was allowed to retain this office; but having been sent during the hundred days into the department of the Moselle to organize the defence of that district, he was punished at the second Restoration by a few months of neglect. He was soon after, however, readmitted into the council of state, where he distinguished himself by the prudence and conciliatory tendency of his views. In 1819 he opened at the law-school of Paris a class of public and administrative law, which in 1822 was suppressed by Government, but was re-opened six years later under the Martignac ministry. In 1837 the Government acknowledged the long and important services which De Gérando had rendered to his country by raising him to the peerage. He died in Paris, November 9. 1842. at the age of seventy.

De Gérando's works are very numerous. That by which he is best known now, and which constitutes his chief title to posthumous fame, is his *Histoire Comparée des Systèmes de Philosophie rélativement aux principes des Connaissances Humaines*, of which the first edition appeared at Paris in 1804, in 3 vols. 8vo. The germ of this work had already appeared in the author's *Mémoire de la Génération des Connaissances Humaines*, crowned by the Academy of Berlin, and published at Berlin in 1802. In this work De Gérando, after a rapid review of ancient and modern speculations on the origin of our ideas, singles out the theory of primary ideas, which he endeavours to combat under all its forms. The latter half of the work, devoted to the analysis of the intellectual faculties, is intended to show how all human knowledge is the result of experience; and reflection is assumed as the source of our ideas of substance, of unity, and of identity.

De Gérando's great work is divided into two parts, the first of which is purely historical, and devoted to an exposition of various philosophical systems; in the second, which comprises fourteen chapters of the entire work, the distinctive characters and value of these systems are compared and discussed. Great fault has been found with this plan, and justly, as it is impossible to separate advantageously the history and critical examination of any doctrine in the arbitrary manner which De Gérando has chosen for himself. Despite this disadvantage, however, the work has great merits. It brought back the minds of men to a due veneration for the great names in philosophical science,—a point which had been utterly neglected by Condillac and his school. In correctness of detail and comprehensiveness of view it was greatly superior to every work of the same kind that had hitherto appeared in France. During the Empire and the first years of the Restoration, De Gérando found time, despite his political avocations, to recast the first edition of his *Histoire Comparée*, of which a second edition appeared at Paris in 1823, in 4 vols. 8vo. The plan and method of this edition are the same as in the first; but it is enriched with so many additions that it may pass for an entirely new work. The last chapter of the part published during the author's lifetime ends with the revival of letters and the philosophy of the 15th century. The second part, carrying the work down to the close of the 18th century, was published posthumously by his son in four vols. (Paris, 1847). Twenty-three chapters of this had been left complete by the author in manuscript; the remaining three were supplied from other sources, chiefly printed but unpublished memoirs.

The next valuable work of De Gérando was his essay *Du perfectionnement moral et l'éducation de soi-même*, crowned by the French Academy in 1825. The fundamental idea of this work is that human life is in reality only a great education, of which perfection is the aim.

Besides the works already mentioned, De Gérando left many others, of which we may indicate the following:—*Considérations sur diverses méthodes d'observation des peuples sauvages*, 8vo, Paris, 1801; *Éloge de Dumarsais,—discours qui a remporté le prix propose par la seconde classe de l'Institut National*, 8vo, Paris, 1805; *Le Visiteur du pauvre*, 8vo, Paris, 1820; *Institutes du Droit Administratif*, 4 vols. 8vo. Paris, 1830; *Cours normal des instituteurs primaires ou Directions rélatives à l'éducation physique, morale, et intellectuelle dans les écoles primaires*, 8vo, Paris, 1832; *De l'éducation des Sourds-Muets*. 2 vols. Paris, 1832; *De la Bienfaisance publique*, 4 vols. 8vo, 1838. A detailed analysis of the *Histoire Comparée des Systèmes* will be found in the *Fragments Philosophiques* of M. Cousin.

