held there, June 10, 1686, in which it was decreed, in reference to the parochial clergymen having cure of souls, that each should have a schoolmaster in his parish to instruct the little children in "Christian doctrine and good courses." In 1688 he presided at a synod held in Dublin. On the downfall of the Stuart dynasty he fled to Paris. He returned to his native country and died at the close of the year 1692. See D'Alton, Memoirs of the Archbishops of Dublin, page 446.

## Russell, Robert D.[[@Headword:Russell, Robert D.]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Guilford County, N.C., March 23, 1793. He was educated at the academy at Greensborough, and the University of North Carolina, at Chapel Hill; studied divinity in the Union Theological Seminary at Prince Edward, Va., and was licensed by Orange Presbytery in 1829. In 1832 he labored for Goshen and Olney churches, in Lincoln County, N.C.; in 1834 in Tuscumbia and Russellville, Ala.; and in 1837 he removed to Nanapolia, and was ordained in that year by the South Alabama Presbytery. He was agent for the American Bible Society, and preached at Geneva, Tompkinsville, London, and Shell Creek, and at Nanapolia, near which place he died, April 16, 1867. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1868, p. 368. (J.L.S.)

## Russell, Robert Young[[@Headword:Russell, Robert Young]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born in Antrim County, Ireland, April 18, 1800. In 1801 his parents emigrated to the United States, and settled in York District, S.C. After acquiring a good English education, he commenced the study of the languages under Dr. Samuel Wright, of Turkey Creek; subsequently taught school in order to obtain pecuniary means; and in 1820 entered Salem Academy, in Union District, and thence went to Yorkville, where he completed his academic course under the care of Rev. Robert M. Davis. During this period he had, from honest and earnest convictions of truth and duty, connected himself with the Independent Presbyterian Church; and in view of the apparent necessities  of this Church, then in its infancy, he was induced to forego his cherished design of completing his studies, and in 1824 he commenced the study of divinity under Rev.r. M. Davis. He was licensed by Yorkville Presbytery of the Independent Presbyterian Church, Jan. 24, 1825, and ordained by the same presbytery, April 22, 1826. He removed to Mount Tabor, in Union District, where he taught school; for a time, and where he organized a Church to which he preached for many years. Thence he removed to the bounds of Bullock Creek Church, and became pastor of that Church in May, 1829, which relation continued for thirty-seven years. He died Nov. 5, 1866. Mr. Russell was a man of untiring zeal and impressive power as a minister of the Gospel. He had the most remarkable success all through his ministry. For thirty years prior to the union of the Independent Presbyterian Church with the Presbyterian Church, he was the acknowledged and honored leader in that branch of the Church in which he had cast his lot. He loved this Church and her peculiar doctrines, and yet in every endeavor which was made to heal the breach he gave his hearty approval and earnest aid. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1867, p. 450. (J.L.S.)

## Russia[[@Headword:Russia]]

             one of the largest empires of the world, containing in 1881 an area of 8,500,000 square miles, and a population of 103,716,232 souls, has under its rule about one sixth of the entire surface of the earth, and still continues to expand in Asia. It is in point of territory about equalled by the British empire, but is more than twice as large as any other country. Among the Christian nations it is the foremost standard bearer of the interests of the Greek Church, being not only the only large state in which this Church prevails, but containing within its borders fully seventy-seven percent of the aggregate population connected with it. More than any Catholic or Protestant state, the government of Russia uses its political influence for advancing the power of its official Church at home as well as abroad; and has recently not only cooperated in the reestablishment of a number of independent coreligious states in the Balkan peninsula, but is rapidly planting the creed of the Greek Church among the subjected tribes of Asia, and also, to some extent, in the adjacent countries. The Russian empire, by its vast conquests in Europe and Asia, embraces a variety of religions, even the Mohammedan and heathen. The relation of the state to other forms of religion is deter, mined by Article 40 et seq. of the first volume of the Russian law, as follows: “The ruling faith in the Russian empire is the Christian Orthodox Eastern Catholic declaration of belief. Religious liberty  is not only assured to Christians of other denominations, but also to Jews, Mohammedans, and pagans, so that all people living in Russia may worship God according to the laws and faith of their ancestors.” This law, however, is interpreted in such a manner as to mean that religious liberty is assured only so long as a member of an umnorthodox Church adheres to the faith in which he was born; but all unorthodox churches are forbidden to receive as members proselytes from other churches. A severe penalty is imposed upon any one who leaves a Christian for a non-Christian religion.

I. The Russian Church. —

1. Its Origin and Progress.-- The Russian empire begins with the elevation in 862 of the Norman Ruric to the throne. At that time, the territory inhabited by the Russians was without Christian churches. A Russian tradition, according to which the apostle Andrew had planted the first cross at Kief, cannot be authenticated. Tertullian, Origen, and Chrysostom speak of the triumphs of Christianity among the Scythians and Sarmatians, and a doubtful inference has been drawn from their words that Christianity had also made converts among the Russians at this early period. If really any congregations were organized, they perished during the migration of nations. It is reported that in the 9th century patriarch Ignatius of Constantinople sent again missionaries to the Russians, and patriarch Photius praised them for their enthusiastic desire for the Gospel — a praise which was not verified by subsequent events. In 955, Olga, the widow of Igor (912943) and regent of Russia during the minority of her son Svatoslav, procured baptism for herself in Constantinople from the patriarch Theophylact, and had her name changed to Helena; but even to the close of her life she could enjoy the services of a Christian priest only in secret. Her pious desire to see her son converted was not fulfilled; but her grandson Vladimir I (980-1014), called Isapostolos (apostle-like), not only embraced Christianity himself (988), but at once decided the triumph of Christianity in the empire. After investigating the conflicting claims of Mohammedanism, Judaism, and Christianity, as represented by missionaries of these various creeds, he was won over by the enthusiastic accounts which his ambassadors to Constantinople made of the splendor of the Eastern service in the Church of Sophia. The people cried when the images of Peroun and other gods were cast into the Dnieper, but without active resistance yielded to the demand of Vladimir that the people be baptized. His son Yaroslav (1019-54) nearly completed the conversion of the Russians who remained in close connection with the see of  Constantinople. A metropolitan see was established at Kief, which was called a second Constantinople.

The fifth metropolitan, Hilarion (105172), was elected by order of grand-duke Yaroslav at the Council of Kief without the cooperation of the patriarch of Constantinople. A cave convent (Peczera) at Kief became in the 11th century a famous seminary of the Russian clergy and a flourishing seat of Russian literature. Here the monk Nestor (1056-1111) wrote his Annals, the chief source of information for the earliest history of the Russian Church. The rapid growth of the Church, and the great practical strength which it displayed so soon after its establishment, naturally attract the attention of the Church historians, who attribute it chiefly to the fact that the Church, at its foundation, found the translation of the Bible by Cyril and Methodius into the national Slavonic, language ready for use. The practical strength displayed by the Russian Church at so early a period is the more surprising, as Russia alone among the European nations (unless Spain and Hungary be counted exceptions) was Christianized without the agency of missionaries, and chiefly by the direct example, influence, or command of its prince. The Russian Church has dignified its founder, prince Vladimir, with the name of saint, and the same honor has been conferred upon another prince of the 13th century, Alexander Nevski, so called from a victory on the banks of the Neva, in which he repulsed the Swedes. Besides these two saints, two other princes are held in high veneration — the one, Yaroslav (1017), for introducing the Byzantine canon law and the first beginnings of Christian education; the other, Vladimir I1, surnamed Monomachos, for being a model of a just and religious ruler. Ivan I transferred (1325) his residence, and with it the primacy of the Russian Church, from Kief to Moscow. Gradually the metropolitans of the Russian Church became independent of Constantinople. In the middle of the 17th century, Jonah was appointed by the grand-prince metropolitan of Moscow, and recognized by a synod of all the Russian bishops held at Moscow as metropolitan of Russia. He was the first in whose appointment “the great Church” had no direct share. The metropolitan of Moscow remained, however, in close and friendly relations with the patriarchs of the Byzantine empire, and conjointly with them the metropolitan Isidor attended the Union Council of Florence.

The fall of Constantinople in 1453 smoothed the way for an entire independence of the Russian Church, which, however, was not fully established until 1587. In that year, the patriarch Jeremiah of Constantinople, while visiting Russia to obtain support, consented to turn the metropolitan of Moscow into a patriarch in the person of Job, the patriarchate of Russia thus taking, in the  opinion of the Eastern bishops, the place of the schismatic patriarch of Rome. It was further arranged that the Church of Russia be governed by four metropolitans, six archbishops, and fight bishops. Soon after, the patriarchs of Alexandria and Jerusalem, sixty-five metropolitans and eleven archbishops of the Byzantine Church, declared their concurrence in the independent organization of the Russian Church. The Muscovite patriarchs continued, however, to apply to Constantinople for confirmation until 1657. Soon after, in 1660, the Russian ambassador received from patriarch Dionysius II of Constantinople and the other Greek patriarchs the documentary declaration that the Russian patriarch night in future be elected by his own clergy without needing a confirmation by the Greek patriarchs. The Roman popes of the 16th century, especially Leo X, Clement VII, and Gregory XIII, made renewed efforts for gaining over the Russian Church to a union with Rome. When Ivan Vasilivitch (1533-84) had been defeated by the Poles, he intimated a readiness (1581) to unite with the Roman Catholic Church as long as he needed the help of the emperor and the mediation of the pope. Gregory XIII sent the Jesuit Possevino to the grandprince, who held a religious disputation with the Russians, in which the grand-prince himself took part. Possevino was, in the end, unsuccessful in Russia; but in those Russian provinces which fell with Lithuania into the hands of the Poles, his efforts had the desired effect.

The metropolitan Rahoza of Kief. keenly offended by the patriarchs Jeremiah and Job, convoked the bishops of his metropolitan district to a synod held at Brzesc (1593), where the union with Rome was effected in conformity with the agreement which had been formed in Florence, with a great respect at first for old ancestral usages. Clement VIII announced the union to the Catholic world in his bull Magnus Dominus ac laudabilis, and confirmed the metropolitan in the possession of his traditional rights of jurisdiction (1596), including the right of confirming the bishops of his metropolitan diocese; only the metropolitan himself was to apply to the papal nuncio in Poland for confirmation. For that part of the Russian Church which refused to enter into the union with Rome, Peter Mogila was in 1633 elected orthodox metropolitan of Kief, with the approbation of king Vladoslav IV. As a bar against the further advance of Roman Catholic and Protestant views, Mogila composed (1642) a catechism, which was confirmed by all the patriarchs as an official confession of the orthodox Eastern Church.  Important innovations in the liturgy of the Russian Church were made by patriarch Nikon, who has been called by a modern Church historian (Stanley, History of the Eastern Church) “the greatest character in the annals of the Russian hierarchy,” “a Russian Chrysostom,” and also “in coarse and homely proportions a Russian Luther and a Russian Wolsey.” The most important among the changes introduced by him was the revival of preaching, entirely without an example in the other Eastern churches at that time. Among the innovations which he made in the Russian ritual, in order to make it more conform to that of Constantinople, were benedictions with three fingers instead of two, a white altar cloth instead of an embroidered one, the kissing of pictures to take place only twice a year, a change in the way of signing the cross, and in the inflections in pronouncing the Creed. Many regarded these changes as an apostasy from orthodoxy, and refused to adopt them, but at that time their protests were put down with an iron hand. The man whose energy introduced a new period in Church history was finally himself deposed from his office. His severity had exasperated the clergy, his insolence had enraged the nobles. In 1667 a council of the Eastern patriarchs, convened at Moscow, and presided over by the czar, formally deprived him of his office.

A still greater change was introduced into the Russian Church by Peter the Great. The aim of his life was to civilize the Russian empire and to raise it to a level with the remainder of Europe. While traveling in Europe, he studied the Protestant and Roman Catholic systems of belief. He heard the doctrines and studied the religious belief of all the countries which he passed, but he concluded to remain a prince of the Orthodox faith. He believed, however, he would be guilty of ingratitude to the Most High if, “after having reformed by his gracious assistance the civil and military order, he were to neglect the spiritual,” and “if the Impartial Judge should require of him an account of the vast trust which had been reposed in him, he should not be able to give an account.” Among the practical reforms which he introduced were the increase of schools, restrictions on the growth of monasteries, and regulations respecting the monastic property. But by far the most radical change was the abolition of the patriarchate and the substitution for it of a permanent synod, consisting of prelates presided over by the emperor or his secretary.

After the death of the eleventh patriarch, Hadrian (1702), whose retrograde policy had greatly exasperated him, Peter allowed his see to remain vacant, and transferred the administration of the patriarchate to the metropolitan of Riazan, who as  exarch had not the full authority of the patriarch, and was not allowed to exercise all his functions. This semblance of a patriarchal government lasted for twenty years, and during this time various changes were gradually carried through. Taxes were levied on the possessions of cloisters and bishops, the titles and dignities of several episcopal sees which were offensive to the czar were abolished, and the episcopal jurisdiction, which in former times had been wholly unhindered, was now in many respects restricted. A number of reformatory regulations were issued for the government of the religious orders. For the reform of the secular clergy Peter wrote with his own hand twenty-six articles of Spiritual Regulations, and for the use of the bishops he issued a pastoral instruction. After having accustomed in this way the clergy and the people to an absolute submission to his all powerful authority, Peter declared in an assembly of bishops, held in 1720 at Moscow, that a patriarch was neither necessary for the government of the Church nor useful for the State, and that he was determined to introduce another form of Church government which would be intermediate between the government by one person (the patriarch) and a general council, since both forms of Church government were subject in Russia to great inconveniences and difficulties on account of the vast extent of the empire. When some of the bishops objected that the patriarchate of Kief and of all Russia had been erected with the consent of the Oriental patriarchs, Peter exclaimed, “I am your patriarch!” then, throwing down his hunting knife on the table, “There is your patriarch!” The plan of Peter was vigorously supported by Theophanes, archbishop of Pskov, and Demetrius of Rostoff, adopted by the episcopal synod, and sanctioned by the whole body of Eastern patriarchs. In the next year (1721), the Holy Governing Synod of Russia was instituted, and solemnly opened by an address of its vice-president, archbishop Theophanes. Even those who blame Peter for subjecting a Church formerly enjoying the fullest amount of self-government to the rule of the State readily admit that its first members were the best men of the Russian Church, and generally esteemed on account of their character and ability.

While the abolition of the patriarchate and the establishment of the Holy Synod fixed the position of the Russian Church among the large national divisions of Christianity, other measures led to the separation from it of a large number of ultra- conservatives, who could not bear the idea of seeing the smallest change in the holy faith of their forefathers. Peter resolutely continued the work of patriarch Nikon, and as the latter had introduced many innovations from Constantinople, Peter introduced new customs from the West. Thus. on  the opening of the 18th century the emperor decreed that henceforth the year should no longer begin on the 1st of September and be dated from the creation of the world, but that the Christian eras should be adopted and the new year begin on the 1st of January. Still more irritating for the uncompromising opponents of ecclesiastical reforms was Peter's endeavor to assimilate his countrymen to the West by for. bidding the use of the beard. The Eastern Church had shown a strong attachment to the beard. Michael Ceerularius had laid it down in the 11th century as one of the primary differences between the Greek and the Latin Church. and “to shave the beard had been pronounced by the Council of Moscow in the 17th century as a sin which even the blood of the martyrs could not expiate.” So determined was the opposition which was made to this innovation that even Peter, with all his energy, quailed before it. The nobles and the gentry, after a vain struggle, had to give way and be shaved; but the clergy were too strong for the czar, and the magnificent beards which the Russian priests are known to wear to the present day are the expressive proof of the ecclesiastical victory they gained in this particular over the reforming czar. The implacable enemies to the reforms of Nikon and Peter sullenly withdrew from the communion of the Established Church, and under the name “Raskolniks” (Separatists), or, as they call themselves, “Starovertzi” (Old Believers), have continued separate ecclesiastical organizations to the present day.

The reigns of most of the successors of Peter during the 18th century have left no marked influence upon the progress of the Russian Church. None of them continued the work of political reform with such energy as Catharine II. She was a friend of Voltaire, but did not deem it expedient to open to the deistic tendencies of Western Europe a road to the National Church of her dominions. During her reign, Ambrose, the learned archbishop of Moscow, came to a violent death (1771) by the populace of that city because he had ordered the removal of a miraculous picture to which the people flocked in immense numbers at a time of frightful pestilence. SEE AMBROSE. “I send you the incident, “wrote the empress Catharine in one of her letters to Voltaire, “that you may record it among your instances of the effects of fanaticism.” One of his successors to the see of Moscow, Plato, has attained outside of Russia a greater celebrity than any other Russian bishop. He was the favorite both of the civilized Catharine II and for a time of her savage son, Paul, and in the last years of his life was the trusted comforter of Alexander I in the terrible year of the French invasion.  Alexander I made noble efforts to raise the educational standard of the Russian people, and thus contributed much to tlhe improvement of the National Church. Schools were established on all the lands belonging to the crown, improvements made in the theological seminaries, and the respect of the people for the priestly character strengthened by exempting the priests from the knout. For a time, Alexander showed himself very favorable to the principles of evangelical Protestantism; and when the British and Foreign Bible Society was formed in London, Alexander requested the society to establish a branch in St. Petersburg. In the labors of the Russian Bible Society he took a warm interest. At his request, the Holy Synod prepared a translation of the New Test. into Russian, and into almost all the other languages spoken in the Russian empire. The emperor's inclination towards Biblical theology and experimental religion was greatly strengthened by the influence which in 1814 the pious and enthusiastic baroness von Krudener gained over him; but in the latter years of his life the emperor yielded to the growing ecclesiastical opposition to the Bible Society, and it was finally abolished under Nicholas I in 1826. In the same year, Philaret, formerly bishop of Reval and archbishop of Iver, was appointed archbishop of Moscow. He has been called the most gifted and influential archbishop of Russia since Nikon. He revived in the Church the spirit of austere asceticism, inflamed the religious enthusiasm of the people in the wars against the Mohammedan Turks and the Catholic Poles, vigorously aided the emperor in preparing the abolition of Russian serfdom, and made valuable contributions to the theological literature of the Russian Church. During the reign of Alexander I, the Russian Church began to make earnest efforts for the conversion of the Mohammedan and pagan subjects of the vast empire, and inducements were held out to those who might become converts to Christianity. The missionary zeal thus awakened was greatly strengthened during the reign of Nicholas I (1825- 55), when schemes were formed and extensively supported for the consolidation of all the tribes of the vast empire into one language and one religion. The Armenian Church, which, in consequence of the conquest of a part of the Persian territory by Russia, saw the seat of its ecclesiastical head, the catholicos of Etchmiadzin, placed under Russian rule, showed itself disinclined to being incorporated with the Russian Church; but the United Greeks of the formerly Polish provinces, who during Polish rule had been induced to recognize the supremacy of the pope, yielded to the influences brought to bear upon them by the Russian government. These exertions were begun as soon as Catharine II had acquired the possession  of the Polish provinces, and it has been calculated that during the reign of this empress about seven millions of United Greeks joined the Russian Church. Little was done for this purpose during the reigns of Paul and Alexander I, but Nicholas I resumed these efforts with extraordinary vigor; and in 1839 the bishops and clergy of the United Greek Church of Lithuania and White Russia were induced at the Synod of Polotsk to declare in favor of a union with the Russian Church. Only one United Greek diocese — Chelm, in Poland — remained in communion with Rome until about 1877, when the majority of its priests and people were reported to have likewise been received into the Russian Church. SEE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH.

The missions among the pagan tribes of the empire made considerable progress, and especially Innocent, archbishop of Kamtchatka, became a much praised example of the revived missionary spirit in the Russian empire, traversing to and fro the long chain of pagan islands between Northeastern Asia and Northwestern America. The reign of Alexander II (since 1855) has been prolific of important reforms in the civil administration of the empire. Some of them, as the total abolition of serfdom, and the organization of a system of public schools, have had a considerable and favorable reaction upon the progress of the national Church. The efforts for Russifying the polyglot and polyreligious tribes of the empire in one tongue and one creed gained in vigor and extent. The great Eastern war of 1877 was proclaimed by the Russian bishops as a holy religious war for the overthrow of the Mohammedan power over the Orthodox Eastern churches in the Turkish empire, and made the Russian Church appear to a greater extent than ever before as the standard bearer of all the interests of the Oriental Eastern Church. The increasing missionary zeal of the Church overstepped the boundaries of the empire and founded missions in China and Japan which were prosperous beyond expectation. In many large cities of Western Europe and of the United States, Russian priests were appointed by the Russian government to gather not only the Orthodox Russians, but all persons belonging to the Eastern Oriental Church, into permanent congregations, and in 1879 even a bishop, with his residence in San Francisco, was appointed to exercise the episcopal superintendence over the congregations on the Pacific coast of North America. A strong desire for establishing friendly intercourse and relations with other churches of episcopal constitution madle itself felt among many of the most educated and zealous priests and laymen of the  Church, and “societies for religious enlightenment” were formed at St. Petersburg and in other cities which proclaimed the promotion of this intercourse as one of their chief objects. The grand-duke Constantine. brother of Alexander II, is an enthusiastic patron of this movement and the president of the St. Petersburg society.

