

A

# RELIGIOUS ENCYCLOPÆDIA:

OR

## DICTIONARY

OF

BIBLICAL, HISTORICAL, DOCTRINAL, AND PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

*BASED ON THE REAL-ENCYKLOPÄDIE OF HERZOG, PLITT, AND HAUCK.*

*EDITED BY*

PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR IN THE UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, NEW YORK.

*ASSOCIATE EDITORS:*

REV. SAMUEL M. JACKSON, M.A., AND REV. D. S. SCHAFF.

VOLUME III.

NEW YORK:

FUNK & WAGNALLS, PUBLISHERS,

10 AND 12 DEY STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1883, BY FUNK & WAGNALLS.

*Electrotyped and printed by Rand, Avery, & Co., Boston.*

excels every thing hitherto produced, and is still a perpetual mine of wealth. M. Butzer's Commentary (1520) is distinguished by sagacity and delicacy of judgment. Calvin's exposition has many excellencies; but his deficiency consists in denying the messianic relation, even in those psalms which the modern rationalistic exegesis must even acknowledge. Calvin's strict historical method of interpretation becomes a caricature in Esrom Rüdinger, the Moravian. (f) *The Post-Reformation Exposition* is best represented by Martin Geier, more dogmatist, however, than exegete. In the Reformed Church we find Coccejus (d. 1669). Johann Heinrich Michaelis represents, in his *Adnotationes uberioris in Hagiographa*, the exposition of the Psalms from 1600 to 1750: every thing is accumulated here; the glossarial annotations groan beneath the burden of numberless unsifted examples and parallel passages. After 1750 Burk published his *Gnomon* to the Psalms (1740), and Christian A. Crusius, his *Hypomnemata* (1764): both follow Bengel's principles. To have freed the psalm-exposition from want of taste is the merit of Herder; and the merit of Hengstenberg consists in having brought it back, out of this want of spirituality, to the believing consciousness of the Church. (g) *Modern Exposition* is marked by De Wette's Commentary, which was first published in 1811 (ed. by G. Baur, 1856), and forms an epoch in exegesis. The negative criticism of De Wette was supplemented by the positive results of Hitzig (1835, 1836), who was followed by Lengerke (1817) and J. Olshausen (1853), but with this difference, that, while Lengerke surpasses Hitzig by asserting that not a single psalm can be ascribed with certainty to David, Olshausen finds Maccabean influences wherever the opposition of the just and unjust is mentioned. But, though excellent in linguistic respect, yet Olshausen's Commentary is surpassed by that of Hupfeld (1855, 1858 sq.). Beside all these works, Ewald's Commentary (1839, 1840) has a special charm. The merit of having perceived fully the object of the expositor, and having explained the Psalms in the spirit of the Church, and thus in truly spiritual rapport with the spirit of the psalmists, belongs to the much abused name of Hengstenberg (1812-47, 2d ed., 1849-52). The kindred spirited works of Umbreit (*Christliche Erbauung aus dem Psalter*, 1835) and Stier (*Siebzig Psalmen*, 1834, 1836) comprise only a part of the Psalms. The Commentary of Tholuck (1813) is adapted to gain friends for the Psalms from among the educated classes. The same may be said also of Vaihinger's Commentary (1845). A second edition of Hupfeld's Commentary was published by Riehm in 1867-71: a third is to be prepared by Eb. Nestle. For Lange's *Bibelwerk*, Moll wrote the theologico-homiletical exposition of the Psalter, 1869-71 [Eng. trans. New York, 1872]. The German predecessors to Moll have been made use of in the excellent Commentary on the Psalms by J. J. Stewart Perowne (1864, 1868). In Holland, the General Synod of the Reformed Church adopted in 1855 the resolution of preparing a commentary on the Old Testament. The Psalms were given to John Dyserinck, and his work was published in 1877. In 1878 he also published *Kritische Scholien bij de Vertaling van het boek der Psalmen*, containing

emendations on 250 passages. Degenerated beyond measure is the critico-conjectural tendency in Graetz's (the Jewish historian) critical Commentary on the Psalms (1882, 1883, 2 vols.). To exegesis and textual criticism this scholar has evidently no call. A more pleasing and intelligent work is the fifth part of the Biblical Commentary by the veteran Ed. Reuss, who treats of the Psalms and Lamentations under the main title of *Poesie Lyrique* (2d ed., 1879). He refuses to assign any date to almost all the Psalms (*Geschichte des Alten Testaments*, 1881, § 157), and doubts that "we have Davidic psalms at all." Stade also (*Zeitschrift*, 1882, p. 166) declares the Psalter to be the product of post-exile Judaism, and asserts that each and every psalm must be regarded as post-exilic, unless the contrary is proved. The critical stand-point of an Ewald and Hitzig, who, like Herm. Schultz in his *O. T. Theol.* (2d ed., 1878, pp. 81 sq.), acknowledge a group of real psalms of David, is thus surpassed; and freer scope is now left to the modern reconstruction of the religious history of Israel according to the Darwinistic pattern. FRANZ DELITZSCH. (B. PICK.)