DEGGENDORF, or Deckendorf, the chief town of a district in Lower Bavaria, about 25 miles north-west of Passau, on the left bank of the Danube, which is there crossed by two iron bridges. It is situated at the lower end of the beautiful valley of the Perlbach, with the mountains of the Bavarian Forest rising behind; and in itself it is a well-built and attractive town. Besides the administrative offices it possesses an old council-house dating from 1566, a hospital, a lunatic asylum, an orphanage, a poor-house, and a large parish church rebuilt in 1756; but of greater interest than any of these is the Church of the Sacred Tomb, which for centuries attracted thousands of pilgrims to its *Porta Cœli, Gnadenpforte*, or Gate of Mercy, opened annually on St Michael's Eve, near the end of September, and closed again on the 4th of October. In 1837, on the celebration of the 500th anniversary of this solemnity, the number of pilgrims was reckoned at nearly 100,000. Such importance as the town possesses is now rather commercial than religious,—it being the main depôt for the timber-trade of the Bavarian Forest, a station for the Danube steamboat company, and the seat of several mills, breweries, potteries, and other industrial establishments. On the bank of the Danube, outside the town, are the remains of the castle of Findelstein; and on the Geiersberg, in the immediate vicinity, stands the old pilgrimage-church of *Mariæ Dolores*. About six miles to the north is the village of Metten, with the Benedictine monastery founded by Charlemagne in 801, restored as an abbey in 1840 by Louis I. of Bavaria, and well-known for its educational institutions. The first mention of Deggendorf occurs in 868, and it appears as a town in 1212. Henry XIII. of the Landshut dynasty made it the seat of a custom-house; and in 1331 it became the residence of Henry III. of Natternberg, so called from a castle in the neighbourhood. In 1337 there took place in the town a dreadful massacre of the Jews, who were accused of having thrown the sacred host of the Church of the Sacred Tomb into a well; and it is probably from about this date that the pilgrimage above mentioned came into vogue. The town was captured by the Swedish forces in 1633, and in the war of the Austrian succession it was more than once laid in ashes. Population in 1871, 5452

See Grüber and Müller, *Der Bayerische Wald*, Ratisbon, 1851; Mitternüller, *Die heil. Hostien und die Juden in Deggendorf*, Landshut, 1866; and *Das Kloster Metten*, Straubing, 1857.

DEHRA DÚN, a district of British India in the Meerut (Mirat) division of the lieutenant-governorship of the North-Western Provinces, lies between 29° 57′ and 30° 59′ N. lat., and 77° 37′ 15″ and 78° 22′ 45″ E. long. It comprises the valley (*dún*) of Dehra, together with the hills division (*parganá*) of Jaunsár Báwar, which runs from S.E. to N.W. of it, on the north. The district is bounded on the N. by the native state of Tehri or Garhwál, on the E. by British Garhwál, on the S. by the Siwálik hills, which separate it from Saháranpur district, and on the W. by the hill states of Sirmur, Jubol, and Taránch. The valley (*the Dún*) has an area of about 673 square miles, and forms a parallelogram 45 miles from N.W. to S.E. and 15 miles broad. It is well wooded, undulating, and intersected by streams. On the N.E. the horizon is bounded by the Mussooree (Mansúri) or lower range of the Himálayas, and on the S. by the Siwálik hills. The Himálayas in the north of the district attain a height of between 7000 and 8000 feet, one peak reaching an elevation of 8565 feet; the highest point of the Siwálik range is 3041 above sea-level. The principal passes through the Siwálik hills are the Timli pass, leading to the military station of Chakráta, and the Mohand pass leading to the sanatoriums of Mussooree and Landaur. The Ganges bounds the Dehra valley on the E.; the Jumna bounds it on the W. From a point about midway between the two rivers, and near the town of Dehra, runs a ridge which forms the water-shed of the valley. To the west of this ridge, the water collects to form the Asan, a tributary of the Jumna; whilst to the east the Suswa receives the drainage and flows into the Ganges. To the east the valley is characterized by swamps and forests, but to the west the natural depressions freely carry off the surface drainage. Along the central ridge, the water-level lies at a great depth from the surface (228 feet), but it rises gradually as the country declines towards the great rivers. To meet the demand for water five canals have been constructed, and are fed by the hill streams. These canals have a total length of 67 miles, irrigate about 10,734 acres, and yield a net annual revenue of about £2300. Jaunsár Báwar, north of the valley, comprises a triangular hilly tract, situated between the Tons and Jumna rivers near their point of confluence, and has an area of about 343 square miles. It is covered with forests of deodars, firs, cypresses, and oaks.