2. Doctrinal Basis of the Russian Church. — Although the connection between the Russian Church and the other sections of the Orthodox Eastern Church has for some time been severed, they have remained in entire union with regard to their common doctrine. Some (Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, 1, 70) regard as “the most hopeful feature of the Russian Church the comparatively free circulation of the Scriptures, which are more highly esteemed and more widely read there than in other parts of the Eastern Church.” Hepworth Dixon (Free Russia, p. 290) says that the Russians, next to the Scotch and the New Englanders, are the greatest Bible readers, but it must be remarked that not more than one out of ten Russians can read at all. Dr. Pinkerton, an English Independent, who for manyr years resided and travelled in Russia as agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society, takes, in his work on Russia (London, 1833), a hopeful view of the future of the Russian Church, “for the Church that permits every one of its members to read the Scriptures in a language which he understands, and acknowledges this Word as the highest tribunal in matters of faith on earth, is possessed of the best reformer of all superstition.” It is also noteworthy that the treatise on The Duty of Parish Priests, which was composed by archbishop Koninsky of Mohilev, aided by bishop Sopkofsky of Smolensk (St. Petersburg, 1776), and on the contents of which all candidates for holy orders in the Russian seminaries are examined, approaches more nearly the Protestant principle of the supremacy of the Bible in matters of Christian faith and Christian life than any deliverance of the Eastern Church. Thus it says, “All the articles of the faith are contained in the Word of God; that is, in the books of the Old and the New Testament. The Word of God is the source, foundation, and perfect rule, both of our faith and of the good works of the law. The writings of the holy fathers are of great use, but neither the writings of the holy fathers nor the traditions of the Church are to be confounded or equalled with the Word of God and his commandments” (see Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, 1, 73).

Notwithstanding this respect of the Russian Church for the supreme authority of the Scriptures, it has never been prevailed upon to hold  ecclesiastical communion with any other than the several branches of the Orthodox Eastern (commonly called Greek) Church. An interesting attempt to establish intercommunion and cooperation between the Russian Church and some Anglican bishops was made from 1717 to 1723 by two High-Church English bishops, called Nonjurors (for refusing to renounce their oath of allegiance to James II), in connection with two Scottish bishops. They wrote to this end, in October, 1717, to Peter the Great and the Eastern patriarchs. The patriarchs, in 1723, sent their ultimatum, requiring as a term of communion absolute submission of the British to all the dogmas of the Greek Church. The “Most Holy Governing Synod” of St. Petersburg was more polite, and in transmitting the ultimatum of the Eastern patriarchs proposed, in the name of the czar, “to the most reverend the bishops of the remnant of the Catholic Church in Great Britain, our brethren most beloved in the Lord, that they should send two delegates to Russia to hold a friendly conference, in the name and spirit of Christ, with two members to be chosen by the Russians, that it may be more easily ascertained what may be yielded or given up by one or the other; what, on the other hand, may or ought for conscience' sake to be absolutely denied.” The conference, however, was never held, for the death of Peter the Great put an end to the negotiations.

A more serious attempt to effect intercommunion between the Anglican and Russo-Greek churches was begun in 1862, with the authority of the Convocation of Canterbury and the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. In the session of the latter held in New York in 1862, a joint committee was appointed “to consider the expediency of opening communication with the Russo-Greek Church, to collect authentic information upon the subject, and to report to the next general convention.” Soon afterwards (July 1, 1863) the Convocation of Canterbury appointed a similar committee looking to “such ecclesiastical intercommunion with the Orthodox East as should enable the laity and clergy of either Church to join in the sacraments and offices of the other without forfeiting the communion of their own Church.” The Episcopal Church in Scotland likewise fell il with the movement. These committees corresponded with each other, and reported from time to time to their authorities. Two Eastern Church associations were formed, one in England and one in America, for the publication of interesting information on the doctrines and worship of the Russo-Greek Church. Visits were made to Russia, fraternal letters and courtesies were exchanged, and informal  conferences between Anglican and Russian dignitaries were held in London, St. Petersburg, and Moscow. The Russians, however, as well as the other branches of the Orthodox Eastern (Greek) Church, did not show the least disposition towards making any concession. A number of Russian divines took an active part in the Old Catholic reunion conferences at Bonn in 1874 and 1875; but although the Anglican and Old Catholic theologians here surrendered to the Orientals as a peace offering the filioque of the Western Creed, the Orientals made no concession on their part.

3. Ecclesiastical Polity. — In regard to Church constitution, the organization of the Holy Governing Synod has established a considerable difference between the Russian Church, on the one hand, and all the other sections of the Orthodox Eastern Church, on the other.

(1.) The Holy Synod. — The members of the synod are partly priests, partly laymen. All of them are appointed by the czar, who has also the right to dismiss them whenever he pleases. They meet at St. Petersburg in a special part of the large building which has been erected for the high imperial boards. At first the synod had twelve clerical members, one president, two vice-presidents, four councillors, and four assessors. The twelfth member was destined for the synodal office at Moscow. Three of the twelve clerical members had to be bishops, the others were to belong to different degrees of the hierarchy. It was, however, forbidden to appoint an archimandrite or protopresbyter from any diocese the bishop of which was a member of the synod, as it was feared that the former might be influenced by their bishop. According to the pleasure of the czar, the number of the clerical members was, however, sometimes larger, sometimes smaller than twelve. No episcopal see except that of Grusia (Tiflis) confers ex officio upon its occupant the right of membership in the Holy Synod, but the metropolitans of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kief invariably belong to it. Some of the members are obliged to reside at St. Petersburg, others are absent members who are invited only when matters of prime importance require the presence of all the members. The synod is always presided over by the oldest metropolitan. The most prominent among the lay members is the procurator-general of the synod. He represents the czar, makes the necessary preparations, has the right of veto, and carries out the measures that have been adopted. Every member of the synod, before taking his seat, must bind himself by a solemn oath to discharge faithfully the duties of his office, to be loyal to the czar and his successor, and to recognize the czar as the highest judge in the synod. The salaries of the members of the synod  were at first paid from the property of the former patriarchate, which after its abolition was called synodal property. At present they receive a very moderate fixed addition to the salaries which they derive from their regular ecclesiastical office (as archbishops, bishops, or priests).

The synod is subject to the emperor, and receives his orders; on the other hand, all prelates and clergymen are subject to the synod. Among the chief duties of the synod are to preserve purity of doctrine, to regulate divine service, and to act as the highest court of appeal in all Church matters. The Synod has to prevent the spreading of heresies, to examine and censure theological books; it is entitled to prescribe ceremonies, and to see to it that they are observed. It has to superintend all churches and convents, to present to the czar suitable candidates for the vacant positions of archimandrites and prelates, and to examine the candidates for episcopal sees. It may transfer bishops to other sees, remove them, or send them to a convent. It acts as a court of appeal from the decisions of the bishops, and receives the complaints of any clergyman against his superiors. It has the right in doubtful cases to give instruction to the prelates; but it can make new laws only with the consent of the czar. It can grant dispensation from ecclesiastical laws, as from the rigid observation of the fasts. All trials which were formerly brought before the court of the patriarch belong now to the jurisdiction of the synod; among them are trials for heresy (against the Raskolniks), blasphemy, astrology; for doubtful, unlawful, and forced marriages; for adultery, divorce. Fornication and abduction are tried before secular courts. In affairs which are partly of an ecclesiastical and partly of a secular character, the synod acts conjointly with the senate, to which it is, in general, co-ordinate. The administrative functions of the synod are divided into two sections, the Economical Department (or College of Economy) and the comptroller's office. All affairs which involve an outlay of money — as the erection of churches, schools, convents, payments, supports of clergymen, and so forth — are first submitted to the Economical Department. The Department of Comptrol has to examine whether the moneys assigned have been properly used, and to examine the accounts. Since 1809 all sums realized by the sale of consecrated candles and other objects which the faithful purchase from the Church, as well as the proceeds of the voluntary offerings of the people, have to be sent by the bishops to the synod, which distributes them among the eparchies according to their several wants. The treasury of the synod, which receives all these moneys, stands under the special control of the two youngest  members of the synod, and of a civil officer appointed by the chief procurator.

In 1839 the commission of ecclesiastical schools, which had been established in 1808, was dissolved by the czar, and the Holy Synod was charged with the direction of these schools.

Subordinate to the Holy Synod are 1, the synodal office of Moscow, which is presided over by the metropolitan of the city, who is assisted by a vicar- general, one archimandrite, and one protopresbyter; 2, the synodal office of Grusia, in which the metropolitan of Tiflis and Grusia presides, being assisted by two archimandrites and one protopresbyter; 3, the college of the former Greek United Church in White Russia and Lithuania, presided over by the archbishop of Lithuania, who is assisted by three members of the secular clergy. The synod has two printing offices, in St. Petersburg and Moscow, in which all rescripts of the czar and the synod referring to ecclesiastical affairs, all books used at divine service, and, in general, all books, registers, circulars, prayers, pictures, etc., intended for Church use are printed. The synod sends the printed matter to the bishop, who distributes it among the clergy. Every parish priest has to render at the end of the year an account to the bishops of all articles sold, and to remit to him the proceeds. The bishop sends an account of all articles sold within the diocese and remits the amount. The synod has annually from these sales a considerable surplus, which is used for supplying poor eparchies and parishes gratuitously with the books and other objects needed at divine service. Books on theological subjects are not only printed in the offices of the synod, but their contents must be expressly approved by it. For this purpose the Holy Synod is assisted by three committees of censorship, which have their seats at St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kief.

(2.) Orders of the Clergy. — The higher clergy of the Russian Church consists of metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops. At first Russia had only one metropolitan, at Kief; when the patriarchate was erected, the archbishops of Novgorod, Kasan, Astrakhan, Rostoff, and Krutizk were raised to the rank of metropolitans. In 1667 the czar Alexis Michaelovitch raised the archbishops of Kasan and Siberia to metropolitans, and appointed a special metropolitan at Astrakhan. Five other metropolitans were appointed by Theodore Alexievitch, and, on the accession of Peter the Great, Russia had, therefore, twelve metropolitans. Peter appointed in the place of the deceased metropolitans and archbishops only bishops, and  conferred the title of “metropolitan” and “archbishop” upon any bishops he pleased. Thus the titles “metropolitan” and “archbishop” are now not bound to dioceses of a higher degree, but are only the honorary titles of bishops whom the czar wishes to distinguish by a higher title. It has, however, been customary that the occupants of the eparchies Novgorod- Petersburg, Moscow, and Kief have the title “metropolitans, “and in 1878 no other archbishop had this title. The eparchies are divided into eparchies of the first, second, and third classes, according to the salaries connected with the sees. The three metropolitans of Novgorod-Petersburg, Moscow, and Kief belong to the first class. According to Silbernagl (Verfassung und gegenwartiger Bestand sammtlicher Kirchen des Orients, 1865), there were seventeen eparchies of the second and thirty of the third class. Not embraced in these numbers are the eparchies of Georgia or Grusia, which territory in 1801 was incorporated with Russia. The country has at present five eparchies, which are not divided into classes, but among which that of Tiflis holds the highest rank. The occupant of the see has the title “exarch of all Georgia,” and is always ex officio member of the Holy Synod and president of the synodal office at Tiflis. When an episcopal see becomes vacant, the synod, according to the regulations of Peter the Great, presents to the czar two candidates, of whom the czar is to select one. Often, however, the czar himself designates a candidate, whom the synod has to elect. As the bishop has to be unmarried, and all the secular clergy are married, the candidates for the episcopal sees can only be taken from the regular clergy. The first claim belongs to those archimandrites who are members of the Holy Synod, or those to whom affairs of the synod have been intrusted, and who have given proof of their ability. After the confirmation of the bishop elect by the czar, all the archbishops and bishops present in the capital assemble in the hall of the synod, and the new bishop is proclaimed by the oldest archbishop. The consecration always takes place in the cathedral, and is also attended by all bishops of the capital.

The rights and duties of the bishops are fully explained in the Spiritual Regulations of Peter the Great. The bishop ordains all the clergymen of his diocese, but he is expected not to ordain more priests, deacons, and other clergymen than are necessary for the celebration of divine service. He has to superintend all the monks under his jurisdiction, and to see that they observe the monastic rules, but he has not the right to punish them without the previous consent of the Holy Synod. The secular clergy, on the other hand, are, also in this respect, wholly under his jurisdiction. Laymen may be excommunicated by the bishop on account of  public transgression of the divine commandments, or on account of heresy, but the bishops must previously admonish them three times, and must not involve the family of the culprit in the sentence. The bishop is in particular expected to devote himself zealously to the establishment of schools and seminaries. In order to become acquainted with his eparchy, the bishop shall visit all its parishes at least once every two or three years, and he is not allowed to leave the diocese without the permit of the Holy Synod. In all important or doubtful affairs he is directed to ask for the advice of the Holy Synod. The bishop holds the official rank of a major-general and a councilor of state. According to a ukase of 1764, issued by Catharine II, the property of all bishoprics, convents, and churches of Great Russia was confiscated and transferred for administration to the College of Economy, which now pays to all the bishops a fixed salary. To new eparchies the czar assigns likewise a fixed salary, to be paid by the College of Economy; he also determines, in case two eparchies are united, whether the bishop shall receive the income of one or of both. As has already been stated, the eparchies are divided, according to the amount of the salaries, into eparchies of the first, second, and third class. According to the ulase of Catharine II, the prelates of the first class are to receive a salary of 1500 rubles, those of the second class 1200 rubles, and those of the third class 1000 rubles. Besides, the bishops receive a certain amount of table money, etc., for defraying the expenses of their household. The table money of the metropolitans ranges from 2200 to 3900 rubles; the bishops of the second class receive 1000, and those of the third class 800. The bishops generally reside in celebrated convents, which, however, although they are still called convents, are now rather extensive “episcopal houses.” Besides the incomes derived from the State, the bishops receive fees for their episcopal functions, as the consecration of new churches, the ordination of priests, for masses for the dead, etc. The eparchies bear their name from the place where the prelate has his residence, rarely from a province. It is common to mention the name of the eparchy by means of adjectives, as the “Muscovite metropolitan” instead of the “metropolitan of Moscow.”

Besides bishops, archbishops, and metropolitans, Russia has also vicars of episcopal rank. They were at first appointed in very extensive eparchies, where the prelate found it impossible to perform all the episcopal functions. The first eparchy which had a vicar was Novgorod; in 1764 the empress Catharine II established another for the eparchy of Moscow. The vicars have their own dioceses and full episcopal jurisdiction. They have a  consistorial chancery like the other prelates, but an appeal may be taken from their judgments to the metropolitan or archbishop in whose eparchy their district is situated. In regard to salary, they are placed on a level with the prelates of the third class. At present the Russian Church has ten vicariates. Every prelate is assisted in the administration of his diocese by a consistory which is composed of from five to seven members. They are presented to the synod by the bishop, and, after their confirmation, can only be removed with the consent of the synod. Each consistory has its own chancery, which generally consists, in eparchies of the first class, of twenty-eight persons, in eparchies of the second, of twenty-one, and in eparchies of the third, of nineteen. The consistory has to take the necessary measures for preserving the purity of the faith. It superintends the sermons and the keeping of the clerical registers, and reports once a year on the condition of the eparchy to the synod. To its jurisdiction belong also matrimonial affairs and the complaints of clergymen and laymen against each other. If secular priests or monks wish to return to the ranks of the laity, the consistory has to subject them to an admonition, the former during three and the latter during six months; it has also to sentence clergymen for important or disgraceful offenses. The sentences pronounced against such clergymen are: 1, suspension; 2, degradation to a lower degree of the clergy; 3, entire degradation or deposition. The last named sentence involves the surrender of the culprit into the army or to the imperial manufactures, and, in criminal cases, to the secular authorities. From the judgment of a consistory an appeal may be taken to the prelate, and from the latter to the Holy Synod. In every large town of the eparchy there are offices called “ecclesiastical directories,” generally consisting of two members, which have to receive petitions to the consistory and make reports to it. The bishop appoints, with the consent of the synod, deans for superintending the churches and the clergymen. A dean's district embraces from ten to thirty parish churches. They have to visit the churches of their district, and to revise once every six months the registers of the Church and the lists of baptisms, marriages, and deaths. Under their presidency the parishes elect the church-wardens. In the cities the protopresbyter of the principal church has the superintendence of the entire clergy.

The clergy are divided into the white, or secular, clergy, and the black clergy, or monks. The white clergy chiefly recruits itself from the sons of the priests and other employes of the Church. The admission of persons from other classes of society is surrounded with difficulties. The bishop is  forbidden to ordain any one without the necessary knowledge, the requisite age, and good certificates of character, and is not to exceed the number of priests wanted by his eparchy. No one shall be ordained a secular priest without having previously been married to a virgin. The other persons employed for the services of the Church, as sextons, choristers, etc., do not receive any ordination, but are also regarded as a part of the clergy.

(3.) Schools. — Peter the Great was the first who commanded the prelates to establish in the capitals of their eparchies ecclesiastical seminaries where boys — especially the sons of priests — might be educated for the priesthood. All that had been required before his time was that the candidates should be able to read, to write a little, and to perform the liturgical functions. Peter the Great also decreed that the chief convents should contribute one twentieth, and the principal churches one thirtieth of their corn for the gratuitous education of the pupils of the ecclesiastical schools. After the confiscation of the Church property in 1764, the support of the seminaries devolved upon the Holy Synod. The ecclesiastical schools are divided into the four school districts of Petersburg, Kief, Moscow, and Kasan. At the head of each of the districts is an ecclesiastical academy. At each academy is a conference consisting of the rector of the academy, one archimandrite, one yeromonach, two secular priests, and several professors, and presided over by the metropolitan or archbishop, who has to superintend the execution of all the decrees of the synod in regard to the education of the clergymen and of the priests. The Conference of the Academy of St. Petersburg constitutes the center of the scientific life in the Russian Church, as the conferences of the other school districts receive from it the decisions of the Holy Synod. The system of Church schools, which is under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy Synod, consists of the ecclesiastical academies, the eparchial seminaries, the circuit schools, and the parish schools. Every pupil has first to enter the parish school and to remain there for two years. He then attends in succession the circuit school, the eparchial seminary, and finally the academy, remaining in each of these schools for three or four years.

(4.) Marriage and Privileges of the Priests. — As the secular clergy must be married, they cannot ascend to a higher position than that of a protopresbyter. Widower presbyters were required by a canon of Theodosius, metropolitan of Moscow, to resign and withdraw to a convent. The Council of Moscow in 1667 authorized widower clergymen who led a virtuous life in the convent to continue their priestly functions as  yeromonach. Peter the Great forbade the bishop to force any widower priest to retire to a convent. By a second rescript, issued in 1724, he provided that widower priests who were good scholars or preachers and who should marry a second time should be employed as rectors of the seminaries or in the chanceries of the bishops. At present the synod can give permission to widower priests to remain in their office.

The secular clergy are exempt from personal taxes and from military duty. For any criminal offense the clergy are subject to the civil court, but the proceedings against them always take place in the presence of deputies of the ecclesiastical court. In the case of any other offense they are judged by the Church courts. No priest or deacon can be subjected to corporal punishment until he has been degraded by his ecclesiastical superior. The wives of priests and other Church employes share the privileges of their husbands as long as they are not married again.

(5.) Appointment and Support of the Clergy. — In 1722 and 1723 the synod fixed, conjointly with the senate, the number of clergymen who were to serve at every church. Since the confiscation of the Church property in 1764, the Economy College of the Holy Synod pays fixed salaries to the clergymen and employes of all churches which had real estate, or at least twenty serfs. In case a community wants a larger number of clergymen than the government is bound to pay, it has to make satisfactory provision for a sufficient salary.