The English literature on the Psalms embraces translations of the Commentaries by HENGSTENBERG (Edinb., 1845-48, 3 vols.), THOLUCK (by J. I. Mombert, Lond., 1856, N. Y., 1858), DELITZSCH (Edinb., 1871, 3 vols.), MOLL (in Lange Series, N. Y. and Edinb., 1872); original works by HORNE (Lond., 1776, 2 vols., many eds., e.g., N. Y., 1865), HORSLEY (Lond., 1815, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1815), J. A. ALEXANDER (N. Y., 1850, 3 vols.), PEROWNE (Lond., 1864-68, 2 vols., 4th ed., 1878-79), PLUMER (N. Y., 1867), BARNES (N. Y., 1869, 3 vols.), SPURGEON (*Treasury of David*, homiletical, Lond. and N. Y., 1870-84, 7 vols.), W. KAY (Lond., 1871), J. G. MURPHY (Edinb., 1875), FAUSSET (Lond., 1877), D. THOMAS (Lond., 1882 sq.). Works upon Individual Psalms or Groups of Psalms. — SIR RICHARD BAKER: *Meditations and Disquisitions on the First and Seven Penitential Psalms*, Lond., 1640, rep. 1882; JOHN BROWN: *The Sufferings and Glories of the Messiah* (Ps. xviii.), Edinb., 1853; JAMES MORGAN: *The Penitent* (Ps. li.), Belfast and Lond., 1855; CHARLES BRIDGES: *Exposition of the 119th Psalm*, Lond., 22d ed., 1857, N. Y., 1867; SAMUEL COX: *The Pilgrim Psalms, an Exposition of the Songs of Degrees*, Lond. and N. Y., 1874. Works upon the Psalms as a whole. — T. W. CHAMBERS: *The Psalter a Witness to the Divine Origin of the Bible*, N. Y., 1876; WILLIAM ALEXANDER: *The Witness of the Psalms to Christ and Christianity*, Lond., 1877, 2d ed., 1878; T. C. MURRAY: *Origin and Growth of the Psalms*, N. Y., 1880.

**PSALMS, Use of the, in Worship.** There are professing Christians, not a few, who believe, that, in the exercise of praising God directly or formally, the inspired Psalter, that is, the canonical Book of Psalms, only, should be used, or at least should be used to the exclusion of all uninspired songs.

At present this position is held by the United Presbyterian Church of North America, the Associate Presbyterian Church of North America, the Associate Reformed Synod of the South (U. S.), the Reformed Presbyterians (commonly called Covenanters) of Scotland, Ireland, and America, the United Original Secession Church of Scotland,

and, we believe, the General Synod of the Christian Reformed Church of Holland. In the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, the only authorized manual of praise is the Book of Psalms; although, in many congregations of that church, "paraphrases" of other parts of Scripture, and a few uninspired hymns which have never received the sanction of the Church, are also used. In the Waldensian Church, so far as the original congregations in the Piedmontese valleys are concerned, the Psalms only are used in praising God, or at least were till very recently; but, in the mission congregations of that church in other parts of Italy, uninspired hymns have been introduced. In all the Presbyterian churches of Scotland, Canada, the United States, and Australia, there is a considerable number of persons who favor the view that only the Psalms should be used in the service of praise.

Among those who advocate the exclusive use of inspired songs in praising God, some (a small minority, it is believed) hold, that, besides the Psalter, other parts of Scripture may warrantably be employed in that exercise. It is, moreover, to be observed that the advocates of Scripture Psalmody do not object absolutely to the use of uninspired hymns as a means of exciting and expressing pious feeling; their objection being to the use of such compositions in the direct and proper worship of God.

Some of the considerations urged in favor of restriction to the Psalms are here subjoined.

1. To worship God otherwise than he has appointed is "will-worship," more or less gross. The law regulative of worship is not that we may use both what is commanded and what is not expressly forbidden, but that we must be limited to the use of what is either expressly or implicitly appointed by God (Deut. xii. 32; Matt. xv. 9, xxviii. 20).

2. To the Old-Testament Church God gave inspired songs, and prescribed the use of them in worship.

3. There is no evidence that God ever authorized his ancient people to employ in the stated service of song any other hymns than those finally collected into one book, that of Psalms.