The agricultural products consist of rice, *mandua* (*Eleusine corocana*), oil seeds, millets, vegetables, and garden crops, such as potatoes, turmeric, red pepper, &c. The method of cultivation in the valley does not differ from that adopted in the plains; but in Jaunsár, the *khil* or *jum* system of cultivation is largely practised. This consists in clearing and burning the undergrowth on the steep banks of ravines and hills, and in sprinkling the seed, chiefly millets, over the ashes. The process yields a good crop for about two years, when the site is abandoned. The principal industries are tea planting and cultivation, rhea cultivation, and recently silk cultivation. The area under tea in 1872 was 2024 acres, yielding an out-turn of 297,828 ℔, valued at £17,486.

The total revenue derived from Dehra district (exclusive of forests) in 1872–73 amounted to £19,169. Since 1872 the Dehra valley has been subject to the ordinary laws of other settled districts; but in the hilly division of Jaunsár a less formal code is better suited to the people, and this tract is still "non-regulation." The fiscal arrangements of Jaunsár are also peculiar. The tract is divided into *khats*, each presided over by a *sayana*, or head-man. The *sayanas* engage with the Government for the payment of the land revenue, and exercise police and civil jurisdiction in their respective *khats*; whilst a committee of *sayanas*, subject to the control of the British Superintendent of Dehra Dún, decide graver disputes affecting one or more *khats*. Education is progressing rapidly in the Dehra valley. Schools have also been established in Jaunsár. Mussooree has Protestant diocesan schools for European boys and girls; and similar institutions are managed by Roman Catholic priests for members of that faith. It likewise forms the head-quarters of an active American mission. There is little crime in the district, and in Jaunsár no regular police are found necessary.

The principal places in the district are Dehra, Mussooree, with the military sanatarium of Landaur, and the military station of Chakráta. Dehra town is the civil head-quarters of the district, and is constituted a municipality. It contained (1872) a total population of about 7000 souls, (5000 Hindus, and 2000 Mahometans). The municipal income is mainly derived from a house tax. Dehra is the head-quarters of the 2d Gurkha regiment, and of the Great Trigonometrical Survey. The hill station of Mussooree is a favourite summer resort. Its population varies according to the season of the year. During the winter months it is almost entirely deserted. Landaur, the military depot for European convalescents, is really a portion of Mussooree. Chakráta is a hill station for a British regiment of infantry.

The census of 1872 returned the population of the entire district at 116,953 souls, of whom 102,814 were Hindus, 12,427 Mussulmans, 1061 Europeans, 191 Eurasians, and 460 native Christians. The Brahmans numbered 10,279, Rájputs or military caste 33,125, Baniyás or traders 2664. The Brahmans and Rájputs chiefly belong to the spurious hill clans bearing these names. The Mahometan population consists principally of Patháns and Shaikhs.

DEISM is the received name for a current of theological thought which, though not confined to one country, or to any well-defined period, had England for its principal source, and was most conspicuous in the last years of the 17th and the first half of the 18th century. The deists, differing widely in important matters of belief, were yet agreed in seeking above all to establish the certainty and sufficiency of natural religion in opposition to the positive religions, and in tacitly or expressly denying the unique significance of a supernatural revelation in the Old and New Testaments. They either ignored the Scriptures, endeavoured to prove them in the main but a helpful republication of the *Evangelium æternum*, or directly impugned their divine character, their infallibility, and the validity of their evidences as a complete manifestation of the will of God. The term deism is not only used to signify the main body of the deists' teaching, or the tendency they represent, but has of late especially come into use as a technical term for one specific metaphysical doctrine as to the relation of God to the universe, assumed to have been characteristic of the deists, and to have distinguished them from atheists, pantheists, and theists,—the belief, namely, that the first cause of the universe is a personal God, but is not only distinct from the world but apart from it and its concerns.