Every regiment of the army has its own priest, who is under the jurisdiction of the prelate in whose eparchy the regiment is stationed. Only in time of war all the military priests are placed under the jurisdiction of a superior priest who is specially appointed for this purpose.

The bishop has full freedom in appointing the priests of all churches which have no patron. In the army no priest is to be appointed without the consent of the bishop. The children and relatives of a parish priest must not be appointed at the same church. The nobleman on whose estate a church has been erected has the right of patronage. He may propose a priest whose appointment he desires to the bishop, and without his consent no priest can be appointed. In villages the patrons superintend the church- warden and hold the key to the Church treasury.

(6.) Monks and Nuns. — All the convents of Russia follow the rule of St. Basil. No one can become a monkl before the fortieth year of age, nor a  nun1 before the fiftieth year. Before the year 1830 the thirtieth year of age was required for monks. The synod grants, however, dispensations in regard to age, especially to young men who, after completing their studies at an ecclesiastical academy, desire to enter a convent with a view to securing as early as possible an appointment as prelate, archimandrite, or professor. Children need the consent of their parents to their entrance into a convent, and many legal precautions have been taken to close the gates of the convents against persons who are unwilling, or who by entering a convent would violate other duties. In those convents which are supported by the State the limit of the number of monks is fixed by law. The novitiate lasts three years. After its termination the permission of the diocesan bishop is required for admitting the novices to a preparatory degree. On this admission they put on the black habit, from which the monks have received the name of the black clergy. The taking of the monastic vows is connected with solemn rites. There is a third monastic degree, called the “great” or “angelic” habit, but only a few monks are admitted to it.

Every convent of monks is either under an archimandrite or an igumen; smaller convents are under a predstoyatel (president); the female convents are under an igumena. Formerly the superiors of convents were elected by the monks, now they are appointed by the Holy Synod. The monks are divided into two classes, those who have received the order of priests or deacon and are called yeromonachs and yerodeacons, and common monks called monachs. The number of the former is only small. The convents are under the superintendence of the bishop in whose eparchy they are situated; only the lauras, a small class of the most prominent convents, and the stauropigies, or exempt convents, are under the direct jurisdiction of the Holy Synod. The present regulations of the Russian convents date from the time of Peter the Great. By a ukase of 1701 he abolished the institution of the lay brothers, and bound the monks to receive and nurse invalid soldiers and other aged and poor men; the nuns, in the same way, were required to receive aged females, to educate orphans, and teach female handiwork. The regulations are, on the whole, the same as for most of the religious orders of the Eastern and Roman Catholic churches. The monks are admonished to read often in the Bible and to study, and the superiors are required to be well versed in the Scriptures and the monastic rules. The monks are excluded from pastoral duties; only the chaplains of the navy are taken from their ranks. The government has established a college for this special purpose at Balaklava, in the Crimea. To this college monks are  called from the various eparchies, and the archimandrite of the convent elects from them chaplains for the men-of-war. As the monks receive, in general, a better education than the secular clergy, the professors in the seminaries and ecclesiastical academies are generally taken from them.

The first Russian convents were established during the reign of Vladimir the Great, but the cradle of all the Russian convents was the Petchersky Laura at Kief, which had been founded by Anthony, a monk of Mount Athos, during the reign of Yaroslav (1036-54). From that time the convents increased rapidly. In 1542 Ivan II Vasilivitch forbade, at the Council of Moscow, the establishing of a convent without the permission of the monarch and the diocesan bishop. Peter the Great not only forbade bishops and other persons to build convents or hermitages, but also ordered the abolition of smaller convents and of all hermitages. Catharine II, in 1764, confiscated the entire property of the convents. At the same time many convents were suppressed, for the empress intended to preserve only the most prominent convents in the large cities and those that were most celebrated. In consequence of numerous petitions addressed to her, the empress allowed the continuance of many convents under the condition that such convents should support themselves or be supported by the voluntary offerings of the people. Since that time two classes of convents have been distinguished, those which are supported by the Economy College and those which are not. The former are, like the eparchies, divided into three classes, according to the number of inmates and the amount of their salaries.

4. Statistics. — The procurator-general of the Holy Synod publishes annually an account of the condition of the Russian Church. The following facts are taken from the report made by the present procurator-general, count Tolstoi, on the state of the Church in 1876, and published in April, 1878. There were in 1875 in all the eparchies, with the exception of the exarchate Grusia, the Alexandro-Nevski Laura (convent of the first rank) of St. Petersburg, and the Petchayevsk-Uspensky Laura at Kief, from which no report had been received, 56 archiepiscopal houses and 380 convents of monks, of which 169 received no support from the State. The total number of monks was 10,512, of whom 4621 were serving brothers. Of nunneries there were 147 (forty of which derived no support from the State), with 14,574 nuns, of whom 10,771 were serving sisters. The number of cathedral churches, including 57 episcopal churches, 562 chief churches of cities, 3 army cathedrals, and 3 navy cathedrals, was 625; of  other churches, 39, 338; of chapels and oratories, 13,594. Of the churches, 227 parish churches are reported to belong to Raskolniks. The total number of the secular clergy, which includes the sextons, was 98,802. In the course of the year 1876,323 churches and 170 chapels and oratories were built. There were 87 hospitals with 1192 inmates, and 605 poorhouses with 6763 inmates. The number of persons received into the Russian Church was 12, 340, embracing 1192 Roman Catholics, 516 United Greeks, 8 Armenians, 688 Protestants, 2539 Raskolniks, or Old Believers (1498 completely united with the Russian Church, and 1041 reserved the use of the ancient canons), 450 Jews, 219 Mohammedans, and 6728 pagans. The number of divorces was 1023; in 29 cases the cause was remarriage of the one party during the lifetime of the other; in 2, too close consanguinity; in 15, impotence; in 80, adultery; in 650, the unknown residence of one party; in 247, the condemnation of one party to forced labor or exile.

The institutions for the education of the clergy, with the number of their teachers and pupils, were as follows: The number of schools connected with churches and monasteries was 6811, with an aggregate of 197,191 pupils, of whom 170, 461 were male and 26,730 female. The number of Church libraries was 15,770; the number of new libraries established in the course of the year, 235. The Church property under the administration of the procurator-general amounted, on Jan. 1, 1877, to 26, 855,858 rubles. The population connected with the Orthodox Russian Church, with the exception of three Asiatic eparchies, the exarchate Grusia, and the army and navy, from which no reports had been received, amounted to 57,701,660. Adding an estimate of the Orthodox population in the districts above named, the total population of the Orthodox Russian Church was in 1876 about 60,100, 000. The Orthodox Church prevails in each of the sixty governments into which European Russia is divided, except sixteen, of which twelve are chiefly inhabited by Roman Catholics, three by Protestants, and one by Mohammedans. Of the total Orthodox population about 54,900,000 live in European Russia, 2,100,000 in Caucasia, 3,000,000 in Siberia, and 270,000 in Central Asia. The grand-duchy of Finland has about 37,000 adherents of the Russian Church. Outside of Russia the Russian Church has established missions in China and Japan which are reported as making satisfactory progress, and as counting in each country a population of about 5000 souls.

II. Other Christian Churches. — While nearly the entire population in those provinces which have not been under any other than Russian rule  belong to the Greek Church, the empire has received a large Roman Catholic population by the partition of Poland, and a considerable Protestant population by the annexation of the Baltic provinces. The conquest of Erivan in 1828 placed under Russian rule not only a considerable portion of the Armenian Church, but the seat of its head, the catholicos of Etchmiadzin.

1. Roman Catholics. — Until 1642 no provision had been made for the few Roman Catholics living in the Russian dominions. In 1642 the Italian embassy to Moscow was attended by a Jesuit, who was followed by twenty Capuchin monks and a praefect. From 1705 to 1715 several other Jesuits were sent to Russia, and a college was established by them at Minsk. Pius VI sent a legate to St. Petersburg, and placed under his jurisdiction the missions of that city, Moscow, Riga, and Reval. As the provinces which were incorporated with Russia at the first partition of Poland contained a considerable Catholic population, Catharine II concluded to erect a bishopric of the Latin rite for her Catholic subjects. This led to the establishment of the archbishopric of Mohilev, which was confirmed in 1783 by Pius VI. By the second and third partitions of Poland, a number of episcopal sees fell under Russian rule, all of which, except that of Livonia, were abolished by Catharine II, who, instead, erected two new ones. Paul I came to an understanding with the pope about a reorganization of the Catholic Church in the new Russian provinces, and accordingly, in 1797, the following dioceses were organized: Mohilev, archbishopric; and Samogitia, Wilna, Luzk, Kaminiec, and Minsk, bishoprics. All these dioceses received a new circumscription by the concordat of Aug. 3, 1847. By the same concordat a sixth episcopal see of Kherson, or Tiraspol, was erected for the Catholics in the southern provinces of European Russia and in the Caucasus.

The archbishop of Mohilev is president of the Roman Catholic academy, a kind of central or general seminary for all the Catholic dioceses above referred to. The constitution of this academy is almost the same as that of the four academies of the Orthodox Russian Church already referred to. The diocese of Mohilev embraces all those parts of Russia proper (exclusive of the former kingdom of Poland) which do not belong to one of the six dioceses which have been mentioned, also the Catholics of Finland. Besides the archbishopric of Mohilev, Russia has in the former kingdom of Poland the ecclesiastical province of Warsaw, embracing the archbishopric of Warsaw and the bishoprics of Cracow, Lublin, Yanov or Podlachia, Sendomir, Seyna or Augustovo, and  Vladislav-Kalish or Kuyavia. This ecclesiastical organization of Poland dates from the papal bull of June 30, 1818, and was confirmed by another concordat concluded in 1847. The Russian government has pursued, with regard to the Catholic Church of Poland, the same policy as that with regard to the Russian State Church. The Church property was confiscated, and, in return, the clergy were paid and the buildings maintained by the government. The number of convents was greatly reduced, and the remaining ones placed under almost the same regulations as those of the Orthodox Russian Church. As the Russian government, in many cases, carried through new regulations in regard to the Roman Catholic Church without having come to a previous understanding with the pope, frequent conflicts between Russia and the pope have been the consequence. In 1878 the diplomatic relations between Russia and Rome were still interrupted. The active part which a number of the Catholic clergy in the Polish districts have always taken in the national movements of the Poles against the Russian rule has naturally added to the unfriendly feelings which have generally prevailed between Russia and the Roman Catholic Church. Notwithstanding these incessant conflicts, the immense majority of the total population of the former kingdom of Poland has remained in connection with the Roman Catholic Church. In 1878 the Roman Catholics there were reported as numbering 4,597,000 in a total population of 5,210,000, while the Orthodox Russian Church had only a population numbering 34,135 souls.

Exclusive of the kingdom of Poland, Russia proper in Europe had a Roman Catholic population of 2,898,006 souls; in Caucasia, 25, 916; in Siberia, 24,316; in Central Asia, 1316. Only in two governments did they forma majority of the total population — in Kovno, where they constitute 79.5 percent, and in Wilna, where they constitute 61 percent

Besides the Roman Catholic population of the Latin rite, the Polish provinces had formerly a large population belonging to the United Greek Church. Nearly the whole of this population has been induced by the Russian government, in the manner already referred to, to unite with the Russian Church, and to sever its connection with Rome. The Russian government in 1879 reported the Church as nearly extinct. The United Armenians are estimated at about 33,000. They have no bishops of their own, but are under the jurisdiction of the Catholic bishops of the Latin rite.

2. Protestants. — By far the most numerous among the Protestant sects represented in Russia are the Lutherans, who, in the Baltic provinces, constitute a considerable majority of the entire population; besides them, there are Reformed, Mennonites, Moravians, and Baptists.

(1.) The Lutherans. — Until Peter the Great, Russia had no Protestant congregation outside of Moscow. By the acquisition of the Baltic provinces and of Finland, a numerous Lutheran population was placed under Russian rule. The Russian government did not interfere with their Church constitution. The affairs of the Lutheran Church were superintended by the St. Petersburg College of Justice, and the administration of the several sections was carried on by consistories. In 1810 the Lutheran, with all other non-Russian churches, was placed under the Ministry of Ecclesiastical Affairs; in 1832, under the Ministry of the Interior. In 1829 a committee was appointed in St. Petersburg to draft a new Church constitution, with the greatest possible regard for the existing institutions of the Church. As a fruit of the activity of this committee, a law was published in 1832 for the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Russia, an instruction of the clergy and Church boards, and an agenda for the congregations. All these laws, however, were only intended for Russia proper, not for the grand-duchy of Finland. The clergy and the teachers of theology and religion have to bind themselves by an oath to adhere to the symbolical books. The members of the Church are required to go at least once a year to the Lord's supper. Marriages with pagans are forbidden, but with Jews and Mohammedans permitted. Candidates for the ministry have to pass two examinations — one before the theological faculty at Dorpat, and the other before the consistory — ere they are allowed to preach. A third examination has to be passed before they can be appointed.

The appointment is at first for only one, two, or three years; after the expiration of which a new colloquium is required. A number of parishes are united into a district, at the head of which is a probst (provost). There is no difference of degree between the titles of superintendent and superintendentgeneral, but the name of superintendency-general is given to the larger consistorial districts. The title of bishop, which was introduced in 1819, is only honorary, and does not denote a distinct office. The superintendents are the organs of the consistories: they examine the candidates, ordain the preachers, and visit the provosts; only in exceptional cases the pastors. For this office of a provost all the preachers of a district propose two candidates, and the appointment is made by the State ministry  upon the recommendation of the consistory. For the superintendent's office two candidates are presented: in Riga and Reval by the magistrate, in Moscow and St. Petersburg by the General Consistory, in the other consistories by the nobility. The appointments are made by the emperor. There are eight consistories: St. Petersburg, Livonia, Courland, Esthonia, Moscow, Oesel, Riga, and Reval. The consistories are composed of an equal number of clerical and lay members, and presided over by a layman. All the members must belong to the Lutheran Church. The superintendent is the vice-president. The consistories have jurisdiction in all matrimonial affairs. As the members do not reside in the same place, plenary meetings are only called at intervals for disposing of the more important affairs, while ordinary matters are treated by a committee. The General Consistory of St. Petersburg is the central Church board and court of appeal in matrimonial affairs. It is composed of deputies who meet twice a year in St. Petersburg, and are elected for a term of three years. Candidates for this office are nominated in a similar manner to those for the office of superintendent. The election of one of the candidates is made by the ministry, upon the recommendation of the General Consistory. The presidents are appointed by the emperor. Preachers' synods are held in all the consistorial districts, and one half of the clergy are always required to be present. A Lutheran general synod is to be convoked from time to time as a deliberating assembly. It consists of clerical and lay delegates, who are partly chosen by the consistories, and partly elected by the consistoaial districts. The candidates for the ministry receive their theological education at the University of Dorpat. The total number of Lutherans amounts to about 2,400,000 in Russia proper, to 300,000 in Poland, and to 12,000 in Asia.

(2.) The Reformed Church. — The membership of this Church in all Russia does not exceed 200,000, about one half of whom live in Lithuania, in the governments of Wilna and Grodno. Lithuania is divided into four districts, at the head of each of which are a superintendent and vice-superintendent. Annually a synod is held, which lasts from three to four weeks. This synod governs the Reformed Church of Lithuania, under the superintendence of the State ministers.

(3.) Other Protestant Denominations. — The Mennonites have established a number of flourishing colonies in Tauris (where they numbered in 1876 about 15,000 souls), and on the Volga. Quite recently, when the Russian  government had revoked their exemption from military service, they began to emigrate to the United States.

The Moravians have in Livonia and Esthonia prosperous societies, with more than 250 chapels and above 60, 000 members. In accordance with the general character of the Moravian societies in the diaspora, the members do not sever their connection with the State churches. SEE MORAVIANS.

The German Baptists have recently established some missions, chiefly among the Germans of Russia, and they report encouraging progress.

3. The Gregorian Armenian Church. — By the conquest of the Persian province of Erivan in 1828 the head of the Armenian Church, the catholicos of Etchmiadzin, became a subject of Russia. When the catholicos Ephrem died, in 1830, the emperor of Russia, who was desirous of restoring the ancient order of election, decreed to leave the election to all the clergymen, and to the most distinguished lay members of the Armenian Church, and that in future also members of the same Church in other states might be admitted. A new regulation for the government of the Armenian Church was drawn up by the St. Petersburg Department of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of Foreign Creeds, on the basis of propositions submitted by two commissions, one consisting of prominent Armenian clergymen and laymen at Tiflis, and the other consisting of Russian officers at St. Petersburg. The draft was examined and commented upon by the commander-in-chief of the Transcaucasian provinces, and sanctioned by the emperor in March, 1836. This new regulation is divided into ten chapters, of which six relate to the administration of eparchies and convents, while the first four treat of the administration of the Armenian Church of Russia in general. According to the first chapter, the Armenian Church and the Armenian clergy enjoy equal rights with those of other foreign (non-Russian) creeds. The clergy are free from taxes and corporal punishments. The second chapter treats of the privileges and jurisdiction of the catholicos. For this office the clergy and the notables of the nation are to propose several candidates, one of whom is to be appointed by the emperor. The catholicos has the right to send a deputy to the coronation of the emperor. On leaving the palace, he is accompanied by an honorary guard of Armenians. He has the exclusive privilege of preparing and consecrating the holy oil, and of selling it to all Armenian churches. The third chapter refers to the synod, which constitutes the council of the catholicos, but with only a deliberative vote. The synod consists of a  number of prominent ecclesiastical dignitaries, who are proposed by the patriarch and appointed by the emperor. An imperial procurator is appointed at Etchmiadzin, as also at the seats of the supreme ecclesiastical authorities of other foreign creeds. The fourth chapter provides that the archbishops and bishops be solely appointed by the catholicos, and that they be responsible for the administration of their eparchies both to the catholicos and to the emperor. The number of eparchies which recognize the authority of the catholicos amounts to about forty, but only six are situated within the Russian empire, namely, Astrakhan, Erivan, Grusia, Nachitshevan, Karabagh, and Shirvan. SEE ARMENIAN

 CHURCH. The number of Gregorian Armenians in 1878, as reported by the Russian government, was 38,720 in European Russia, 595,310 in Caucasia, 15 in Siberia, and 1 in Central Asia.

III. Non-Christian Reliqions. —

1. Jews. — For the education of Jewish rabbins, Rabbinical schools have been established by the government at Wilna and Shitomir. The government also supports Jewish schools at Odessa, Kishinef, Vinnica, Stara-Constantinof, and Berditchef. The number of Jews of Russia proper in Europe was stated to be, in 1878, 1,944,378; in Poland, 815,433; in Caucasia, 22,732; in Siberia, 11,941; in Central Asia, 3396.

2. Mohammedans. — The Mohammedan population has rapidly increased by the progress of the Russians in Central Asia. It now amounts to about 7, 500,000, of whom 2,364,000 are found in Russia proper in Europe, 426 in Poland, 1, 987,000 in Caucasia, 61,000 in Siberia, and 3,016,000 in Central Asia. The Mohammedans even constitute a majority of the population in one of the European governments — Oofa. There are about 20,000 muftis, mollahs, and teachers, all of whom, except those of Tauris and the Kirghis Cossacks, are subject to the mufti of Orenburg.