4. This book continues to be the only divinely authorized hymn-book of the church. It is more suited to the present dispensation than it was even to the past. It is full of Christ, as the early Christian writers asserted vigorously. From the most devout Christians of the last eighteen centuries the highest eulogies of the Psalms have proceeded. Of the right and obligation to use the Psalms in praise, there has been no repeal. No substitute, no supplement, has been furnished or authorized by God. At the institution of the Supper, Christ and his disciples "hymned." It is generally admitted that the hymns used on the occasion were the Psalms, extending from Ps. cxiii. to Ps. cxviii. inclusive. Our Lord thus wedded together the Supper and the Psalms, and authoritatively transferred the Psalms to the worship of the New-Testament Church.

By apostolic authority the use of the Psalms in praising God is clearly enjoined in Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16. It is urged, indeed, that, in these texts, the use of "hymns" and "spiritual songs" is also enjoined, and therefore that unin-

spired odes may warrantably be employed in formal praise.

The reply made to this is, that it assumes without proof that the "hymns" and "songs" meant are uninspired compositions; that the argument, if valid, would prove that it is sinful not to use uninspired hymns; that the direction given is not to prepare hymns, but only to sing them; that the epithet "spiritual," applied to the songs, marks them as emphatically the product of the Spirit, that is, as inspired, and not merely devotional (1 Cor. ii. 13, xiv. 1); that it is difficult to believe that the apostle placed inspired and uninspired compositions on the same level; that, if psalms differ materially from hymns and songs, these latter must differ from each other, whereas, no distinction is made between them practically by hymn-singers; that the advocates of an uninspired hymnology seem to admit that psalms may fitly be called hymns, for psalms may be found in many popular collections styled *Hymnals* or *Hymn-books*: and that in the Septuagint version of the Old Testament, the version used by the Christians of Ephesus and Colosse, the three terms which the apostle uses are employed to designate the Psalms, while, moreover, Josephus, a contemporary of Paul, frequently styles the Psalms "hymns," and expressly says that David wrote "*ὕμναι εἰς ὁδὸν καὶ ἔργον*," that is, "songs and hymns to God" (Ant., 7, 12, 3).

5. If other hymns than those of the Psalter were used in the Apostolic Church, some of them would surely have survived. But not even one has certainly come down from the first two centuries. The earliest Christian hymn extant is believed to be that to the *Logos*, attributed to Clemens Alexandrinus, who died about 220 A. D.; but there is no evidence that it was ever used in the express worship of God. It needs to be noted that the mere existence of a hymn, or the fact that it was sung devotionally, is no proof that it was used in formal worship. During, at least, the first four centuries, the Psalms were pre-eminently used in worship; and the earliest departures from them, so far as the Orthodox were concerned, consisted in the chanting of fragments culled from other parts of Scripture, as if, in the heart of the church, the feeling existed, that, in praising God, inspired compositions only should be employed.

6. The fact that God gave to the church a psalm-book, but not a prayer-book, seems to teach that between prayer and praise there is such a difference, that the right to make our own prayers does not warrant the conclusion that we have the right to worship God with hymns uninspired.

7. The aid of the Spirit is promised in reference to prayer, but no such aid in reference to hymn-making, a much more difficult operation.

8. The inspired Psalter is the true *Union Hymn-book*. Prepared, as it was, by the Spirit, it meets the wants of all Christians, while, moreover, it forms a golden link between the church of the past dispensation and that of the present.

LIT.—WILLIAM ANNAMN: *Letters on Psalmody*, Pittsburgh, Penn.; *Vindication of Letters on Psalmody*, Pittsburgh, 1866; JOHN MUIRHEAD: *The Divine Institution of singing the Psalms of David*, Montrose, 1790; JOHN ANDERSON: *Vindicia Cantus Domini*, 1800; GILBERT McMASTER: *Apology for the Book of Psalms*, Philadelphia, 1852; *The*

*True Psalmody*, Philadelphia, 1860; WILLIAM BINNIE: *The Psalms, their History, Teachings, and Use*, London, 1870; Bishop ALEXANDER: *Witness of the Psalms to Christ*, 1877. JAMES HARPER.

**Instrumental Music in Worship.** Those churches which reject uninspired hymns, though not they only, have hitherto been noted for a repugnance to the use of instrumental music in worship: hence a brief statement of the anti-instrumental line of argument may not unfitly be appended to the sketch given of the arguments against uninspired hymns.

Anti-instrumentalists commonly reason thus:—

1. In the matter of worship, our great inquiry should be, "What has God appointed?" Any form of worship not appointed is forbidden.

2. That only which is necessary to the suitable observance of a prescribed form of worship can be regarded as a circumstance needing no explicit appointment. If so, instrumental music is not a circumstance of worship.

3. Though divinely prescribed in the Old Dispensation, instrumental music was not intended to form an element of New-Testament worship; for

(1) It is in keeping with the sensuousness which distinguished the Old Dispensation from the New.