The words deism and deist were treated as novelties in the polemical theology of the latter half of the 16th century in France, but were used substantially in the same sense as they were a century later in England. By the majority of those historically known as the English Deists, from Blount onwards, the name was owned and honoured. They were also occasionally called *rationalists*. *Free-thinker* (in Germany, *freidenker*) was generally taken to be synonymous with deist, though obviously capable of a wider signification, and as coincident with *esprit fort*, and with *libertin* in the original and theological sense of the latter word. *Naturalists* was a name frequently used of such as recognized no god but nature, of so-called Spinozists, atheists; but both in England and Germany, in the 18th century, this word was more commonly and aptly in use for those who founded their religion on the *lumen naturæ* alone. The same men were not seldom assaulted under the name of *theists*; the later distinction between theist and deist, which stamped the latter word as excluding the belief in providence or in the immanence of God, was apparently formulated in the end of the 18th century by those rationalists who were aggrieved at being identified with the naturalists.

The chief names amongst the deists are those of Lord Herbert (1581–1648), Blount (1654–1693), Tindal (1657–1733) Woolston (1669–1733), Toland (1670–1722), Shaftesbury (1671–1713) Bolingbroke (1678–1751), Collins (1676–1729), Morgan (?–1743), and Chubb (1679–1746). Annet, who died in 1768, and Dodwell who made his contribution to the controversy in 1742, are of less importance. Of the ten first named, nine appear to have been born within twenty-five years of one another; and it is noteworthy that by far the greater part of the

literary activity of the deists, as well as of their voluminous opponents, falls within the same half century.

The impulses that promoted a vein of thought cognate to deism were active both before and since the time of its greatest notoriety. But there are many reasons to show why, in the 17th century, men should have set themselves with a new zeal, in politics, law, and theology, to follow the light of nature alone, and to cast aside, to the utmost of their ability, the fetters of tradition and prescriptive right, of positive codes, and scholastic systems, and why in England especially there should, amongst numerous free-thinkers, have been not a few free writers. The significance of the Copernican system, as the total overthrow of the traditional conception of the universe, dawned on all educated men. In physics, Descartes had prepared the way for the final triumph of the mechanical explanation of the world in Newton's system. In England the new philosophy had broken with time-honoured beliefs more completely than it had done even in France; Hobbes was more startling than Bacon. Locke's philosophy, as well as his theology, served as a school for the deists. Men had become weary of Protestant scholasticism: religious wars had made peaceful thinkers seek to take the edge off dogmatical rancour: and the multiplicity of religious sects provoked distrust of the common basis on which all founded. There was a school of distinctively latitudinarian thought in the Church of England; others not unnaturally thought it better to extend the realm of the *adiaphora* beyond the sphere of Protestant ritual or the details of systematic divinity. Arminianism had revived the rational side of theological method. Semi-Arians and Unitarians, though sufficiently distinguished from the free-thinkers by reverence for the letter of Scripture, might be held to encourage departure from the ancient landmarks. The scholarly labours of Huet, Simon, Dupin, and Clericus, of Lightfoot, Spencer, and Prideaux, of Mill and Fell, furnished new materials for controversy; and the scope of Spinoza's *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus* had naturally been much more fully apprehended than ever his *Ethica* could be. The success of the English revolution permitted men to turn from the active side of political and theological controversy to speculation and theory; and curiosity was more powerful than faith. Much new ferment was working. The toleration and the free press of England gave it scope. Deism was one of the results.

A great part of the deistical teaching was the same from first to last; but though deism cannot be said to have any marked logical development, it went through a sufficiently observable chronological growth.