Lutherans and Roman Catholics are forbidden to convert to Christianity a Mohammedan who is a Russian subject, while a non-Russian Mohammedan may be received into any of the Christian churches permitted in the empire. These laws have been very strictly executed. On several occasions Tartars who had embraced Christianity and had afterwards returned to their original faith were punished by imprisonment, while no attention was paid to the excuse that the relapse had been occasioned by an unbearable pressure exercised by Orthodox priests, as  well as by their avariciousness. On the other hand, the government aids the Orthodox clergy in every possible manner in their efforts to convert the unfaithful. In Kasan, one of the principal seats of the Mohammedan population of European Russia, the Brotherhood of St. Gurij was formed in 1870 for the purpose of converting the Mohammedans and pagans on the Volga. This brotherhood had established up to 1874, 115 schools with their own means, which were attended by 1992 male and 339 female Tartars, besides members of other nationalities. The civil rights of the Mohammedans are, like those of the Jews, limited by special laws. They are, indeed, eligible to municipal and government offices under the same conditions as Christians; but in city councils, e.g., the non-Christian members must not exceed one third of the total number of members, while the office of mayor is entirely closed to them. The criminal statistics are particularly interesting. Among all the inhabitants of the empire, the Mohammedans occupy the lowest rank with regard to the more serious crimes, there being but one conviction among 5779 Mohammedans against 2710 Orthodox Christians. With regard to the less serious offenses, the Mohammedans occupy the fifth rank; but even this unfavorable relation is caused by the numerous convictions for evasion of military duty. Theft, however, is also of common occurrence among them. The Mohammedans are generally very prompt in observing their duties to the State, with the exception of those arising from the general liability to military service. The service in the regular army is to this day so unpopular among the Tartars of the Crimea that in 1876 the government was forced to take severe measures to prevent a wholesale emigration to Turkey. An official report states that the Tartars feared, above all things, that they would be forced to fight against their coreligionists the Turks, and that they would be compelled to eat pork, which is to them worse than death. But even before the declaration of war against Turkey, and during this war, the excitement was said to have subsided, and they were, with a few exceptions, loyal; The same was the case with the Mohammedans in Asiatic Russia. In matters pertaining to their religion, the Mohammedans are granted complete liberty, although the government takes care to be informed on the entire personnel of the clergy, their actions, etc.

The highest Moslem ecclesiastical body in the governments of European Russia is the Mohammedan Ecclesiastical College of Oofa. This college is elected, and fills all offices under its jurisdiction without the necessity of obtaining the consent of the government. For the Mohammedan clergy of  Central Asia, the cities of Bokhara and Samarcand are to this day centers of learning, and the heads of the institutions of learning at these places are regarded as the preservers of the true faith. The colleges for theology and Mohammedan law (madrassa, or medresseh) number several hundred. (In European Russia there are two hundred and fifty, of which several are attended by hundreds of students.) In these colleges, Mohammedan science flourishes, without ever having been touched by so much as a breath of Western culture. The government does not interfere in any manner in the inner affairs of these schools; does not oppose a journey to Mecca; and even permits priests (mollahs) who have finished their education in Constantinople, Arabia, or Egypt to hold a position upon their return to Russia. It was found that the ulemas (the learned men) connected with the mosques or schools readily submit to any government, as this alone could secure to them the use of their legacies (vakuf), their main source of income. Those brethren, however, who have had themselves declared saints have become in all Mohammedan countries a perfect nuisance, and the sworn enemies of a well-regulated government. The title of saint (ishan) is easily obtained. The motives to obtain it are, however, very frequently the most dishonorable, while the saints themselves in many cases bear a very poor reputation. In Central Asia, the majority of robberies are committed by the saints, and they are therefore avoided by the stationary population. The nomads, on the other hand, receive them with open arms, and here, among the roving sons of the steppe, they find their true home. The Russian government at first did not oppose them. The decrees of 1781 and 1785, on the contrary, opened to them the newly acquired Kirghis steppes. Their influence here was a very pernicious one. The government, however, treats them at present more strictly. In 1873 a case occurred in Orenburg where such a saint was banished to a government having no Mohammedan inhabitants. In the same manner, the Russian government proceeded against the saints in the Caucasus, while in Turkestan it watches the fanatical order of Nakshbandi very closely The popular school system among the Mohammedans was entirely reorganized by an imperial decree of Nov. 20, 1874. This decree placed the schools of the Tartars, the Bashkirs, and Kirghis under the imperial ministry of education, which informed its subordinates of this act as follows: “The subordination of the Tartar nonRussian schools under this ministry is not only important in an educational, but also in a political, point of view. The Mussulmans' schools have been, up to this time, without any government supervision, and therefore promoted among the people an anti-Russian sentiment and a  fanaticism which prevented the assimilation of the Tartar, etc., with the other inhabitants of Russia.” According to Mohammedan views, every mollah is at the same time a teacher, while the school is near the mosque. Through these schools, the mollahs endeavor to bring their community under their influence, and to keep them away from their Russian neighbors. They are also decidedly opposed to any government supervision of the schools. The government at first tried to establish teachers' seminaries for the education of teachers in these schools; and the decree of 1870, which ordered the establishment of these seminaries, provided, in order to do away with all prejudices, that the teachers of the Russian language should be, as far as possible, Mohammedans, and the mollahs be permitted to attend all the lessons, so that they might convince themselves that nothing objectionable was taught. Even now the teachers in the madrassas of the principal cities, like Kasan, speak Russian fluently, although they are all Mohammedans. The authorities are also actively engaged in the preparation of reading books containing, besides tales and fables, incidents from Russian his tory, as well as facts from geography and natural history. This is a decided improvement, as according to all authorities, like Shaw, Lerch, and Vdmbery, the entire Turkish-Tartaric literature breathes “a spirit of religious mysticism, rose-colored sensual love, and reckless bravery emanating from the most bitter hate of the unbelievers.” Even such an old library as that of Kasan is completely wanting in works on the history and geography of Mohammedan countries; but it is expected that this want will be relieved in time by the Mohammedan students in the Russian high and secondary schools. In 1871 the Oriental faculty of the University of St. Petersburg was attended by thirty-six students. In the same year there were ninety-two Mohammedan students in the Russian gymnasia, of which the educational district of Kasan, with its forty-three percent of the total Mohammedan population, had forty-seven.

3. Pagans. — The number of pagans in European Turkey is 258,125; in Poland, 245; in Caucasia, 4683; in Siberia, 286,016; in Central Asia, 14,740.

IV. Literature. — On the history of the Russian Church, see Mouravieff, History of the Russian Church (transl. by Blackmore [1842] to the year 1710), vol. i; Strahl, Beitrdge zur russischen Kirchengeschichte (1827), vol. i; id. Geschichte der russischen Kirche (1830), vol. i; Schmitt, Die qmorgenlandisch-griechisch-russische Kirche (1826); id. Kritische Geschichte der neugriech. und der russischen Kirche (1840); Neale,  History of the Holy Eastern Church (1850); Stanley, History of the Eastern Church (1862); Theiner, Die Staatskirche Russlands (1853); Gallitzin [prince A.], L'Eglise Greco-Russe i (1861); Boissard, L'Eglise de Russie (1867, 2 vols.); Philaret [archbishop of Tchernigoff], Geschichte der Kirche Russlands (Germ. transl. by Blumenthal, 1872); Basaroff, Russische Orthodoxe Kirche (1873); also the a Occasional Papers of the Eastern Church Association of the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States (published in New York I and London since 1864). The doctrine of the Orthodox Eastern Church as taught in Russia is set forth in the catechisms of the metropolitans Plato and Philaret of Moscow. An English translation of the larger catechism of Philaret was published by Blackmore (1845), ad republished in Schaff, Creeds of Christendom (1877), vol. 2. See also Guettde [a Gallican priest who joined the Russian Church], Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Cath. Orthodoxe de Russ. (1866); Procopowicz, Theologia Christiana Orthodoxa (1773-75), 5 vols.; abridg. (1802). On the rites and ceremonies of the Russian Church, see King [Anglican chaplain in St. Petersburg ], The Rites and the Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia (1772); Mouravieff, Lettres a un Ami sur l'Office Divin (French transl. by prince Gallitzin). On the constitution and present condition of the Church, see Silbernagl, Verefassung und gegenwartiger Bestand simmtlicher Kirchen des Orients (1865); Neher, Kirchl. Statistik (1865), vol. 2. The latest statistics of the Church are found in the annual reports of the procurator- general. A full statistical account of all the religious denominations of the empire is found in the Statistical Year-book of the Russian Empire (in the Russian language [St. Petersburg, 1871]), vol. 2. (A.J.S.)

## Russia, Versions of[[@Headword:Russia, Versions of]]

             or, rather, VERSIONS IN THE LANGUAGES OF RUSSIA. The praise which has been awarded to ancient Thebes on the Nile by calling it ἑκατόμπυλος, “the hundred gated,” may be also given to Russia, which, in its geographical dimensions, variety of races, multiplicity of population, and diversity of languages, is a world in itself, and baffles and bewilders the mind at the bare conception that the millions that owe allegiance to the throne of the czar are to be furnished with the Word of God in their own vernaculars. According to the geographical position, we get the following linguistic groups:

I. East Siberian, or Eastern Group:

a, Jukagir;

b, Tchuksht and Coreak;

c, Kamtchatkan;

d, Giliak.

II.

(A.) Altaic Group:

a, Tungusian;

b, Mantchu;

c, Aino, or Kurile;

d, Aleutian.

(B.) Mongolian Languages:

a, Mongol;

b, Buriat;

c, Kalmuck.

(C.) Tartar:

a, Jakut;

b, Siberian Tartar;

c, Kirghise Tartar;

d, Bashkir and Meshtcherik;

e, Nogaian and Kumuk;

f, Turkmenian;

g, Aderbedshan;

h, Kazan Tartar;

i, Tchuvash.

(D.) Samoiede:

a, Jarak;

b, Tawgy, Samoiede.

(E.) Finnish Family:

α, Ugrian.

a, Ostjak;

b,

 Wogul.  β, Bulgarian.

a, Tcheremissian;

b, Morduin.

γ, Permian.

a, Permian;

b, Sirenian;

c, Wotjakian.

δ, Finnish Branch:

a, Finnish in the narrower sense, with

1, Carelian;

2, Tschudian.;

3, Wotian;

4, Olonetzian.

b, Esthonian;

c, Livian;

d, Krewingian;

e, Lapponese.

III. Jeniscan Group:

a, Jeniseo, Ostjakian;

b, Kottian.

IV. Caucasian Group:

a, Georgic;

b, Lesghic;

c, Ristic;

d, Tcherkess Families.

V. Shemitic Group:

a, Hebrew;

b, Arabic.

VI. Asiatic Group:

a, Persian;

b, Kurdish;

c, Armenian;

d, Ossitirian.

VII. European Group:

(A.) Slavonic Family.

a, Russian;

b, Polish;

c, Servian;

d, Tschechian;

e, Bulgarian.

(B.) Lithuanian Family.

a, Lithuanian and Samogitian;

b, Lettish.

(C.) Germanic Family.

a, German;

b, English;

c, Swedish;

d, Dutch.

(D.) Grceco-Latin Family.

a, Greek;

b, Albanian;

c, Latin;

d, Italian;

e, French;

f, Rouman.

These are the representatives of the Russian empire. As to the versions made for these different families, only a few enjoy this privilege. Following our table, we must pass over the East Siberians, or Eastern Group, as none of these people, who are but partially Christians, have the Scriptures in their vernacular. The same must be said of the Ainos, or Kuriles, belonging to the Altaic, and of a great many others belonging to the other groups. For a better view, we will speak of the different versions in alphabetical order; and with the help of the linguistic table the reader will be easily guided as to which family the respective version belongs to. As the most  important versions have either been given already, or will be given, in this Cyclopoedia, the reader will be referred to them.

1. Albanian.

2. Aleutian is the language of the inhabitants of the Aleutian Islands. For the most part, they belong to the Greek Church, which had the Gospel of St. Matthew printed for them in the Aleutian, according to the translation prepared by priest John Veniaminoff, in the year 1840, in parallel columns with the Russian version.

3. Arabic.

4. Armenian.

5. Bulgarian. SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

6. Buriat. The Buriats, residing on Lake Baikal, and numbering about 150,000 individuals, are Lamaists; some are Christians. At a very early tine, prince Gallitzin, president of the Russian Bible Society, wrote to the governor of Irkutsk, requesting him to send two learned Beuriats to St. Petersburg for the purpose of assisting Dr. Schmidt in the translation of the New Test. Two saisangs, or Buriat nobles, accordingly repaired to St. Petersburg, and, with the consent of their prince and lama, engaged in the work of translation. The Divine Word was blessed in their conversion, and in a letter addressed to their chief they avowed their faith in Jesus. In 1818 the Gospel of St. Matthew was published, which was soon followed by other parts of the New Test. Since 1840 the British and Foreign Bible Society possesses a translation of the entire Bible, which was prepared at the expense of that society.

7. Dutch.

8. English.

9. Esthonian. Esthonia is a maritime government in the northwest of European Russia, and forms one of the Baltic provinces. The language is spoken in two dialects — the Dorpat and Reval Esthonian. The former is spoken in South Esthouia, and the latter prevails in the North. Almost all the Esthonianis are of the Lutheran persuasion. As early as 1686 they received the entire New Test. in the Esthonian language, translated by John Fischer, a German professor of divinity and general superintendent of Livonia. This translation was executed at the command of Charles XI. A  version of the Old Test., made by the same translator, aided by Gosekenius, appeared in 4to in 1689; but it is uncertain in which dialect these early versions were written, although it was understood throughout Esthonia. Later versions considered both dialects, and thus we have two versions — the Reval Esthonian (q.v.) and the Dorpat Esthonian. As to the latter dialect, a New Test. was printed in Riga in 1727, which edition was soon exhausted. In 1815, through the exertions of Dr. Paterson, 5000 copies of the New Test. were printed by the British and Foreign Bible Society; and in 1824 the Russian Bible Society had 8000 copies printed, while another edition was undertaken in 1836 by the Dorpat Bible Society. In the same year a version of the Psalms, translated from the Hebrew by the Rev. Ferdinand Meyer, of Carolen, was printed by the aid of the parent society, and the number of copies of the New Test. together with the Psalms which has been distributed is, according to the last report of the British and Foreign Bible Society (1878), 35, 000.

10. Finnish. As early as 1548 the New Test. was published at Stockholm. This version was made by Michael Agricola, rector, and afterwards bislop of Abo, a friend of Luther. In 1644 the entire Bible was published under the patronage of queen Christina, to whom the work was also dedicated. Editions of the New Test. from the text of queen Christina's version appeared in 1732, 1740, 1774, and 1776. In 1811 the British and Foreigln Bible Society commenced its operations in Finland, and a Bible society was formed at Abo. In 1815 an edition of 8000 copies of the New Test. was published at Abo, and in the following year 5000 copies of the entire Bible left the press in Abo. A quarto edition of the entire Bible, aided by a grant from the British and Foreign Bible Society, was completed in 1827, but the extensive fire which broke out in the same year at Abo destroyed this edition (consisting of 7500 copies). In consequence, another edition of 5000 copies of the New Test. was immediately undertaken by the same society; and this edition was completed at Stockholm in 1829. In 1832 the Bible Society of Abo was again in active operation, and new editions of the entire Bible, as well as of the New Test., left the press. Apart from the Finnish edition printed at Abo, the St. Petersburg Society undertook some editions for the purpose of supplying the Finns in their own neighborhood. The New Test. was printed in 1814 and again in 1822, and the entire Bible was completed in 1817. Many large editions of the Scriptures have subsequently been issued by the joint agency of the Finnish and the British and Foreign Bible societies. According to the latest report for 1878, the  former society had issued since its formation 239, 273, and the latter 409, 743 copies of the Holy Scriptures.

11. French.

12. Georgian. By way of supplement we will add that in 1876 the British and Foreign Bible Society decided to print an edition of the Four Gospels, the work being done at Tiflis.

13. German.

14. Greek.

15. Hebrew New Testament.

16. Italian.

17. Judoeo-Arabic.

18. Judoeo-German.

19. Judoeo-Persic.

20. Judoeo-Polish is a language spoken by the Polish Jews, consisting principally of Old German with a mixture of Hebraisms, or at least phrases peculiar to the Jews, with very little Polish in it. In 1820 a translation of the New Test. into this language was undertaken by the London Society for Promeoting Christianity among the Jews. An edition was published in 1821 by the British and Foreign Bible Society, the characters being the so called Rabbinic. A new edition in the Hebrew square letters was published by the London society in 1869, while in 1872 the British and Foreign Bible Society undertook a new edition in the pointed Hebrew characters, edited by P. Hershon, which was completed in 1878.

21. Kalmuckian. For the Kalmucks near the mouth of the Volga, Mr. Neitz, a missionary of the Moravian Brethren, at the beginning of this century undertook the work of translation, which was continued by Dr. Schmidt, whose version of St. Matthew was printed at St. Petersburg at the expense of the British and Foreign Bible Society. This is the only part which has been translated.

22. Karaite-Tartar.

23. Karelian is the language of a people dwelling in the government of Tver, in European Russia. As early as the 12th century they joined the Church of Rome, but in a bull published March 14, 1351, by Clement IV, we are told that they were obliged to join the Greek Church, to which they still belong. In 1820 the Russian Bible Society published the Gospel according to St. Matthew for the benefit of this tribe in the modern Russian characters.

24. Kirghisian. The Kirghise, belonging to the Tartaric iribes, are the most numerous, their number being given as about 1,500,000. At the expense of the Russian Bible Society at Astrachan, the New Test. was translated in 1818 by Mr. Charles Frazer, a Scottish missionary. Since this mission was abandoned, nothing has been done for the circulation of the Word of God among this people.

25. Kurdish. SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

26. Lapponese.

27. Latin.

28. Lettish SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

29. Lithuanian SEE SLAVONIC VERSIONS.

30. Manchu.

31. Mordvinian. The Morduins occupy a locality lower down the Volga, aned their number is, on good authority, supposed to approach 400,000. They are divided into two tribes — the Mokshans and Ersans. The Russian Bible Society translated the New Test. into their language, but the dissolution of that society brought the work to a termination.

32. Olonetzian, which is a sub-dialect of Karelian, had a small portion of the Scriptures translated into that dialect. A specimen of this translation was sent in 1820 to Tver to be compared with the dialect spoken in that government, but the suspension of the Russian Bible Society arrested the progress of this undertaking.

33. Ostjakian is a dialect spoken by one of the most numerous tribes in Siberia. A translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew into this vernacular exists in a collection at London, prepared at the expense of prince Lucien Bonaparte.

34. Ossitinian is the language spoken by the Ossetes, who inhabit the central part of Caucasus, north of Georgia. In 1752 Russian priests established a mission among them, and in 1821 upwards of 30, 000 Ossetes had joined the Greek Church. Among the converts was also a nobleman of the name of Jalguside, who, being anxious to provide his countrymen with a version of the Scriptures in their own tonigue, proposed to the committee of the Russian Bible Society to prepare a translation of the gospels in ihe Ossitiniau dialect. The proplosition was accepted, and in 1824 the work was ordered to be put lo press. While tihe printing was going on, the Russian Bible Society was suspended, and thus the work was discontinued. Forty years later a new translation of the gospels was prepared at Tiflis.

35. Permian. The Permians, occupying the seat of the ancient Bjarmaland, are divided into three divisions — the Permians proper, composed of about 50,000 souls, partially Christianized, but without the Scriptures in their language except the Gospel of St. Matthew, which had been executed for prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, not with a view to circulation, but to aid linguistic studies. The Sireuian and Wotjak will be mentioned in the proper place.

36. Persian.

37. Polish. SEE SLAVONIC VERSION.

38. Roumanian.

39. Russian.

40. Samogitian.

41. Slavonic.

42. Servian.

43. Sirenian. This dialect is spoken by the Sirenians, another section of the Permians; their number is about 70,000. The Russian Bible Society translated the Gospel of St. Matthew into their language, of which 1400 copies were printed in 1823.

44. Swedish. SEE SCANDINAVIAN VERSIONS.

45. Syriac in Hebrew Characters.

46. Transcaucasian Tartar.

47. Teheremissian is a dialect spoken by a people dwelling along the banks of the Volga and Kama, in the governments of Kazan and Simbirsk. The complete New Test. appeared in the Tcheremissian language in 1820. being printed at the expense of the Russian Bible Society during the reign of the emperor Alexander. While the work was in progress, the archbishop of Kazan collected a number of the people tanid read to them from one of the books of the New Test. to ascertain whether it was intelligible to them. The people wept aloud for joy that they had received the Word of Jesus in their own tongue. An edition of 3000 copies was printed, but the dissolution of the Russian Bible Society that followed brought the work to a termination.

48. Tchuwaschian is spoken by a people inhabiting both sides of the Volga, numbering about 670,000 individuals, partially Christianized. In 1817 an attempt was made by the Russian Bible Society at Simbirsk to translate the New Test. In 1818 the Four Gospels were translated, and two years later the entire Test., under the care of the archbishop of Kazan, to whose diocese the people belong. The edition, consisting of 5000 copies, was printed in Russian characters.

49. Vogulian is spoken in the governments of Perm and Tobolsk, in a district between the Tobol, the Beresov, the Obi, and the Uralian Mountains. A translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew into Vogeulian is contained in the collection of prince Lucien Bonaparte.