(2) It pertained to the transient ceremonial system of the Israelites. The temple was the seat, and Levites the performers, of the instrumental service. Even if practised elsewhere and by others, it could still be deemed ceremonial; for the rites of the ceremonial system were not limited to the precincts of the tabernacle, or the temple.

The Psalms, indeed, which by divine authority are still sung, enjoin the use of instruments, but so do they the use of sacrifices; while, besides, an injunction is more than a permission, which is all for which most instrumentalists contend.

(3) The New Testament is unfavorable to the view that instrumental music is among the appointments of New-Testament worship.

At the institution of the Supper, Christ and his disciples "hymned," but used no instruments. If, in the most sacred of our observances, instrumental music may be wisely dispensed with, why not in all?

Sanction of instrumental music in worship is supposed by many to be found in Eph. v. 19 and Col. iii. 16, where occurs the word *ψάλλω*, which, it is alleged, means to sing with the accompaniment of a harp. But this argument would prove that it is as much a duty to play as to sing in worship. It is questionable whether, as used in the New Testament, *ψάλλω* means more than to sing. But, even admitting that it retains an instrumental allusion, we may hold, with Meyer and others, that it does so only figuratively; the heart being the seat or the instrument of the action indicated. The absence of instrumental music from the worship of the church for some centuries after the apostles, and the sentiment regarding it which pervades the writings of the Fathers, are unaccountable, if in the apostolic church such music was used.

**LIT.—In Favor of Instrumental Music.** ALEXANDER FLEMING: *Letters and Answers*, 1808; ANONYMOUS: *Organs and Presbyterians*, Edinburgh, 1829; D. F. BONNER: *Instrumental Music*

*divinely authorized in the Worship of God*, Rochester, N.Y., 1881. Against Instrumental Music. JOHN CALVIN: *Commentary on Psalm cl.*; GIBBERTUS VOETIUS: *Politica Eccl.*, vol. i. lib. 2, tract. 2, cap. 2, Amsterdam, 1663; JAMES BEGG: *The Use of Organs in Christian Worship Indefensible*, Glasgow, 1866; JAMES GLASGOW: *Heart and Voice*, Belfast, 1874 (?); D. W. COLLINS: *Musical Instruments in Divine Worship condemned by the Word of God*, Pittsburgh, Penn., 1881; JAMES HARPER: *A Counterblast to the Organ*, New York, 1881. JAMES HARPER

(Professor of Theology, U. P. Theol. Seminary, Xenia, O.).

**PSALTER**, technically the Book of Psalms arranged for use in worship. So in the Roman-Catholic Church the Psalter presents the Psalms distributed to fit different services. In the Prayer-Book, the Psalms are divided into sections for reading in daily morning or evening service. The translation is that of the Great Bible (Cranmer's, 1539).

**PSELLUS**, b. in Constantinople about 1020; studied in Athens; held for many years the first chair in philosophy in his native city, and was appointed tutor to the imperial princes, but lost the favor of the court after the death of Michael Ducas, and retired in 1078 to a monastery, where he died after 1105. He was a very prolific writer, and wrote on metaphysics, logic, mathematics, physics, jurisprudence, medicine, etc. His principal works are, *De omnifaria doctrina*, a metaphysical exposition of the fundamental ideas of all science; *De dæmonum operatione*, a dialogue edited by Boissonade (Paris, 1838); and, of special interest for the study of the sect of the Euchites, a comparison between the ancient Christian and Pagan orators, etc. All his works are found collected in MIGNÉ: *Patr. Græca*, vol. 122. See LEO ALLATIUS: *Diatriba de Psellis* (Paris, 1861), who mentions five other writers of the same name. GASS.

**PSEUDEPIGRAPHA OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.** After a careful examination of the scope of the biblical canon, the ancient church divided the mass of biblical literature, in the widest sense of the word, into three classes; viz., (1) The canonical and inspired; (2) The non-canonical, but, on account of their long use, worthy of being read in the churches (*ἀντιλεγόμενα* and *ἀναγνώσκόμενα*, *ἐκκλησιαζόμενα*); and (3) The other books of a biblical character in circulation (biblical name in the title, a biblical form, biblical contents, but differing greatly in spirit and truth from the canonical books), called secret, and such that should be kept secret (*ἀπόκρυφα*).

Virtually the same books which the ancient church called Apocrypha are embraced under the name Pseudepigrapha by the Protestant Church. Since, after the example of Jerome, the non-canonical books of the Old Testament received the name Apocrypha, it became necessary to find a new one for the third class. The name *ψευδεπίγραφον* is indeed taken only from a single and outward mark; namely, the spurious character of the author's name which they bear. It is neither sufficiently comprehensive, nor does it distinguish sufficiently this class of writings from the anti-*legomena*; nor is it applicable to all the writings of the third class. For many reasons, however, it is probably the best term that could be found.