Long ere England was ripe to welcome deistic thought, Lord Herbert earned the name "Father of Deism" by laying down the main line of that religious philosophy which in various forms continued ever after to be the backbone of deistic systems. He based his theology on a comprehensive, if insufficient, survey of the nature, foundation, limits, and tests of human knowledge. And amongst the divinely implanted, original, indefeasible *notitiæ communes* of the human mind, he found as foremost his five articles:—that there is one supreme God, that he is to be worshipped, that worship consists chiefly of virtue and piety, that we must repent of our sins and cease from them, and that there are rewards and punishments here and hereafter. These truths, though often clouded, are found in all religions and at all times, and are the essentials of any religion—their universal prevalence being, along with their immediacy, an unmistakable mark of their verity. Thus Herbert sought to do for the religion of nature what his friend Grotius was doing for natural law,—making a new application of the standard of Vincentius, *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*

Herbert had hardly criticised the Christian revelation either as a whole or in its details. Blount, a man of a very different spirit, did both, and in so doing may be regarded as having inaugurated the second main line of deistic procedure, that of historico-critical examination of the Old and New Testaments. Blount adopted and expanded Hobbes's arguments against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; and, mainly in the words of Burnet's *Archeologia Philosophica*, he asserts the total inconsistency of the Mosaic Hexaemeron with the Copernican theory of the heavens, dwelling with emphasis on the impossibility of admitting the view developed in Genesis, that the earth is the most important part of the universe. He assumes that the narrative was meant *ethically*, not *physically*, in order to eliminate false and polytheistic notions; and he draws attention to that double narrative in Genesis which was elsewhere to be so fruitfully handled. The examination of the miracles of Apollonius of Tyana, professedly founded on papers of Lord Herbert's, is meant to suggest similar considerations with regard to the miracles of Christ. Naturalistic explanations of some of these are proposed, and a mythical theory is distinctly foreshadowed when Blount dwells on the inevitable tendency of men, especially long after the event, to discover miracles attendant on the birth and death of their heroes. Blount assaults the doctrine of a mediator as irreligious; and much more pronouncedly than Herbert he dwells on the view, afterwards regarded as a special characteristic of all deists, that much or most error in religion has been invented or knowingly maintained by sagacious men for the easier maintenance of good government, or in the interests of themselves and their class. And when he heaps suspicion, not on Christian dogmas, but on beliefs of which the resemblance to Christian tenets is sufficiently patent, the real aim is so transparent that his method seems to partake rather of the nature of literary eccentricity than of polemical artifice; yet by this disingenuous indirectness he gave his argument that savour of duplicity which ever after clung to the popular conception of deism.

Shaftesbury, dealing with matters for the most part different from those usually handled by the deists, stands almost wholly out of their ranks. But he showed how loosely he held the views he did not go out of his way to attack, and made it plain how little weight the letter of Scripture had for himself; and, writing with much greater power than any of the deists, he was held to have done more than any one of them to forward the cause for which they wrought. Founding ethics on the native and cultivable capacity in men to appreciate worth in men and actions, and associating the apprehension of morality with the apprehension of beauty, he makes morality wholly independent of scriptural enactment, and still more of theological forecasting of future bliss or agony. He yet insisted on religion as the crown of virtue; and, arguing that religion is inseparable from a high and holy enthusiasm for the divine plan of the universe, he sought the root of religion in feeling, not in accurate beliefs or meritorious good works. The theology of those was of little account with him, he said, who in a system of dry and barren notions "pay handsome compliments to the Deity," "remove providence," "explode devotion," and leave but "little of zeal, affection, or warmth in what they call rational religion." In the protest against the scheme of "judging truth by counting noses," Shaftesbury recognized the danger of the standard which seemed to satisfy many deists; and in almost every respect he has more in common with those who afterwards, in Germany, annihilated the pretensions of complacent rationalism than with the rationalists themselves.

Toland, writing at first professedly without hostility to any of the received elements of the Christian faith, insisted that Christianity was not mysterious, and that the value of

religion could not lie in any unintelligible element; though we cannot know the real essence of God or of any of his creatures, yet our beliefs about God must be thoroughly consistent with reason. Afterwards, Toland discussed, with considerable real learning and much show of candour, the comparative evidence for the canonical and apocryphal Scriptures, and demanded a careful and complete historical examination of the grounds on which our acceptance of the New Testament canon rests. He contributed little to the solution of the problem, but forced the investigation of the canon alike on theologians and the reading public. Again, he sketched a view of early church history, further worked out by Semler, and surprisingly like that which, as elaborated by the Tübingen school, is still held with modifications by a large number of students of Christian antiquity. He tried to show, both from Scripture and extra-canonical literature, that the primitive church, so far from being an incorporate body of believers with the same creed and customs, really consisted of two schools, each possessing its "own gospel"—a school of Ebionites or Judaizing Christians, and the more liberal school of Paul. These parties, consciously but amicably differing in their whole relation to the Jewish law and the outside world, were subsequently forced into a non-natural uniformity. The cogency of Toland's arguments was weakened by his manifest love of paradox.