50. Wotjakian. The third section of the Permian race consists of the Wotjaks, about 200,000, located in the Upper Kanma, and generally Christianized. In 1820, Lewandowski, a learned Wotjak, commenced a translation of the New Test. The Russian Bible Society encouraged him to continue; and thus under the care and inspection of the Viatka Branch Bible Society, the gospels of SS. Matthew and Mark were completed during the year 1823. From the first sheets of these gospels some poretions were read in their churches, and it is related that the people demanded to hear more, but a change came; the Russian society became extinct, and all its printing operations were necessarily suspended.

Besides the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society, see The Bible of Every Land, but especially Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands (St. Petersburg, 1870). (B.P.)

## Russian Sects[[@Headword:Russian Sects]]

             Religious sects abound in Russia, and under the most absolute monarchy in Europe we have the singular phenomenon of large bodies of dissenters defying the sovereign's power, and living in open secession from the National Church. All of these sects are included under the general name of Raskolniks (q.v.), i.e. Schismatics. The Raskolniks are divided into two great branches, the Popoftchins and the Bezpopoftchins, thie former having priests and the latter none. (For much of the following article we are indebted to the Rev. F.W. Flocken, missionary to Bulgaria.)

I. The POPOFTCHINS are divided into five principal sects.

1. The Diaconoftchins. This sect was started in 1706 at Veska, usnder the leadership of Alexander the Deacon, from whom it takes its name.

2. The Epefanoftchins (q.v.).

3. The Peremayanoftchins (q.v.).

4. The Starovertzi (men of the ancient faith) is the name assumed by the majority of those who refused to acquiesce in the reforms introduced ini the 17th century, especially the revision of the Scriptures and the liturgical books effected by the patriarch Nikon (A.D. 1654). The following are the points which, they strenuously maintain, justify their separation from the National Church:

a. The service should be according to the old books before their alteration by Nikon.

b. In the Creed the article on the Holy Ghost should read, “And in the Holy Ghost, the true and living Lord.”

c. The Hallelujah should be sung only twice, not three times; after the second adding “Glory to (God.”

d. The processions around the churches should go with the course of the sun, and not against it.

e. That the sign of the cross should be made by uniting the fourth and fifth fingers, and not the first three fingers, with the thumb.

f. To acknowledge, respect, and adore only the eight-ended cross.

g. The name of Jesus is to be written and pronounced Isus, and not Jesus.

There were other and still smaller points of dispute, and the tendency to fanaticism so universally found in Russian dissent did not fail to appear among them. They were persecuted under Peter I (A.D. 1689-1725), who laid double taxes on them; but his successors, especially Catharine II and Alexander I, have adopted a milder policy with the hope of winning them back to the Eastern Church. But little success has attended these attempts at reconciliation.

5. Tchernoltzi, or Wjetkaers, an insignificant body who, during the time of the persecution (A.D. 1730), took refuge on the islands of the Wjetka, a small river between Russia and Poland, whence their name. Here they formed a separate community and built two monasteries, from which, fifty years later, some of them migrated to Poland and built a church and convent at Tchernoboltz. Their chief distinguishing practices are a refusal to take oaths and to offer prayers for the emperor.

II. The BEZPOPOFTCHINS, as we have said, are dissenters who refuse to have priests, the sacraments being administered and services conducted by lay elders. They recognize no priestly hierarchy. and dislike the national bishops and priests so much that when any one of these enters their houses they hasten, as soon as he leaves, to wash the seats and walls. They believe that the Church is in a period of decline and apostasy, that the apostolic succession has been interrupted, and that legitimate priests are now impossible. They hold that the world has had four aeras: a spring, or morning, from Adam until the building of Solomon's Temple; a summer, or noon, lasting until the birth of Christ; an autumn, or evening, until the appearance of Antichrist, about 1650; and now the cold winter, the dark night, which will continue until the Lord shall descend upon earth to save men. The Bezpopoftchins are divided up into very many sects, some of  them holding opinions exceedingly absurd. The three principal of these sects are the following:

1. The Pomoryans. — The founder of this sect was a runaway deacon of the name of Danilo Wiculin. In the year 1695 he founded a monastery on the borders of the Viga, of which for forty years he was the prior, and (died in 1735. In the erection of the monastery and in its leadership he was assisted by Andrei Mishtezky, who was of princely origin, and occupied his post until his end, ill 1736. Soon after this a monastery for females was organized, of which Salomonia, the sister of Mishtezky, became prioress. The monasteries soon amassed wealth, and were thereby enabled to procure a large library of old Slavic manuscripts, and composed books for the education of singers, writers, painters, and the future leaders of the sect. At the end of the past century these monasteries contained 2000 male and 1000 female inmates. Andrei and Simion Denisow have written several works for the sect, and in general defense of the Raskolniks, of which the Pomoryan Answers to the Questions of Nevfit is the principal.

The teachings of the Pomoryans, also called Danilowtchina, consist in the following:

a. From the time of Nikon, the Antichrist has been reigning, though unseen, in the orthodox Church, and has abolished the true sacraments and priesthood.

b. Those from the orthodox Church who wish to join the Pomoryans must receive rebaptism, which, like other sacraments, can, in consequence of the fall of the true priesthood, be administered by laymen, and even by females

c. As there is no true priesthood, there is no one to solemnize marriages, therefore all are obliged to live in the unmarried state, and those married in the Church must separate.

d. Monks from the orthodox Church can be acknowledged as such after having been rebaptized, and they may install others in that state and be permitted to serve as priests, even if they have not been such before.

e. For those in authority no prayers are to be offered. During the reign of Anna Ivanova one of the Pomoryans reported this to the authorities; then, to avoid difficulties with the government, they introduced a prayer for the czar, which they have used ever since. f. The crosses not to have the inscription “J.N.R.I., “because this is a Latin heresy, but to have the initial letters of these words: Zar Slavy Isus Christos Sin Boshii, “Lord of Glory, Jesus Christ, Son of God,” as it had been to the time of Nikon. g. The food bought in the market is not to be considered unclean. h. To be ready for suicide by fire for the true faith.

2. The Fedosejoftchins. — This is the second of the principal sects of the Bezpopoftchins, which spread with the same rapidity in another part of the country. The principal promoter of it was a deacon by the name of Fedosei, a contemporary of Danilo Wiculin. Having removed with his family to Poland, he gathered around him in a short time a number of Raskolnik fugitives from Russia, and founded two abodes, one for males and the other for females, among whom he acted as priest. He agreed in all points with the Pomoryans, except two, viz.:

a. The inscription of “I.N.R.I.” is to be retained upon the cross.

b. The food bought in the markets must be purified by prayer and adoration. These two points gave rise to the sect. The efforts of the Pomoryans to form a union with the Fedosejoftchins proved unsuccessful, and an open enmity between the two began, which increased just as soon as the Pomoryans commenced to pray for the czar. In the year 1771 they succeeded, at Moscow, in founding a cenobitical establishment, known as the Preobrashensky Cemetery, which became the principal center of the sect. The originator, and for thirty-eight years the head of this institution, was Elijah Alexejew Kowilin. a dealer in bricks and wines. During the pestilence at Moscow in 1771, when all the poor workmen who had been there commenced to leave the town to return to their native places, and in that way carried the sickness to all parts of the country, Kowilin, with another merchant, Zenkoff, applied for permission to establish, at their expense, a quarantine on one of the principal roads leading from the city, and with it to connect a cemetery for the burial of those that died. Having received the permission, they established a barrier and building for the purpose proposed. He, with others, fed the hungry, nursed the sick, and comforted the dying. The news of the comfort provided by Kowilin spread very rapidly, and, besides the hungry and sick, the people en masse took  refuge with him. He, on the other hand, did all he could to instil into the minds of the refugees that this woe from hunger and pestilence was sent upon Moscow by God as a just punishment for the Wilonian heresy, and exhorted them to repent and turn to God. The people, seeing that those dying as orthodox were just thrown into a cart and hurled off, while those under Kowilin's care were provided with all the necessaries of life, the sacraments in the last hours, and when dead were given a Christian funeral, chose, between the two, the latter, and submitted en masse to rebaptism and the conditions of Kowilin. At the same time, they turned over to Kowilin all their movable and real property. When the pestilence ceased, he retained many of his adherents and formed a kind of monastery, which, at the commencement of the present century, contained 1500 persons of both sexes. The sect numbered nearly 10,000 members at Moscow. To perpetuate the institution, he petitioned for assistants under the name of trustees, who were selected from among the members, and were of the richest merchants. The news of the wealth and good order of this establishment and the concern of Kowilin for the good of the Fedosejoftchins raised him in the eyes of the sect in other parts of the land, which by degrees placed all their communities under his protection and made them dependent upon the Preobrashensky Cemetery institution, from which they all began to get their leaders and singers, and bought all their books and ikonas, and to which they continued to send their annual contributions.

3. The Philippoftchins. — Besides the general doctrines of the Bezpopoftchins, the Philippoftchins hold: a. That only the eight-ended cross without inscription is to be venerated. b. Only the ikonas according to the old style, and painted by themselves, are to be worshipped. c. No prayers are to be offered for the czar. d. Man and wife are to be separated after having been rebaptized. e. Suicide by fire or hunger is martyrdom for the true faith. This last point explains why the Philippoftchins are sometimes also called Samososhigately (Self-burners) and Morelshtchiky (Starvationists). Even Philip and a number of his followers burned themselves by setting fire to their monastery and remaining in it. SEE PHILIPPINS.

4. Among the minor sects are:

(1.) The Pastushkoe, or A damantowa. — The originator of this sect was a herdsman of Denisow, Adam by name. Pastush, in Russian, means herdsman; and this his calling, combined with his name, forms the name of the sect. He censured the Philippins because of their passion for suicide, the Pomoryans on account of their aversion to eat and drink with others; and taught that it was sinful to walk on paved streets, to handle money, and possess passports, because the first is an invention of the Antichrist, and the last two bear the seal and imprint of the same.

(2.) The Spasova, or Kusmintchin. — Its founder was Kusma, an illiterate peasant, and his doctrine was called Netovtchina (a word derived from the Russian word net, which means “there is not”), and is used in this form to show that he held that since the time of the correction of the books, and with them the prayers and faith in the orthodox Church, the Antichrist is reigning, and, consequently, “there is no” grace, no sanctity, no sacraments. He taught that there is nothing holy remaining in the world, and that salvation is to be obtained only through the “Spassa,” which is the Slavic word for the Russian Spassitel, meaning “Savior.” His followers do not rebaptize those that join them, nor do they always baptize their own children, believing that the “Spassa” can save them without it. The marriage tie, where or whenever performed, is with them considered indissoluble; but, with the approach of age, they are forbidden to make use of its rites. They worship only their own ikonas and crosses, which they always carry with them, and which, therefore, are small and made to fold together. This sect is principally to be found in the districts of Nishgorod.

(3.) The Detoubeitchins (Inf anticides). — This sect consider it a great misfortune for children to come under the influence of Antichrist (the established Church), and believe it to be the best offering they can make to God to deliver them from this calamity — by death, if necessary. They do not hesitate, therefore, to commit the crime of infanticide.

(4.) The Beguny (Deserters), or Stranniky (Wanderers). — This sect originated about 1790, in the village of Sopel, district of Jaroslav, from which it is sometimes called Sopelniks. Its founder was Deserter Efimy, who, after having been rebaptized, settled in said village and taught that the Antichrist had ascended his throne long ago: first, one thousand years after Christ he invisibly reigned in the Greek empire under the Greek name of Appolyen,\* as intimated by John in the Revelation; then, after the lapse of 666 years, which letters compose his name, he appeared in Russia, not yet  as czar, but as a false prophet, as stated in the Revelation by John. And this first beast and false prophet was the patriarch Nikon, for he was the first to blaspheme against God by changing the name of Isus into Jesus,† and, like a beast, persecuted the worshippers of the true Isus; and that he really was the beast spoken of in the Apocalypse is seen from his real or lay name, Nikita, in Greek Νηκήτιος,‡ which gives the number 666. After his fall, there appeared the third Antichrist, or the second beast with the two horns, which signify the two imperial names, czar and imperator, the last of which, in Greek, is Ι᾿περάτορ,§ and also gives the number 666. In this trinity the members of the orthodox Church are baptized and marked with the sign of the cross by three fingers instead of by the two first, as it was of old. To escape eternal punishment, it is necessary, first to wash off this sign and mark by rebaptism, and then flee from every city and village which forms part of this Babel of Antichrist.

(5.) The Isbraniki, or “Company of the Elect.” — The cause of the separation of this sect from the Russian Church was not any difference of doctrine or ritual, but a desire to protest against the laxity and inclination to change displayed by the clergy, and to adopt a greater piety and purity of life. They were termed by the orthodox party Roscholshiki (Seditionists). Pinkerton (On Russian Sects) identifies them with the Starovertzi.

(6.) The Bezslovestni (the dumb), the name given to a not very numerous sect of the 18th century, whose members, after conversion, became perpetually speechless. Very little is known of their tenets.

(7.) The Ismiye Christiane. SEE MALAKANS.

(8.) The Karabliki. See No. (18) below.

(9.) The Khlistie, or Flagellants.

(10.) The Malakans (q.v.).

(11.) The Martinists (q.v.).

(12.) The Moreshiki.

(13.) The Netovtshins (q.v.).

(14.) The Niconians (q.v.).

(15.) The Njetowschitchini. SEE NETOVTSHINS.

(16.) The Roscholshiki (q.v.).

(17.) The Sabatniki (q.v.).

(18.) The Skoptzi (eunuchs), a name given to this sect because of their practice of self-mutilation, which they supposed to be warranted by Scripture (Mat 19:12). The general characteristics of this sect, even among those who do not adopt this extreme course of action, is one of self-mortification and asceticism. They perform self-imposed penances, such as flagellation, wearing haircloth shirts, and iron chains and crosses. They profess great respect for Peter III, of whom they keep pictures in their houses, in which he is represented with a scarlet handkerchief tied round his right knee (which is supposed to be one of their Masonic signs). They expect him to revisit the earth as the true Messiah, and, having rung the great bell of the Church of the Ascension in Moscow, to summon the elect, and reign over all the true Skoptzi. They are noted for their anxiety to procure converts, and he who gains twelve is dignified with the title of apostle. Their chief peculiarities of practice and doctrine are the rejection of the resurrection of the body, a refusal to observe Sunday, and the substitution of certain rites invented by themselves in lieu of the sacrament of the eucharist. They are a numerous sect in some governments, as that of Orel, comprising whole villages, and they have many adherents among the jewellers and goldsmiths of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and other large towns.

(19.) The Strigolniks. This sect arose in Novgorod at the close of the 14th or early in the 15th century. A Jew named Horie, joined by two Christian priests, Denis and Alexie, and afterwards by an excommunicated deacon named Karp Strigolnik, preached a mixture of Judaism and Christianity, and gained so many followers that a national council was called to suppress him. They regard the payment of money by the clergy to the bishops on ordination as simoniacal, and confession to a priest as unscriptural. Strigolnik himself was thrown into the river and drowned during a riot in Novgorod, but the opposition of his followers to the Russian Church continued for many years after his death.

(20.) The Wjetkaers.

(21.) The Yedinovertzi (Coreligionists). This name was given to some members of the Starovertzi in the reign of Alexander (1801-25), when strong hopes were entertained of regaining them to the orthodox communion. They assume for themselves the name of Blagoslovenni, or “The Blessed.”

For literature, see Dimitri, Hist. of Russian Sects; Farlati, Illyricum Sacrum; Gregoire, Hist. des Sectes Religieuses (Paris, 1814), vol. 4; Haxthausen, Studien uber Russland (Han. 1847); Krazinski, Lectures on Slavonia (Lond. 1869); Mouravieff, Hist. of the Church of Russia (ibid. 1842); Platon, Present State of the Greek Church in Russia (Pinkerton's transl. Edinb. 1814; N.Y. 1815); Strahl, Gesch. der Grundung, etc., der christlichen Lehre in Russland, etc. (Halle, 1830). SEE RUSSIA.

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

             The Russian language, which is understood from Archangel to Astrakhan, admits of but two principal divisions, namely, Great Russian--the literary and official language of the nation, spoken in Moscow and the northern parts of the empire — and Little, or Malo, Russian, which contains many obsolete forms of expression, and is predominant in the south of European Russia, especially towards the east. To this may be added the White, or Polish, Russian, spoken by the common people in parts of Lithuania and in White Russia. The earliest Russian version of the Scriptures was written in White Russian, and in 1517 parts of the Old Test. were printed at Prague, while the Acts and the Epistles appeared at Wilna in 1527. The translator is said to have been Fr. Skorina. At the close of the 17th century another attempt was made to produce a version of the Scriptures in the Great Russian. The promoter of this version was the Lutheran pastor Ernest Glück, of Livonia, who made it from the Old Slavonic text. Unhappily, at the siege of Marienburg, in 1702, the whole of Glück's MSS. were destroyed. In the year 1816 the Russian Bible Society laid before the emperor Alexander some copies of a new version, and he was much struck at perceiving that, while so many barbarous tribes had been thus put in possession of the oracles of God, “his own Russians still remained destitute of the boon mercifully designed to be freely communicated to all.” At his instigation an order was immediately forwarded through the president of the society to the Holy Synod, enjoining the translation of the New Test. into modern Russ. Under the auspices of the Religious Academy of St. Petersburg, the work was undertaken by the archimandrite Philaret, and,  after three years had been devoted to the undertaking, an edition of the Four Gospels was struck off, in parallel columns with the Slavonic text. The preface to the Gospels, which appeared in 1819, was signed by Philaret, Michael, metropolitan of Novgorod, and Seraphim of Moscow. The demand for this work was such that in 1820 the fourth edition of the Gospels was published; in the same year the second edition of the Acts was printed, while the first edition of the entire New Test. did not appear till 1823. As to the order of the books of the New Test., which were reprinted and published by Tauchnitz, of Leipsic, in 1838, and again in London in 1862, it is as follows: Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts; the epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude; Romans, Philemon, Hebrews, Revelation.

Of the Old Test., only the Psalms were translated by the Rev. Dr. Pavsky, of the Cathedral of St. Petersburg, the first Hebrew scholar in the empire. The first edition appeared in 1822, and consisted of 15,000 copies; yet so great was the demand that within the space of two years no less than 100,000 copies left the press. In 1853 Mr. Tauchnitz, of Leipsic, published an edition in Hebrew and Russian. The edition before us, in Russ alone, was published at London in 1862, and we notice that the word “Selah” is always put in brackets; that the number of verses in the different psalms does not agree with the English, but with the Hebrew, as the superscriptions, which are found in the English Bible in small type, are counted as a verse; Psalms 9, 10 are translated according to the Sept. as one, and thus, e.g., the 18th is the 17th Psalm; the 147th Psalm of the Hebrew is divided, as in the Sept., into two — 146, from 1-11, and 147, from 12-20 — and thus the usual number of 150 psalms is gained. The translation of the other books of the Old Test. from the Hebrew proceeded under the direction of the religious academies of St. Petersburg, Moscow, and Kief; and an edition to consist of 10,000 copies of the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, was subsequently undertaken; but in 1826 the Russian Bible Society was suspended by the ukase of the emperor Nicholas. A new translation has of late been issued by the Holy Synod, while the British and Foreign Bible Society also published a version, which is largely circulated ill Russia. See The Bible of Every Land, p. 296 sq.; Dalton, Das Gebet des Herrn in den Sprachen Russlands, p. 37 sq.; Reuss, Geschichte der heiligen Schriften des Neuen Testaments (Brunswick, 1874), § 490; also the Annual Reports of the British and Foreign Bible Society. (B.P.)

## Russniaks (Also Russine And Rutheni)[[@Headword:Russniaks (Also Russine And Rutheni)]]

             the name of a variety of peoples who form a branch of the great Slavic race, and are sharply distinguished from the Muscovites, or Russians proper, by their language and the entire character of their life. They are divided into the Russniaks of Galicia, North Hungary, Podolia, Volhynia, and Lithuania, and are estimated by Schafarik at 13,000,000. They are almost all agriculturists, and, on the whole, rather uncultivated. Before the 17th century they were a free race, but were then subjugated, partly by the Lithuanians, partly by the Poles, and for a long time belonged to the Polish kingdom. Their language has consequently become closely assimilated to the Polish. In earlier times it was a written speech with quite distinctive characteristics, as may be seen from the translation of the Bible published at Ostrog in 1581, and from various statutes and other literary monuments still extant. Recently, printing in the Russniak tongue has been recommenced. The Russniaks belong, for the most part, to the United Greek Church, but in part also to the Non-united. They here serve many old customs peculiar to themselves, and much folk lore, prose and poetic, very like that current in Poland and Servia. This has been collected by Vaclav in his Piesni Polskie i Ruskie (Lemnberg, 1833). Levicki has published a Grammatik der russinischen Sprache fur Deutsche (Przemysl, 1833).