Collins, who had created much excitement by his *Discourse of Free-thinking*, insisting on the value and necessity of unprejudiced inquiry, published at a later stage of the deistic controversy the famous argument on the evidences of Christianity. Christianity is founded on Judaism; its main prop is the argument from the fulfilment of prophecy. Yet no interpretation or re-arrangement of the text of Old Testament prophecies will secure a fair and non-allegorical correspondence between these and their alleged fulfilment in the New Testament. The inference is not expressly drawn. Collins indicates the possible extent to which the Jews may have been indebted to Chaldeans and Egyptians for their theological views, especially as great part of the Old Testament would appear to have been re-modelled by Ezra; and, after dwelling on the points in which the prophecies attributed to Daniel differ from all other Old Testament predictions, he states the greater number of the arguments still used to show that the book of Daniel deals with events past and contemporaneous, and is from the pen of a writer of the Maccabean period.

Woolston, at first to all appearance working earnestly in behalf of an allegorical but believing interpretation of the New Testament miracles, ended by assaulting, with a yet unknown violence of speech, the absurdity of accepting them as actual historical events, and did his best to overthrow the credibility of Christ's principal miracles. The bitterness of his outspoken invective against the clergy, against all priestcraft and priesthood, was a new feature in deistic literature, and injured the author more than it furthered his cause.

Tindal's aim seems to have been a sober statement of the whole case in favour of natural religion, with copious but moderately worded criticism of such beliefs and usages in the Christian and other religions as he conceived to be either non-religious or directly immoral and unwholesome. The work in which he endeavoured to prove that true Christianity is as old as the creation, and is really but the republication of the gospel of nature, soon gained the name of the "Deist's Bible."

Morgan criticised with great freedom the moral character of the persons and events of Old Testament history, developing the theory of conscious "accommodation" on the part of the leaders of the Jewish church. This accommodation of truth, by altering the form and substance of it to meet the views and secure the favour of ignorant and bigoted contemporaries, Morgan attributes also to the apostles and to Jesus. He likewise expands at great length a theory of the origin of the Catholic Church much like that sketched by Toland, but assumes that Paul and his party, latterly at least, were distinctly hostile to the Judaical party of their fellow-believers in Jesus as the Messias, while the college of the original twelve apostles and their adherents viewed Paul and his followers with suspicion and disfavour. Persecution from without Morgan regards as the influence which mainly forced the antagonistic parties into the oneness of the catholic and orthodox church.

Annet made it his special work to invalidate belief in the resurrection of Christ, and to discredit the work of Paul.

Chubb, the least learnedly educated of the deists, did more than any of them, save Herbert, to round his system into a logical whole. From the New Testament he sought to show that the teaching of Christ substantially coincides with natural religion as he understood it. But his main contention is that Christianity is not a doctrine but a life, not the reception of a system of truths or facts, but a pious effort to live in accordance with God's will here, in the hope of joining him hereafter. Chubb dwells with special emphasis on the fact that Christ preached the gospel to the poor, and argues, as Tindal had done, that the gospel must therefore be accessible to all men without any need for learned study of evidences for miracles, and intelligible to the meanest capacity.

Dodwell's ingenious thesis, that Christianity is not founded on argument, was certainly not meant as an aid to faith; and, though its starting-point is different from all other deistical works, it may safely be reckoned amongst their number.

Though himself contemporary with the earlier deists, Bolingbroke's principal works were posthumously published after interest in the controversy had declined. His whole strain, in sharp contrast to that of most of his predecessors, is cynical and satirical, and suggests that most of the matters discussed were of small personal concern to himself. He gives fullest scope to the ungenerous view that a vast proportion of professedly revealed truth was ingeniously palmed off by the more cunning on the more ignorant for the convenience of keeping the latter under. But he writes with keenness and wit, and knows well how to use the materials already often taken advantage of by earlier deists.