## Russo-Greek Church[[@Headword:Russo-Greek Church]]

             is the community of Christians subject to the emperor of Russia, using the Slavonic liturgy and following the Russian rite. SEE GREEK CHURCH.

1. Orgin. — The early history of the Russian Church is involved in much obscurity; but that Christianity was introduced into Russia previous to the middle of the 9th century must be inferred from a letter of Photius (866) in which he says that the people called Russians had forsaken idolatry, received Christianity, and allowed a bishop to be placed over them (Epistole, ed. Montacaut, p. 58). Its diffusion, however, was very limited. The princess Olga was baptized about the middle of the 10th century, but by no means succeeded in winning over her son Swatoslav and her people to Christianity. Nor was it till the alliance of Vladimir with the court of Byzantium by his marriage with Anne, sister of the emperor Basil II, and his baptism in 988 (when he took the name of Wassily, or Basil), that the  foundation of Christianity can be said to have been regularly laid in Russia. He issued an edict for the destruction of idols and idol temples throughout his dominions; and his subjects were commanded to receive baptism, which they did in very large numbers. Churches were built in all directions, the first of them being dedicated by Vladimir himself. Yaroslav, the next Russian monarch, built convents which he filled with Greek scholars and artists, and many works were translated from Greek into the Slavonic dialects.

2. Government. — At first the Russian Church was under the jurisdiction of Rome, and it seems that as late as the Council of Florence (1439) the adherents of the Roman Church throughout Russia were as numerous as those of the Greek party. Its complete separation from Rome was effected by an archbishop of Kief, named Photius, in the latter part of the same century. For more than a century it continued directly subject to the patriarch of Constantinople; but in 1588 the patriarch Jeremias, being in Russia, held a synod of the Russian bishops and erected the see of Moscow into a patriarchate with jurisdiction over the entire territory. He was also induced in 1589 to consecrate Job, archbishop of Rostow, the first patriarch. This action was afterwards confirmed by a synod held at Constantinople; but, as their junior, the patriarch of Moscow ranked after the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, and Constantinople. This subordination was acquiesced in until the reign of Alexis Michaelowitz, when the patriarch of Moscow, Nikon, refused to acknowledge it further. When Peter the Great became ruler, he saw that his government was, in fact, divided with the clergy and the patriarch. Upon the death of Adrian, in 1700, when the bishops were assembled to choose his successor, Peter entered and broke up the meeting, declaring himself patriarch of the Russian Church. To wean the clergy by degrees from their established rights, he kept the office open for upwards of twenty years, and abolished it in 1721. The permanent administration of Church affairs was placed under the direction of a council, called the “Holy Synod,” or “Permanent Synod,” consisting of archbishop, bishops, and archimandrites, all named by the emperor.

3. Constitution. — Under the direction of this council, a series of official acts and formularies, and catechetical, doctrinal, and disciplinary treatises, was drawn up, by which the whole scheme of the doctrine, discipline, and Church government of the Russian Church was settled in detail, and to which all the clergy, officials, and dignitaries are required to subscribe. The  leading principle of this constitution is the absolute supremacy of the czar, and it has been maintained in substance to the present time. The Holy Synod is considered as one of the great departments of the government, the minister of public worship being ex officio a member. This code was enacted in 1551 and received the name of Stoglar, or a hundred chapters.

4. Doctrine. — As regards doctrine, the Russian Church may be considered as identical with the common body of the Greek Church (q.v.). With that Church it rejects the supremacy of the pope and the double procession of the Holy Ghost. All the great leading characteristics of its discipline, too, are the same; the differences of ceremony being too minute to permit our entering into detail. The discipline as to the marriage of the clergy is the same as that described for the Greek Church; and in carrying out the law which enforces celibacy upon bishops the Russians adopt the same expedient with the Greeks, viz. of selecting the bishops from among the monks, who are celibates by virtue of their vow.

5. Liturgy. — The service of the Russian Church was, at its commencement, borrowed from the Greek Church, according to the books translated by Cyril and Methodius into the Slavic, which to this day is the language of the Church. They translated, however, only the most necessary books, the others being translated into Russian since the time of Yaroslav I. In them were found many mistakes which Cyprian and Photius labored to correct; but, as the metropolitans who succeeded them were Russians, and not well versed in the Greek language, errors again crowded in. Maksim, a monk, was called from Athos in 1506 and ordered to revise the Church books, and soon discovered that, by the numerous errors of translation, even the articles of the Creed had been changed in meaning. His work displeasing some, they brought false charges against him, and he was sent to a monastery, deprived of the sacraments, and, after thirty years of suffering, died in 1556. When Nikon became patriarch, he undertook the correction of the books, and sent to the East the monk Arseny Suchanow for the purpose of collecting ancient Greek and Slavic MSS. This resulted in the correction of the Scriptures and the introduction of the corrected version in the place of the old ones. The Church service itself underwent no change except the addition of some holy days in honor of new saints.

6. Clergy. — There are three ranks of episcopacy in the Church — metropolitans, archbishops, and bishops, who each have a peculiar dress. These three classes are called by the general name of archirei, or prelates;  next to them in degree are the archimandrites and hegoumeni, or abbots and priors of the monasteries; and last and lowest of all are the monks, who have been either ordained for the priestly office, for the second degree, or diaconate, or are mere lay brothers without having taken the vow. The clergy are divided into two classes, regular and secular. The first are alone entitled to the highest dignities of the Church, are ordained under much stricter vows than the others, and are termed the black clergy from their wearing a black robe. The secular clergy have a brown and blue robe, and are termed the white clergy. Although special provision was made for the Roman Catholics in Poland by the erection of an archbishopric in communion with Rome at Mohilev in 1783, and still later arrangements, yet the whole policy of the Russian government is opposed to the free exercise of worship by its subjects. According to the Statistical Year-book of the Russian Empire for 1871, the orthodox adherents of the Russian Church exceeded 53,000,000, the clergy of all ranks numbering about 215,000. Religious sects abound, who all go by the general name of Raskolniks (q.v.). See King, Travels in Russia; Krazinski, Religious History of the Slavonic Nations; Mouravieff, History of the Church in Russia; Ricaut, History of Greek and Armenian Churches (1694). SEE RUSSIA.

## Rust[[@Headword:Rust]]

             (βρῶσις, ἰός) occurs as the translation of two different Greek words in Mat 6:19-20 and Jam 5:3. In the former passage the word βρῶσις, which is joined with σής, “moth,” has by some been understood to denote the larva of some moth injurious to corn, as the Tinea granella (see Stainton, Insecta Britan. 3, 30). The Hebrew עָשׁ(Isa 1:9) is rendered βρῶσις by Aquila (comp. also Epist. Jer 5:12, ἀπὸ ἰου καὶ βρωμάτων, “from rust and moths;” A.V. Bar. 6, 12). Scultetus (Exerc. Evang. 2, 35; Crit. Sac. vol. 6) believes that the words σὴς καὶ βρῶσις are a hendiadys for σὴς βρώσκων. The word can scarcely be taken to signify “rust,” for which there is another term, ἰός, which is used by James to express rather the “tarnish” which overspreads silver than “rust,” by which name we now understand “oxide of iron.” βρῶσις is no doubt intended to have reference, in a general sense, to any corrupting and destroying substance that may attack treasures of any kind which have long been suffered to remain undisturbed. The allusion of James is to the corroding nature of ἰός on metals. Scultetus correctly observes, “Erugine  deformantur quidem, sed non corrumpuntur nummi;” but though this is strictly speaking, true, the ancients, just as ourselves in common parlance, spoke of the corroding nature of “rust” (comp. Hammond, Annotat. in Mat 6:19). — Smith. Moreover, various writers agree that the gold and silver coins of antiquity were much more liable to corrosion than those of the present, being much more extensively adulterated with alloys.

The word translated “scum” (חֶלְאָה, chelah) in Eze 24:6; Eze 24:11-12 means the rust or corrosion of the pot of brass (or rather copper) which typified Jerusalem Copper is more liable to corrosion than the other metals, each of which has its own dissolvent; but copper is acted upon by all those dissolvents, and the corrosion of the copper pot symbolizes the aptitude of Jerusalem to corruptions, which, being shown by Ezekiel to be removed only by the agency of fire, was a type of the awful punishments and fiery purgation awaiting Jerusalem.

## Rust, George[[@Headword:Rust, George]]

             a learned English divine, was a native of Cambridge, and educated at Christ's College. On the Restoration, Jeremy Taylor, foreseeing the vacancy in the deanery of Connor, in Ireland, sent to Cambridge to secure a man suitable for that position. Dr. Rust was chosen, and he landed at Dublin about August, 1661. He was preferred to the deanery as soon as it was void, and in 1662 to the rectory of the island of Magee. The bishop dying (Aug. 13, 1667), the bishopric was divided, and Dr. Rust became bishop of Dromore, which position he held until his death, in December, 1670. He wrote, A Letter of Resolution concerning Origen, etc. (Lond. 1661, 4to): — Discourse of Truth, besides several Sermons.

## Rust, Isaac[[@Headword:Rust, Isaac]]

             a German doctor of theology and member of the consistory in Speyer, was born in 1796 at Mussbach, in Bavaria. In 1820 he was minister in Ungstein, in 1827 he was appointed minister of the French Reformed Church at Erlangen, in 1847 he was called to Munich, and was finally made pastor in Speyer, where he died in 1862. He wrote, Philosophie und Christenthum, oder Wissen und Glauben (Mannheim, 1833, 2d ed.): — Predigten uber ausgewahlte Texte (Erlangen, 1830): — Stimnmen der Reformation u. der Reformatoren an die Fürsten u. Volker dieser Zeit (ibid. 1831): De Blasio Pascale Veritatis et Divinitatis Religionis Christianoe Vindioe (ibid. 1833), pt. 1, 2: — Jesus Christus gestern u. heute u. derselbe auch in  Ewigkeit (Munich, 1850), sermons. See Winer, Handbuch der theol. Literatur, 1, 25, 411; 2, 103, 405, 744; Zuchold, Bibl. Theol. p. 1101. (B.P.)

## Rustic work[[@Headword:Rustic work]]

             ashlar masonry, the joints of which are worked with grooves, or channels, to render them conspicuous. Sometimes the whole of the joints are worked in this way, and sometimes only the horizontal ones. The grooves are either molded or plain, and are formed in several different ways. The surface of the work is sometimes left, or purposely made, rough, but at the present day it is usually made even. Rustic work was never employed in mediaeval buildings, but it is said to have had its origin in the buildings of Augustus and Claudius at Rome. — Parker, Gloss. of Architect. s.v.

## Ruter, Calvin W.[[@Headword:Ruter, Calvin W.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Bradford, Orange Co., Vt., March 15, 1794. He was received into the Ohio Conference in 1817, and in 1820 was transferred to the Missouri Conference. When the Indiana Conference was formed in 1832, Mr. Ruter was chosen its secretary. He took deep interest in founding the Indiana Asbury University, and was for many years one of its trustees. He took a superannuated relation in 1855, and died June 11, 1859. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1859, p. 274.

## Ruter, Martin, D.D.[[@Headword:Ruter, Martin, D.D.]]

             a minister and instructor of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Charlton, Mass., April 3, 1785. In 1801 he was admitted into the New York Conference, and in 1818 was appointed in charge of the Newmarket Wesleyan Academy, afterwards removed to Wilbraham. In 1828 he became president of Augusta College, where he remained until August, 1832. In 1834 he accepted the position of president of Allegheny College, and held it until 1837, when he was appointed superintendent of the Texas mission, where he formed societies, secured the building of churches, and laid out the greater part of the state in circuits. His death took place May 16, 1838. He published a Hebrew Grammar: — a History of Martyrs:-- an  Ecclesiastical History: — Sermons: — and Letters. See Simpson, Cyclop. of Methodism, s.v.

## Rutgers, Henry[[@Headword:Rutgers, Henry]]

             a distinguished Revolutionary patriot, philanthropist, and Christian of New York city, who was severely wounded while serving as an officer in the war of independence, and always stood high in the confidence of the state and general governments, was born in 1746. Possessed of ample wealth, he was noted for his unceasing munificence to various objects of humane and religious charity. He was one of the first managers of the American Bible Society, and was prominent in all the great benevolent movements of his time. By a timely act of liberality, he was to a large degree instrumental in the revival of Queen's College, which since that date (1825) has been honored with his venerated name as Rutgers College. In the public movements of his denomination (the Dutch Reformed), he was “a prince and a great man, whose praise is in all the churches.” He died Feb. 17, 1830, in the full confidence and triumph of Christian hope. His last words were “Home! home!” (W.J.R.T.)

## Ruth[[@Headword:Ruth]]

             (Heb. Ruth, רוּת, probably for רְעוּת, and this for רִעְיָה, a female friend; Sept. and New Test., ῾Ρούθ; Josephus, ῾Ρούθη, Ant. 5, 9, 1), a Moabitess, the wife, first, of Mahlon, secondly of Boaz, and by him mother of Obed, the ancestress of David and of Christ, and one of the four women (Tamar, Rahab, and Uriah's wife being the other three) who are named by Matthew in the genealogy of Christ. She thus came into intimate relation with the stock of Israel, and her history is given in one of the books of the sacred canon which bears her name. The narrative that brings her into the range of inspired story is constructed with idyllic simplicity and pathos, and forms a pleasant relief to the sombre and repulsive shades of the picture which the reader has just been contemplating in the later annals of the Judges. It is the domestic history of a family compelled, by the urgency of a famine, to abandon the land of Canaan, and seek an asylum in the territories of Moab. Elimelech, the head of the emigrating household, dies in the land of his sojourn, where his two surviving sons “took them wives of the women of Moab; the name of the one was Orpah, and the name of the other Ruth.” On the death of the sons, the widowed parent resolving to return to her country and kindred, the filial affection of the daughters-in-law is put to a  severe test, and Ruth determines at all hazards to accompany Naomi. “Whither thou goest, I will go, and where thou lodgest, I will lodge; thy people shall be my people, and thy God my God: where thou diest, I will die, and there will I be buried: the Lord do so to me, and more also, if aught but death part thee and me,” was the expression of the unalterable attachment of the young Moabitish widow to the mother, to the land, and to the religion of her lost husband. They arrived at Bethlehem just at the beginning of barley harvest, and Ruth, going out to glean for the support of her mother-in-law and herself, chanced to go into the field of Boaz, a wealthy man, the near kinsman of her father-in-law, Elimelech. The story of her virtues and her kindness and fidelity to her mother-in-law, and her preference for the land of her husband's birth, had gone before her; and immediately upon learning who the strange young woman was, Boaz treated her with the utmost kindness and respect, and sent her home laden with corn which she had gleaned. Boaz had bidden her return from day to day, and directed his servants to give her a courteous welcome. An omen so propitious could not but be regarded as a special encouragement to both, and Naomi therefore counselled Ruth to seek an opportunity for intimating to Boaz the claim she had upon him as the nearest kinsman of her deceased husband. A stratagem, which in other circumstances would have been of very doubtful propriety, was adopted for compassing this object; and though Boaz entertained the proposal favorably, yet he replied that there was another person more nearly related to the family than himself, whose title must first be disposed of. Without delay he applied himself to ascertain whether the kinsman in question was inclined to assert his right — a right which extended to a purchase of the ransom (at the Jubilee) of Elimelech's estate. Finding him indisposed to the measure, he obtained from him a release, ratified according to the legal forms of the time, and next proceeded himself to redeem the patrimony of Elimelech, and finally, with all due solemnity, took Ruth to be his wife, amid the blessings and congratulations of their neighbors. As a singular example of virtue and piety in a rude age and among an idolatrous people; as one of the first fruits of the Gentile harvest gathered into the Church; as the heroine of a story of exquisite beauty and simplicity; as illustrating in her history the workings of Divine Providence, and the truth of the saying that “the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous;” and for the many interesting revelations of ancient domestic and social customs which are associated with her story, Ruth has always held a foremost place among the Scripture characters. Augustine has a curious speculation on the relative blessedness  of Ruth, twice married, and by her second marriage becoming the ancestress of Christ, and Anna remaining constant in her widowhood (De Bono Viduit.). Jerome observes that we can measure the greatness of Ruth's virtue by the greatness of her reward — “Ex ejus semine Christus oritur” (Epist. xxii ad Paulam).

The period in which the famine above spoken of occurred is a greatly disputed point among commentators. The opinion of Usher, which assigns it to the age of Gideon (B.C. cir. 1360), and which is a mean between the dates fixed upon by others, carries with it the greatest probability. The oppression of the Midianites, mentioned in Jdg 6:3-6, which was productive of a famine, and from which Gideon was instrumental in delivering his people, wasted the land and destroyed its increase, “till thou come unto Gaza;” and this embraced the region in which Judah and Bethlehem were situated. The territory of Judah was also adjacent to Moab, and a removal thither was easy and natural. The scourge of Midian endured, moreover, for seven years; and at the expiration of ten years after the deliverance by Gideon was fully consummated, Naomi reemigrated to her native land (see Henstenberg, Pentat. 2, 92, note). Ruth seems in the genealogy of David to have been his great-grandmother; but as Boaz is in the same list set down as the grandson of Nahshon, who flourished at the Exode, we are forced to suppose the omission of some nine generations, which chronologers insert according to their respective schemes. SEE GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST.

## Ruth, Book Of[[@Headword:Ruth, Book Of]]

             This book is inserted in the canon, according to the English arrangement and that of the Sept., between the book of Judges and the books of Samuel, as a sequel to the former and an introduction to the latter. Among the ancient Jews it was added to the book of Judges, because they supposed that the transactions which it relates happened in the time of the judges of Israel (Jdg 1:1). Several of the ancient fathers, moreover, make but one book of Judges and Ruth. In the Hebrew Bible it stands among the Kethubim, or Hagiographa. But the modern Jews commonly place, after the Pentateuch, the five Megilloth (q.v.) —

1. The Song of Solomon;

2. Ruth;

3. The Lamentations of Jeremiah;

4. Ecclesiastes;

5. Esther.

Sometimes Ruth is placed the first of these, sometimes the second, and sometimes the fifth.

1. The true date and authorship of the book are alike unknown, though the current of tradition is in favor of Samuel as the writer (Talmud, Baba Bathra, 14, 2). That it was written at a time considerably remote from the events it records would appear from the passage in Rth 4:7, which explains a custom referred to as having been “the manner in former time in Israel, concerning redeeming and concerning changing” (comp. Deu 25:9). That it was written, also, at least as late as the establishment of David's house upon the throne appears from the concluding verse, “And Obed begat Jesse, and Jesse begat David.” The expression, moreover (Deu 1:1), “when the judges ruled,” marking the period of the occurrence of the events, indicates, no doubt, that in the writer's days kings had already begun to reign. Add to this what critics have considered as certain Chaldaisms with which the language is interspersed, denoting its composition at a period considerably later than that of the events themselves. Thus Eichhorn finds a Chaldaism or Syriasm in the use of א for ה in מָרָא though the same form occurs elsewhere. He adverts also to the existence of a superfluous Yod in שׁמתי and ירדתי (Rth 3:3) and in שׁבבתי; (Rth 3:4). As, however, the language is in other respects, in the main, pure, these few Chaldaisms may have arisen from a slight error of the copyists, and therefore can scarcely be alleged as having any special bearing on the eras of the document. The same remark is to be made of certain idiomatic phrases and forms of expression which occur elsewhere only in the books of Samuel and of Kings, as, “The Lord do so to me, and more also” (Rth 1:17; comp. 1Sa 3:17; 1Sa 14:44; 1Sa 20:23; 2Sa 3:9; 2Sa 3:35; 2Sa 19:13; 1Ki 2:23; 1Ki 19:2; 1Ki 20:10; 2Ki 6:31); “I have discovered to your ear,” for “I have told you” (Rth 4:4; comp. 1Sa 20:2; 2Sa 7:27).

2. The canonical authority of Ruth has never been questioned, a sufficient confirmation of it being found in the fact that Ruth, the Moabitess, comes into the genealogy of the Savior, as distinctly given by the evangelist (Mat 1:6). The principal difficulty in regard to the book arises, however, from this very genealogy, in which it is stated that Boaz, who was the husband of Ruth. and the great-grandfather of David, was the son  of Salmon by Rahab. Now, if by Rahab we suppose to be meant, as is usually understood, Rahab the harlot, who protected the spies, it is not easy to conceive that only three persons — Boaz, Obed, and Jesse — should have intervened between her and David, a period of nearly four hundred years. The solution of Usher is not probable, that the ancestors of David, as persons of pre-eminent piety, were favored with extraordinary longevity. It may be that the sacred writers have mentioned in the genealogy only such names as were distinguished and known among the Jews. But a more reasonable explanation is that some names are omitted, as we know is elsewhere the case in the same genealogy. (See above.)

3. The leading scope of the book has been variously understood by different commentators. Umbreit (Ueber Geist und Zweck des Buches Ruth, in Theol. Stud. und Krit. for 1834, p. 308) thinks it was written with the specific moral design of showing how even a stranger, and that of the hated Moabitish stock, might be sufficiently noble to become the mother of the great king David, because she placed her reliance on the God of Israel. Bertholtt regards the history as a pure fiction, designed to recommend the duty of a man to marry his kinswoman; while Eichhorn conceives that it was composed mainly in honor of the house of David, though it does not conceal the poverty of the family. The more probable design we think to be to preintimate, by the recorded adoption of a Gentile woman into the family from which Christ was to derive his origin, the final reception of the Gentile nations into the true Church, as fellow heirs of the salvation of the Gospel. The moral lessons which it incidentally teaches are of the most interesting and touching character: that private families are as much the objects of divine regard as the houses of princes; that the present life is a life of calamitous changes; that a devout trust in an overruling Providence will never fail of its reward; and that no condition, however adverse or afflicted, is absolutely hopeless, are truths that were never more strikingly illustrated than in the brief and simple narrative before us.

4. The separate commentaries on the entire book are not very numerous. Of the Church fathers we mention the following: Origen, Fragmentum (in Opp. 2, 478 sq.); Theodoret, Qucestiones (in Opp. 1, 1); Isidore, Commentaria (in Opp.); Bede, Qucestiones (in Opp. 8); Raban, Commentaria (in Opp.); also Irimpertus, Expositio (in Pez, Thesaur. 4, 1, 141 sq.). By modern expositors there are the following: Bafiolas, פֵּרוּשׁ [includ. Song of Solomon etc.] (finished in 1329; pub. by Markaria, Riva di  Trento, 1560, 4to; also in Frankfurter's Rabbin. Bible); Bertinoro, פֵּרוּשׁ (Cracov. s. a. 4to; also in his works, Ven. 1585); Sal. Isaak, פֵּרוּשׁ(Salon. 1b51, 4to); Alkabaz, שֹׁרֶשׁ יַשִׁי(Const. 1561; Lubl. 1597, 4to); Mercer, Versio Syriaca cum Scholiis (Par. 1564, 4to); Isaak ben-Joseph, פֵּרוּשׁ(Sabbionetta, 1551, 8vo; Mantua, 1565, 16mo); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1571, 1572, 8vo); Feuardent, Commentaria (Par. 1582; Antw. 1585, 4to); Lavater, Homilioe (Heidelb. 1586, 8vo; also in English, Lond. 1601, 8vo); De Celada, Commentarii (Lugd. 1594, 1651, fol.); Cuper, Commentarius [includ. Tobit, etc.] (Mogunt. 1600, 4to); Topsell, Commentarius (Lond. 1601, 8vo); also Lectures (ibid. 1613, 8vo); Alscheich, עֵינֵי משֶׁה(Ven. 1601, 4to); Manera, Commentarius (ibid. 1604, 4to); Heidenreich, Expositio [includ. Tobit] (Jen. 1608, 8vo); Serrarius, Explanatio [includ. Judges] (Mogunt. 1609, fol.); Bernard, Commentary (Lond. 1628, 4to); Sanctius, Commentarii [includ. other books] (Lugd. 1628, fol.); Bonfiere, Commentarius [includ. Joshua and Judges] (Par. 1631, 1659, fol.); Crommius, Commentarii [includ. Judges, etc.] (Lovan. 1631, 4to); Drusits, Commentarius (Amst. 1632, 4to); Schleupner, Ezpositio (Norib. 1632, 8vo); D'Acosta, Commentarius (Lugd. 1641, fol.); Fuller, Commentary (Lond. 1654, 1868, 8vo); Osiander, Commentarius (Tüb. 1682, fol.); Crucius, Verklaaring (Haarlem, 1691, 4to); Schmid, Adnotationes (Argent. 1696, 4to); Carpzov, Disputationes [to 2, 10] (Lips. 1703, 4to [Rabbinic]); Werner, Interpretatio (Hamb. 1711, 4to); Outhof, Verklaaring (Amst. 1711, 4to); Moldenhauer, Erlauterung [includ. Joshua and Judges] (Quedl. 1774, 4to); MacGowan, Discourse (Lond. 1781, 8vo); Asulat, שְׂמְחִת הָרְגֵל(Legh. 1782, 4to); Wolfssohn, בְּאוּר. (Berl. 1788, 8vo); Lawson, Lectures (Edinb. 1805, 12mo; Phila. 1870, 8vo); Dereser, Erklärung (Fr.- a.-M. 1806, 8vo); Riegler, Anmerk. (Wirzb. 1812, 8vo ); Paur, Bearbeitung (Leips. 1815, 8vo); Macartney, Observations (Lond. 1841, 8vo); Blücher, רוּת. (Lemb. 1843, 8vo); Philpot, Lectures (Lond. 1854, 18mo); Tyng, History (N.Y. 1855; Lond. 1856, 8vo); Metzger, Interpretatio (Tüb. 1856, 4to); Roordam, Versio Syr.-Hexapl. Greece cum Notis (Havl. 1859 sq., 4to); Wright, Commentary (Lond. 1864, 8vo). SEE OLD TESTAMENT.

## Ruthenian Version Of The Holy Scriptures[[@Headword:Ruthenian Version Of The Holy Scriptures]]

             This version, which is of a very recent date, has been prepared for the Ruthenians in Austria, the majority of whom belong to the Orthodox Greek  Church, by which the reading of the Holy Scriptures has never been prohibited. In the year 1875 the Gospel according to St. Luke, as prepared by Mr. Kobylanski, was printed, and thus the Word of God was given to the Ruthenian people in their own tongue for the first time. Encouraged by the success of the Ruthenian Gospel of St. Luke, the British and Foreign Bible Society, in the year 1877, resolved to print the Gospel of St. John also, as translated by Mr. Kobylanski, whose translation Prof. Micklovich has critically examined and declared to be a complete success. See the Annual Reports of the Brit. and For. Bible Soc. 1875, p. 46; 1877, p. 51. (B.P.)

## Rutherford, Samuel[[@Headword:Rutherford, Samuel]]

             a Scottish minister and Covenanter, was born in the parish of Nisbet, Roxburghshire, about 1600. He was ordained minister of Anworth in 1627, but was silenced in 1636 for preaching against the articles of Perth. During the Rebellion he was a zealous defender of Presbyterianism, and in 1639 was appointed professor of divinity in the New College, St. Andrew's. He was commissioner to the assembly of divines at Westminster, 1643-47; principal of New College, St. Andrew's, 1649; and shortly after was raised to the rectorship. He died in 1661. Besides other works, he was the author of Exercitationes Apologeticoe pro Divina Gratia, etc. (Amst. 1636, 8vo; Francf. 1651, 1660, 8vo): — Plea for Paul's Presbytrie in Scotland (Lond. 1642): — Due Rights of Presbyteries (1644, 1645, 4to): — Tryal and Triumph of Faith (1645, 4to; Edinb. 1845, 12mo), twenty-seven sermons: — Divine Right of Church Government, etc. (Lond. 1646, 4to): — Christ's Dying, etc. (1647, 4to), sermons: — Survey of the Spiritual Antichrist (ibid. 1648, 2 parts, 4to): — A Free Disputation against Pretended Liberty of Conscience (1649, 4to): Disputatio Scholastica de Divina Providentia, etc. (Edinb. 1649, 1650, 4to): — Life of Grace (1659, 4to):--Joshua Redivivus, or (352) Religious Letters (1664, 2 parts, 12mo; 1671, 8vo; with his dying words and Mr. M'Ward's preface, Glasg. 1765, 8vo; 9th ed. with biographical sketches, edited by Rev. A. Bonar, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo): — A Garden of Spices: — extracts from above by Rev. L.R. Dunn (Cincinnati, 1869, 12mo). See Murray, Life, etc.; Scots Worthies; Livingston, Characteristics; Watt, Bibl. Brit.; Thompson, Biog. Dict. of Eminent Scotsmen; Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Rutherforth, Thomas[[@Headword:Rutherforth, Thomas]]

             an English philosopher and divine, was born in Cambridgeshire, Oct. 13, 1712. He was educated at St. John's, Cambridge, taking his degree of A.B. in 1729 and A.M. in 1733. He was chosen fellow and made B.D. in 1740. Two years after, he was chosen fellow of the Royal Society, and in 1745 was appointed professor of divinity, took his degree of D.D, and was appointed chaplain to the Prince of Wales. He was afterwards rector of Barrow, in Suffolk; Shenstone, in Essex; Barley, in Hertfordshire; and in 1752 archdeacon of Essex. He died Oct. 5, 1771, and was buried in the church at Barley. He was the author of Ordo Institutionum Physicarum, etc. (Camb. 1743, 4to): — Essay on the Nature and Obligations of Virtue (Lond. 1744, 8vo): — System of Natural Philosophy (Camb. 1748, 2 vols. 4to): — Credibility of Miracles Defended (1751, 8vo): — Institutes of Natural Law (Lond. 1754-56, 2 vols. 8vo; 2d American ed. Baltimore, 1832), lectures read in St. John's College, Cambridge: — also Letters, Sermons, etc. See Hutton, Dict.; Nichol, Lit. Anecdotes; Watt, Bibl. Brit.

## Rutherglen Declaration[[@Headword:Rutherglen Declaration]]

             the name given to a protesting declaration of an armed body of Covenanters who, in 1679, assembled in this old burgh, burned some obnoxious acts of Parliament, and affixed a copy of their protest to the market cross. Claverhouse was sent, May 31, from Glasgow in search of the party; the battle of Drumclog was fought, and the royalist forces were routed. At the battle of Bothwell Bridge, Sunday, June 22, the Covenanters were defeated and twelve hundred prisoners taken.

## Ruthrauff, John F.[[@Headword:Ruthrauff, John F.]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Northampton County, Pa., Jan. 14, 1764, and began his theological studies with Rev. Jacob Goering in York, 1790. He began to preach in 1793, and had charge of several churches in York County and in Carlisle until June, 1795, when he accepted a call from the Green Castle congregation and several others, in some of which he labored upwards of forty years. His charge embraced M'Connelsburg, London, Mercersburg, Waynesboro, Quincy, Smoketown, Jacob's Church, and several in Washington County, Md. He continued his labors until the year before his death, which occurred Dec. 18, 1837. He was a man of strong mental qualities; a fluent, animated, and instructive preacher; and the  possessor of substantial Christian excellence. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 104.

## Ruthrauff, Jonathan[[@Headword:Ruthrauff, Jonathan]]

             a Lutheran minister, was born in Greencastle, Franklin Co., Pa., Aug. 16, 1801, and was son of the preceding. He entered Washington College, Pa., and in 1822 commenced his theological studies under the direction of Rev. Benjamin Kurtz, Hagerstown, Md., and continued them under Rev. Dr. Lochiman. He was licensed to preach at Reading, Pa., in 1825, and served as itinerant missionary until Feb. 25, 1827, when he accepted a call from the united churches of Lewistown and vicinity. In 1829 he accepted a call from Hanover, where he labored for eight years. In December, 1837, he assumed charge of the Church at Lebanon, Pa., which he served with great fidelity until 1849, when he was prostrated by disease, which terminated his life, July 23, 1850. Mr. Ruthrauff was of a kind and genial nature; his preaching, which was in both German and English, was eminently practical and pungent. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 9, 175.

## Ruthven, James[[@Headword:Ruthven, James]]

             a noted ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, Dec. 15, 1783. His father removed to the United States and settled in the city of New York, and attended the ministry of the Rev. John Mason, D.D., of the Scotch Church. In the sixth year of his age James witnessed the inauguration of Washington with indescribable emotions. In 1812 he was ordained a deacon and subsequently an elder in Dr. Mason's church, which was then in Murray Street. He removed in 1842 to Bridgeport, Conn., where his influence was of great value, and returned to New York after an absence of eight years. With him religion was an all- pervading spirit, giving warmth and glow and purity and hope in every experience. A distinguished minister of another Church said of him: “Few persons whom I have ever known have more deeply impressed me with their absolute excellence, their entire, thorough, and beautifully consistent character.” And this character he maintained unblemished for more than half a century. The ripeness and richness of his Biblical piety shone conspicuously in the social meetings, in the community, at the bed of sickness, everywhere. He loved the Church, honored the ministry, consecrated all his wealth to God, and as an almoner of the divine bounty scattered blessings far and wide. For him, “to live was Christ,” and for him,  “to die was eternal gain.” The last words he uttered were, “Dying, and, behold, we live!” He died Nov. 25, 1855. (W.P.S.)

## Rutledge, Francis Huger, D.D[[@Headword:Rutledge, Francis Huger, D.D]]

             a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a native of South Carolina, and a son of chancellor Hugh Rutledge, graduated from Yale College in 1820, and was for some time rector of St. John's Parish, Tallahassee, Fla. He was consecrated bishop of Florida, October 15, 1851, in St. Paul's Church, Augusta, Georgia, and died at Tallahassee, November 6, 1866,  aged sixty-eight years. See Amer. Quar. Church Rev. January 1867, page 646.

## Rutledge, George[[@Headword:Rutledge, George]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Augusta County, Va., Nov. 11, 1811. He professed conversion and joined the Church when twenty years of age. In 1835 he was admitted on trial into the Baltimore Conference, and was immediately transferred to the Illinois Conference. He served as presiding elder on six different districts, and was three times delegate to the General Conference. His death occurred Sept. 7, 1871. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1871, p. 212.

## Ruttenstock, Jacob, Dr.[[@Headword:Ruttenstock, Jacob, Dr.]]

             provost and Lateran abbot at Klosterneuburg, in Austria, was born at Vienna, Feb. 10, 1776, and entered the Augustinian convent at Klosterneuburg, Oct. 6, 1795, completing his theological studies partly in the convent and partly at the University of Vienna. He took vows March 30, 1800, and on Sept. 8 of the same year was consecrated to the priesthood. He devoted himself specially to the cure of souls, but steadily employed his leisure hours in the prosecution of theological studies. He was accordingly appointed professor of Church history and canon law in the institute for theological tutors connected with his convent, and in December, 1809, he was made a temporary supply of the chair of Church history at Vienna. In 1811 he became pastor of Klosterneuburg and director of its principal school, but was almost immediately transferred to the high school at Vienna, where he became ordinary professor of Church history in 1813, and continued during nineteen years to approve himself as a patient inquirer, a thorough scholar, and a capable instructor. The text book entitled Institutiones Historioe Ecclesiasticoe N.T. (Vienna, 1832- 34), in three volumes, and extending to the year 1517, is the only monument of this period of his life that is preserved. He was chosen provost of Klosterneuburg, June 8, 1830, and in that capacity rendered valuable services in completing the convent and adorning the cathedral, etc. In 1832 the emperor Francis I appointed Ruttenstock a councillor of state, director of gymnasial studies in the hereditary states of Austria, etc. In 1842 he received the cross of the Order of Knights of Leopold. He died June 29, 1844, in the convent of Klosterneuburg. It remains to be added that several of Ruttenstock's sermons were published, and that he ranked,  wherever known, as an eminent pulpit orator. See Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. s.v.

## Rutz, Franz Georg Christoph[[@Headword:Rutz, Franz Georg Christoph]]

             a Lutheran theologian, was born at Ratzeburg, October 22, 1733. He studied at Rostock. In 1762 he was preacher of the Lutheran Church at Amsterdam, in 1764 was called to Breda, and in 1775 accepted a call to the Hague. Rutz died December 31, 1802, leaving, Non Placet Nobis Orthodoxia sine Pietate, nec Pietas sine Orthodoxia (Amsterdam, 1777): — Exegetische und kritische Briefe (1779): — Kleine Bydragen tot de deistische Letterkunde (Hague, 1782): — Apologie van het Leeraarampt (1784), etc. See Doring, Die gelehrten Theologen Deutschlands, s.v. (B.P.)

## Ruysbroeck (Or Rusbroek), Jean De[[@Headword:Ruysbroeck (Or Rusbroek), Jean De]]

             the most noted of mystics in the Netherlands, was born in A.D. 1293 at Ruysbroeck, near Brussels, and was educated in the latter city under the direction of an Augustinian prebendary who was his relative. His fondness for solitude and day dreams prevented him from making solid progress, however. His Latin was imperfect, though it is clear that he became acquainted with the earlier mystical writings. He probably did not read the writings of Neo-Platonists, but was certainly not unacquainted with those of the Areopagite. His works suggest the thought that the writings of master Eckart (died 1328), with whom Ruysbroeck was contemporary for thirty-five years, exercised influence over our author's mind. Rulvsbroeck became vicar of the Church of St. Gudula at Brussels, where he lived in strict asceticism, enjoying the society of persons who had devoted themselves to a contemplative life, composing books and exercising benevolence. He contended against the sins of the day, and labored to promote reforms. It is said that Tauler once visited him, attracted by the fame of his sanctity. At the age of sixty he renounced the secular priesthood and entered the new Augustinian convent Gronendal, in the forest of Soigny, near Brussels, becoming its first prior, and there he died in 1381. His life at once became the subject of legendary tales. The name Doctor Ecstaticus was early conferred on him.

The chief of his mystical writings are, The Ornament of Spiritual Marriage (Lat. by Gerh. Groot, Ornatus Spiritualis Desponsionis, MS. at Strasburg; by another translator, and published by Faber Stapulensis [Paris, 1512], De Ornatu Spirit. Nuptiarum, etc.; also in French, Toulouse, 1619; and in Flemish, ‘J Cieraet der gheestclyeke Bruyloft, Brussels, 1624): — Speculum AEternoe Salutis: — De Calculo, an interpretation of the calculus candidus, Rev 2:17 : — Samuel, sive de Alta Contemplatione. The other works of Ruysbroeck contain but little more than repetitions of the thoughts expressed in those here mentioned. He wrote in his native language, and rendered to that dialect the same service which accrued to the High German from its use by the mystics of the section where it prevailed. He is still regarded in Holland as “the best prose writer of the Netherlands in the Middle Ages.” His style is characterized by great precision of statement, which becomes impaired, however, whenever  his imagination soars, as it often does, to transcendental regions too sublimated for language to describe. His works were accessible until lately only in Latin editions (by Surius, Cologne, 1549, 1552, 1609 [the best], 1692, fol.), or in manuscripts scattered through different libraries in Belgium and Holland. Four of the more important works were published in their original tongue, with prefaces by Ullmann (Hanover, 1848). No complete edition has as yet been undertaken (see Moll, )e Boekerij van het S. Barbara-Klooster te Delft [Amst. 1857, 4to], p. 41).

Ruysbroeck's mysticism begins with God, descends to man, and returns to God again, in the aim to make man one with God. God is a simple unity, the essence above all being, the immovable, and yet the moving, cause of all existences. The Son is the wisdom, the uncreated image of the Father; the Holy Spirit the love which proceeds from both the Father and the Son, and unites them to each other. Creatures preexisted in God, in thought; and, as being in God, were God to that extent. Fallen man can only be restored through grace, which elevates him above the conditions of nature. Three stages are to be distinguished: the active, or operative; the subjective, or emotional; and the contemplative life. The first proceeds to conquer sin, and draw near to God through good works; the second consists in introspection, to which ascetic practices may be an aid, and which becomes indifferent to all that is not God. The soul is embraced and penetrated by the Spirit of God, and revels in visions and ecstasies. Higher still is the contemplative state (vita vitalis), which is an immediate knowing and possessing of God, leaving no remains of individuality in the consciousness, and con, centrating every energy on the contemplation of the eternal and absolute Being. This life is still the gift of grace, and has its essence in the unifying of the soul with God, so that he alone shall work. The soul is led on from glory to glory, until it becomes conscious of its essential unity in God.