In the substance of what they received as natural religion, the deists were for the most part agreed; Herbert's articles continued to contain the fundamentals of their theology. Religion, though not identified with morality, had its most important outcome in a faithful following of the eternal laws of morality, regarded as the will of God. With the virtuous life was further to be conjoined a humble disposition to adore the Creator, avoiding all factitious forms of worship as worse than useless. The small value attributed to all outward and special forms of service, and the want of any sympathetic craving for the communion of saints, saved the deists from attempting to found a free-thinking church, a creedless communion. They seem generally to have inclined to a quietistic accommodation to established forms of faith, till better times came. They steadfastly sought to eliminate the miraculous from theological belief, and to expel from the system of religious truth all debatable, difficult, or mysterious articles. They aimed at a rational and intelligible faith, professedly in order to make religion, in all its width and depth, the heritage of every man. They regarded with as much suspicion the notion of a "peculiar people" of God, as of a unique revelation, and insisted on the salvability of the heathen. They rejected the doctrine of the Trinity, and protested against mediatorship, atonement, and the imputed righteousness of Christ, always laying more stress on the teach-

ing of Christ than on the teaching of the church about him; but they repeatedly laid claim to the name of Christians or of Christian deists. Against superstition, fanaticism, and priestcraft they were incessantly lifting up their testimony. They all recognized the soul of man —not regarded as intellectual alone—as the ultimate court of appeal. But they varied much in their attitude towards the Bible. Some were content to argue their own ideas into Scripture, and those they disliked out of it; to one or two it seemed a satisfaction to discover difficulties in Scripture, to point to historical inaccuracies and moral defects. Probably Chubb's position on this head is most fairly characteristic of deism. He holds that the narrative, especially of the New Testament, is in the main accurate, but, as written after the events narrated, has left room for misunderstandings and mistakes. The apostles were good men, to whom, after Christ, we are most indebted; but they were fairly entitled to their own private opinions, and naturally introduced these into their writings. The epistles, according to Chubb, contain errors of fact, false interpretations of the Old Testament, and sometimes disfigurement of religious truth. Fortunately, however, the points on which the private opinions of apostolic men might naturally differ most widely, such as the doctrine of the Logos, are matters which have nothing to do with the salvation of souls.

The general tendency of the deistical writings is sufficiently self-consistent to justify a common name. But it is vain to speak of deism as a compact system, or to regard it as the outcome of any one line of philosophical thought. Of matters generally regarded as pertaining to natural religion, that on which they were least agreed was the certainty, philosophical demonstrability, and moral significance of the immortality of the soul, so that the deists have sometimes been grouped into "mortal" and "immortal" deists. For some the belief in future rewards and punishments was an essential of religion; some seem to have questioned the doctrine as a whole; and, while others made it a basis of morality, Shaftesbury protested against the ordinary theological form of the belief as immoral. No two thinkers could well be more opposed than Shaftesbury and Hobbes; yet sometimes ideas from both were combined by the same writer. Collins was a pronounced necessitarian; Morgan regarded the denial of free will as tantamount to atheism. And nothing can be more misleading than to assume that the belief in a Creator, existent wholly apart from the work of his hands, was characteristic of the deists as a body. In none of them is any theory on the subject specially prominent; save in their denial of miracles, of supernatural revelation, and a special redemptive interposition of God in history, they seem to have thought of providence much as the mass of their opponents did. Herbert starts his chief theological work with the design of vindicating God's providence. Shaftesbury vigorously protests against the notion of a wholly transcendent God. Morgan more than once expresses a theory that would now be pronounced one of immanence. Toland, the inventor of the name of pantheism, was notoriously, for a great part of his life, in some sort a pantheist. And while as thinkers they diverged in their opinions, so too the deists differed radically from one another in their character, in reverence for their subject, and in religious earnestness and moral worth.