Ruysbroeck was constantly desirous of preserving the distinction between the uncreated and created spirits. In the unifying of the soul with God he does not assert an identification of personality, but merely a cessation of the difference in thought and desire, and a giving up of the independence of the creature. His language was often so strong, however, and his thought often so sublimated, that more cautious thinkers found serious cause to charge his writings with pantheism. This was true of Gerson (Opp. vol. 1, pt. 1, p. 59 sq.). Few mystics have ascended to the empyrean where Ruysbroeck so constantly dwelt; and the endeavor to compress into forms  of speech the visions seen in a state where all clear and real apprehension is at an end occasioned the fault of indefiniteness with which his writings must be charged. His influence over theological and philosophical thought was not so great as that exercised by Eckart and Tauler, and was chiefly limited to his immediate surroundings. The Brotherhood of the Common Life (q.v.) was founded by Gerhard Groot, one of Ruysbroeck's pupils, and its first inception may perhaps be traced back to Ruysbroeck himself — a proof that he was not wholly indifferent to the conditions of practical life.

See Engelhardt, Richard v. St. Victor u. J. Ruysbroeck (Erlang. 1838); Ullmann, Reformatoren vor der Reformation, 2, 35 sq.; Schmidt, Etudes sur le Mysticisme Allemand au 14me Siecle, in Memoires de l'Academie des Sciences Morales (1847); Noack, Die christliche Mystik, 1, 147 sq.; Bohringer, Deutsche Mystiker d. 14ten u. 15ten Jahrhunderts, p. 462 sq.

## Ruysbroek (Or Rubruquis), Willem De[[@Headword:Ruysbroek (Or Rubruquis), Willem De]]

             a mediaeval traveller and missionary, was born in Brabant about 1220. In 1253 Louis IX of France sent him and two other friars to Tartary. The object of their mission was to propagate Christianity among the Tartars, to search for Prester John, and to visit Sartach, a Tartar chief, who was reported to be a Christian. Ruysbroek performed this arduous enterprise bravely, and, returning through Persia and Asia Minor, reached home in August, 1255. He died after 1256. He wrote a work, which is divided into two parts, De Gestis (or De Moribus) Tartartorum, and Itinerarium Orientis. Hakluyt published one part in his Principal Navigations (Lond. 1598-1606, 3 vols. fol.); but the story of Ruysbroek is found most complete in Purchas's Pilgrims (1626, 4 vols. fol.). — Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, s.v.

## Ruze, Guillaume[[@Headword:Ruze, Guillaume]]

             a French prelate, was born at Paris about 1530. He taught rhetoric and philosophy in the College of Navarre, where he received the degree of doctor. He was councilor under Henry II, Charles IX, and Henry III, who made him grand almoner. In 1570 he was promoted to the bishopric of Saint-Malo, but resigned it two years later to receive that of Angers. In 1583 he assisted at the Council of Tours, and rendered into French the confession of faith adopted by that council. He was also the author of a  French translation of the Commonitorium adversus Hoereticos of Vincent de Lerius. Ruze died Sept. 28, 1587. See Gallia Christiana.

## Ryan, George Frederick, D.D[[@Headword:Ryan, George Frederick, D.D]]

             a Welsh Congregational minister, was born at Abergavenny, Monmouthshire, in 1790. He joined the Church at the age of fourteen, began village preaching in his sixteenth year, entered Rotherham College in 1814, and commenced his pastoral life at Bridlington. After four years' labor in that place he removed to Stockport, where he ministered ten years, and then went to Dogley Lane Chapel, near Huddersfield. In 1836 he again returned to Bridlington. He died at Dore, August 19, 1865. His principal publication was entitled The Dialogist. He also, at various times, published sermons and pamphlets. See (Lond.) Cong. Year-book, 1866, page 283.

## Ryan, Henry[[@Headword:Ryan, Henry]]

             founder of the "Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Church" (so called), or Ryanites, was born of Irish parentage in Connecticut, April 22, 1775. Educated a Roman Catholic, while teaching school lie heard the eccentric Methodist preacher, Lorenzo Dow, was converted, united with the Methodists, and was disowned by his parents. He taught school for six years after his conversion, preaching regularly, however, and introducing Methodism into a part of Warren County, N.Y. In 1800 he was received into the New York Conference. His circuits in the United States were Vergennes (large part of Vermont) and Plattsburg, N.Y. In 1805 Asbury sent him and William Case to reinforce the Methodist force in Canada. Firm to obstinacy, of indomitable perseverance and iron will, he had a courage that never quailed. In labors and sacrifices he was abundant.  During the war of 1812 the oversight of the societies in Canada devolved upon him, and from 1815 to 1825 he continued to itinerate as a presiding elder, now on the Upper Canada District, then on the Lower Canada District. In 1827 he withdrew from the connection, in consequence of a difference of opinion on Church government. Shortly afterwards some of those who had espoused Ryan's cause organized the Canadian Wesleyan Methodist Church, making lay delegation its distinguishing feature. With this body Ryan united, and with it he continued to be identified during the brief remainder of his earthly existence. He died in September, 1832. See Dr. T. Webster, in the National Repository, September 1880; Stevens, Hist. of the Meth. Episcopal Church (see Index, volume 4); Playter, Hist. of Methodism in Canada (Toronto, 1862), page 84, 234, 297-99.

## Rybaut (Or Ribaut), Paul[[@Headword:Rybaut (Or Ribaut), Paul]]

             a French Protestant minister, was born near Montpellier in 1718. While the law made the preaching of Protestant doctrine a capital offense, he lived and preached for many years in caves and huts in the forest. He was a man of extensive influence, and often used it to restrain his people from violent measures. He died in 1795.

## Ryder, Henry, D.D.[[@Headword:Ryder, Henry, D.D.]]

             an English prelate, a younger son of the earl of Harrowby, was born in 1777, became dean of Wells in 1812, bishop of Gloucester in 1815, and was translated to Lichfield and Coventry in 1824. He died in 1836. He published several Sermons and Charges (1806-32). For full obituary, see Gentleman's Magazine, 1836, 1, 658.

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

             a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic, was born in Dublin in 1800, and emigrated to the United States in early youth. He entered the novitiate of the Society of Jesus in 1815, and pursued his secular studies at Georgetown College, Md., from 1815 to 1820, and his theological studies at Rome from 1820 to 1825. He then received holy orders, and occupied the chair of theology and Sacred Scriptures in the College of Spoleto, Italy, from 1825 to 1828. He returned to America in 1828, and was for several years professor of theology and vice-president of Georgetown College. Iu 1839 he was pastor of St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, and also of St. John's Church, Frederick, Md. From 1840 to 1845, and also from 1848 to 1851, he was president of Georgetown College, and from 1845 to 1848 president of the College of the Holy Cross, Worcester, Mass. He was also superior of the Order of Jesuits in the province of North America. Ryder died in 1860. He published occasional Lectures and Discourses, and was a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Americana. See Allibone, Dict. of Brit. and Amer. Authors, s.v.

## Ryder, John, D.D[[@Headword:Ryder, John, D.D]]

             an Irish prelate, was created bishop of Killaloe in 1741; transferred to the see of Down and Connor in 1743; and to the archbishopric of Tuam in 1752. He died at Nice, Italy, February 4, 1775, in the seventy-eighth year of his age. See (Lond.) Annual Register, 1775, page 206.

## Ryder, William[[@Headword:Ryder, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Holliston, Middlesex Co., Mass., June 27, 1805. He joined the Church in Fort Ann,  N.Y., in 1824, and in 1830 was licensed to preach. A year or two afterwards he entered the Troy Conference. He was ordained deacon in 1833, but was obliged through ill health in 1834 to take a superannuated relation. His disease was of a rheumatic-neuralgic nature, and so severe that in 1837 he lost all power of locomotion, and the use of almost every muscle. His sufferings were very intense, and from them he had very little release. He contrived to have a book so placed before him that he could read, and was thus enabled to beguile many painful hours each day. He died in 1849. See Wentworth, The Superannuate (N.Y. 1846); Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1850, p. 458.

## Rye[[@Headword:Rye]]

             (כֻּסֶּמֶת, kussemeth), occurs in three places of Scripture (Exo 9:32; Isa 28:25; and “fitches” in Eze 4:9); but its true meaning still remains uncertain. It was one of the cultivated grains both of Egypt and of Syria, and one of those employed as an article of diet. It was also sown along with wheat, or, at least, its crop was in the same state of forwardness; for we learn from Exo 9:32 that in the seventh plague the hailstorm smote the barley which was in the ear, and the flax which was bolled; but that the wheat and the kussemeth were not smitten, for they were not grown up. Respecting the wheat and the barley, we know that they are often sown and come to maturity in different months. Thus Forskal says, “Barley ripens in February, but wheat stands till the end of March” (Flora AEgypt. p. 43). The events above referred to probably took place in February (see Kitto, Pict. Bible, ad loc.). That kussemeth was cultivated in Palestine we learn from Isa 28:25, where it is mentioned along with ketsah (nigella) and oumin, wheat and barley; and sown, according to some translators, “on the extreme border (גְּבֻלָה) of the fields,” as a kind of fence for other descriptions of corn. SEE AGRICULTURE.

This is quite an Oriental practice, and may be seen in the case of flax and other crops in India at the present day. The rye is a grain of cold climates, and is not cultivated even in the south of Europe. Korte declares (Travels, p. 168) that no rye grows in Egypt; and Shaw states (p. 351) that rye is little known in Barbary and Egypt (Rosenmüller, p. 76). That the kussemeth was employed for making bread by the Hebrews we know from Eze 4:9, where the prophet is directed to “take wheat,  and barley, and beans, and lentils, and millet, and kussemeth, and put them in a vessel, and make bread thereof.”

Though it is very unlikely that kussemeth can mean rye, it is not easy to say what cultivated grain it denotes. The principal kinds of grain, it is to be observed, are mentioned in the same passages with the kussemeth. Celsius has, as usual, with great labor and learning, collected together the different translations which have been given of this difficult word. In the Arabic translation of Exo 9:32, it is rendered julban: “cicercula, non circula, ut perperam legitur in versione Latina.” By other Arabian writers it is considered to mean pease, and also beans. Many translate it vicia, or vetches, as in the A.V. of Exo 9:32; for according to Maimonides (ad tract. Shabb. 20, 3), carshinin is a kind of legume, which in the Arabic is called kirsana, but in the sacred language kussemeth. Both julban and kirsana mean species of pulse, but it is not easy to ascertain the specific kinds. The majority, however, instead of a legume, consider kussemeth to indicate one of the cereal grains, as the rye (secale), or the oat (avena), neither of which it is likely to have been. These have probably been selected because commentators usually adduce such grains as they themselves are acquainted with, or have heard of as commonly cultivated. Celsius, however, informs us that in the Syriac and Chaldee versions kussemeth is translated kunta; far in the Latin Vulg.; fan adoreum, Guisio, tract. Peah, 8, 5, and tract. Chilaim, 1, 1; ζεά in the Sept., Isaiah 28. Aquila, Symmachus, and others render it spelta. So Ben-Melech, on Exodus 9 and Ezekiel 4, says “kyssemeth, vulg. spelta,” and the Sept. has ὄλυρα. Upon this Celsius remarks, “All these — that is, kunta, far, ador, ζεά, spelta, and ὄλυρα — are one and the same thing.” This he proves satisfactorily by quotations from the ancient authors (Hierobot. 2, 100). Dr. Harris states (Nat. Hist. of the Bible, s.v.) that the word kussemeth seems to be derived from כָּסִ ם, “to have long hairs;” and that hence a bearded grain must be intended; which confirms the probability of spelt being the true meaning. Gesenius derives it from כָּסם, “to shear, to poll,” and translates it, “a species of grain like wheat, with a smooth or bald ear, as if shorn.”

Dioscorides has stated (2, 111) that there are two kinds of ζειά, one simple, and the other called dicoccos. Sprengel concludes that this is, without doubt, the Triticum spelta of botanists; that the olyra was a variety, which Host has called T. zea; and also that the simple kind is the T.  monococcon. That these grains were cultivated in Egypt and Syria, and that they were esteemed as food in those countries, may also be satisfactorily proved. Thus Herodotus states that the Egyptians employ olyra, which others call zea, as an article of Dict. Pliny (Hist. Nat. 18, 8) mentions it as found both in Egypt and in Syria, as it is in more modern times (Dapper, Descriptio Asioe, p. 130; Johannes Phocas, De Locis Syr. et Paloestinoe, p. 34; Cels. loc. cit. p. 100). That it was highly esteemed by the ancients is evident from Dioscorides describing it as more nourishing than barley, and grateful in taste. Pliny also (18, 11) and Salmasius prefer it, in some respects, to wheat. The goodness of this grain is also implied from the name of semen having been especially applied to it (C. Bauhin, Pinox, p. 22).

Triticum spelta, or spelt, is in many respects so closely allied to the common wheats as to have been thought by some old authors to be the original stock of the cultivated kinds; but for this there is no foundation, as the kind cultivated for ages in Europe does not differ from specimens collected in a wild state. These were found by a French botanist, Michaux, in Persia, on a mountain four days' journey to the north of Hamadan. It is cultivated in many parts of Germany, in Switzerland, in the south of France, and in Italy. It is commonly sown in spring, and collected in July and August. There are three kinds of spelt, viz. T. spelta, T. dicoccum (rice wheat), and T. monococcum In its general appearance the more frequent form of spelt differs little from common bearded wheat (T. vulgare). It is equally nutritious, and in its habits more hardy. It grows on a coarser soil, and requires less care in its cultivation. There is an awnless variety, which is “perhaps the most naked of all the cerealia:” so that, betwixt the smooth sort and the bearded, spelt should conciliate even the etymologists. See Tristram, Nat. Hist. of the Bible, p. 479. SEE CEREALS.

## Rye, Peter K.[[@Headword:Rye, Peter K.]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Norway in 1839. It is not known at what time he came to the United States; but in 1858, while a resident of Hart Prairie, Wis., he was converted; prosecuted his studies at the Garrett Biblical Institute, and in 1861 was licensed to preach. In 1862 he was admitted on trial into the Rock River Conference, and at the close of the year was transferred to the Wisconsin Conference. In 1864 he was transferred back to the Rock River Conference and made superintendent of the Scandinavian Mission, with his headquarters at  Copenhagen, Denmark. He returned to America in 1869, and continued to work until a few weeks before his death, March 16, 1873. See Minutes of Annual Conferences, 1873, p. 101. Rykajoth, in the mythology of the ancient Prussians, was a place in which inferior deities were worshipped, always located under the shade of oak, lime, or elder trees. The superior gods were worshipped in similar places at Romowa (q.v.).

## Ryerson, Edgerton, D.D., LL.D[[@Headword:Ryerson, Edgerton, D.D., LL.D]]

             an eminent Canadian Methodist minister, was born in the Province of Ontario, Canada, in 1803. He united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1823. He received an early classical education preparatory to the study of law, He entered the itinerant work, preaching his first sermon on Easter Sunday, 1825. In 1829 he became the first editor of the Christian Guardian; in 1842 was appointed the first president of Victoria College; and in 1845 was made superintendent of education for the Province of Upper Canada, an office he held for thirty years. On the union of the Wesleyan Methodists, the New Connection, and the Eastern British Conference, he was elected first president of the Methodist Church in Canada. He visited Europe and the United States a number of times in the interests of Methodism and education, and was twice a representative to the British Conference and to the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States. He died at Toronto, February 19, 1882. Among his writings, aside from editorial work, may be mentioned his Manual of Agricultural Chemistry: — Compulsory Education: — The Clergy Reserve Question, etc.

## Ryland, John, D.D[[@Headword:Ryland, John, D.D]]

             a learned English Baptist minister, was born at Warwick, January 29, 1753. His father was a fine scholar and able minister, and taught his son Greek and Hebrew and Scripture history. He was baptized at fourteen, and began to preach in 1778, in and around Northampton, as his father's assistant; then as co-pastor, aiding his father in his academy, in which young men were trained for the ministry. In 1786 he was sole pastor at Northampton. In cooperation with Carey Fuller, Sutcliffe, and others, he originated the Baptist Missionary Society, October 2, 1792. He became president of the Baptist College, Bristol, and pastor of the Broadmead Chapel in that city in 1794. In 1815 he became secretary of the Baptist Missionary Society. He died May 25, 1825. Dr. Ryland wrote, Memoirs of Robert Hull, of Drusby: — A Candid Statement of the Reasons which Induce the Baptists to Dijers from their .Christian Brethren: — some Sermons: — and nearly a hundred Hymns, which appeared in magazines, signed "J.R. jun." These have been published in a neat volume by Daniel Sedgwick.

S

## Ryland, William[[@Headword:Ryland, William]]

             a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in the north of Ireland in 1770. He came to the United States at the age of eighteen, and settled in Harford County, Md. He afterwards removed to Baltimore and engaged in commercial pursuits, but in 1802 was admitted on trial in the Baltimore Conference. His ministry comprised a period of forty-four years, the first nine of which were spent on circuits, the next eighteen in cities, and the remaining seventeen as a chaplain in the United States navy. He was five times elected chaplain of the United States Senate, was a friend for many years of general Jackson, and commanded general respect on account of his integrity, his intellectual powers, and pulpit abilities. He died Jan. 10, 1846. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, 7, 392.

## Ryors, Alfred[[@Headword:Ryors, Alfred]]

             a Presbyterian minister, was born on Long Island, N.Y., in 1812. He acquired his academical education under the direction of the venerable Dr. Steel, of Abington, Pa.; graduated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Pa., in 1835; spent one year as tutor in Lafayette College, Easton; and in 1836 was elected professor of mathematics in the Ohio University at Athens. He was licensed to preach in 1838; retained his professorship in the Ohio University until 1844, when he was elected professor of mathematics in the Indiana University at Bloomington, where he remained until 1848, in which year he was recalled to the Ohio University and elected president. He held this office until 1853, when he left for the Indiana University; became a stated supply of the Church at Madison until, in 1854, he was elected professor of mathematics of Center College, at Danville, Ky. He died May 8, 1858. Mr. Ryors was an excellent writer, and eminently distinguished for his attainments as a professor. See Wilson, Presb. Hist. Almanac, 1860, p. 77. (J.L.S.)

## Rysdyck, Isaac[[@Headword:Rysdyck, Isaac]]

             a (Dutch) Reformed minister, was born in Holland in 1720, and was educated at the University of Groningen. After laboring for ten or fifteen years as a pastor in his native land, he accepted a call to the churches of Poughkeepsie, Fishkill, Hopewell, and New Hackensack, N.Y., which made up one charge, and was installed in September, 1765. The strife between the Coetus and Conference was running high, and the parties were bitterly divided when he arrived. He sided with the Conferentie, but was moderate in spirit and action, and in 1771 was prominent in the convention which settled this sad conflict, and president of the convention of 1772 which formed the “Articles of Union” between these parties. In 1772 the Poughkeepsie Church separated peacefully from its collegiate relations, and Mr. Rysdyck retained the sole charge of the others until 1783, when the Rev. Isaac Blauvelt was elected his colleague. The aged pastor died in 1789, and was buried beneath the pulpit of his old church in New Hackensack. Mr. Rysdyck was a stately specimen of the gentleman of the olden time — tall, venerable, precise in antique dress and address; punctilious, polite, and commanding universal respect and reverence. His dark complexion indicated Spanish blood in his Dutch veins. He usually rode on horseback when making parochial visits, and wore a cocked hat, white flowing wig, and the customary clerical dress; and when passing any one on the road, would always lift his hat and give a friendly greeting. Before the Revolutionary War he taught a classical school at Fishkill, and among his pupils was the celebrated Dr. John H. Livingston. He was regarded as the most learned theologian and classical scholar in the Dutch Church. He wrote in Greek and Latin, and was as much at home in Hebrew as in his native tongue. His sermons were textual, analytical, and drawn directly out of the Scriptures, which he expounded with learning and affectionate faithfulness. In the most excited controversies of the Church he was always known as a peace maker. For a long time he was the only minister in Dutchess County. He left no production in print. (W.J.R.T.)