The deists were not powerful writers; none of them was distinguished by wide and accurate scholarship; hardly any was either a deep or comprehensive thinker. But though they generally had the best scholarship of England against them, they were bold, acute, well-informed men; they appreciated more fully than their contemporaries not a few truths now all but universally accepted; and they seemed therefore entitled to leave their mark on subsequent theological thought. Yet while the seed they sowed was taking deep root in France and in Germany, the English deists, the most notable men of their time, were soon forgotten, or at least ceased to be a prominent factor in the intellectual life of the century. The controversies they had provoked collapsed rather than were finally settled; and deism became a by-word even amongst those who were in no degree anxious to appear as champions of orthodoxy.

The fault was not wholly in the subjectivism of the movement. But the subjectivism that founded its theology on the "common sense" of the individual was accompanied by a fatal pseudo-universalism which, cutting away all that was peculiar, individual, and most intense in all religions, left in any one of them but a lifeless form. A theology consisting of a few vague generalities was sufficient to sustain the piety of the best of the deists; but it had not the concreteness or intensity necessary to take a firm hold on those whom it emancipated from the old beliefs. The negative side of deism came to the front, and, communicated with fatal facility, seems ultimately to have constituted the deism that was commonly professed at the clubs of the wits and the tea-tables of polite society. But the intenser religious life before which deism fell was also a revolt against the abstract and argumentative orthodoxy of the time.

That the deists appreciated fully the scope of difficulties in Christian theology and the sacred books is not their most noteworthy feature; but that they made a stand, sometimes cautiously, often with outspoken fearlessness, against the presupposition that the Bible is the religion of Protestants. They themselves gave way to another presupposition equally fatal to true historical research, though in great measure common to them and their opponents. It was assumed by deists in debating against the orthodox, as it is now by orthodox Protestants in contending against the Romish Church, that the flood of error in the hostile camp was due to the benevolent cunning or deliberate self-seeking of unscrupulous men, held to by the ignorant with the obstinacy of prejudice.

Yet deism deserves to be remembered as a strenuous protest against bibliolatry in every degree and against all traditionalism in theology. It sought to look not a few facts full in the face, from a new point of view and with a thoroughly modern, though unhistorical spirit. It was not a religious movement; and though, as a defiance of the accepted theology, its character was mainly theological, the deistical crusade belongs, not to the history of the church, or of dogma, but to the history of general culture. It was an attitude of mind, not a body of doctrine; its nearest parallel is probably to be found in the eclectic strivings of the Renaissance philosophy and the modernizing tendencies of cisalpine humanism. The controversy was assumed to be against prejudice, ignorance, obscurantism; what monks were to Erasmus the clergy as such were to Woolston. Yet English deism was in many ways characteristically English. The deists were, as usually happens with the leaders of English thought, no class of professional men, but represented every rank in the community. They made their appeal in the mother tongue to all men who could read and think, and sought to reduce the controversy to its most direct practical issue, making it turn as much as possible on hard facts or the data of common sense. And, with but one or two exceptions, they avoided wildness in their language as much as in the general scheme of theology they proposed. If at times they had recourse to ambiguity of speech and veiled polemic, this might be partly excused by the death of Aikinhead on the scaffold and Woolston's imprisonment.

French deism, the direct progeny of the English movement, was equally short-lived. Voltaire was to the end a deist of the school of Bolingbroke; Rousseau could have claimed kindred with the nobler deists. Diderot was for a time heartily in sympathy with deistic thought; and the *Encyclopédie* was in its earlier portion an organ of deism. But as Locke's philosophy became in France sensationalism, and as Locke's pregnant question, reiterated by Collins, how we know that the divine power might not confer thought on matter, led the way to dogmatic materialism, so deism soon gave way to forms of thought more directly and extremely subversive of the traditional theology.

In Germany there was a native free-thinking theology nearly contemporary with that of England, whence it was greatly developed and supplemented. The compact rational philosophy of Wolff nourished a theological rationalism which in Reimarus was wholly undistinguishable from dogmatic deism; while, in the case of the historico-critical school to which Semler belonged, the distinction is not always easily drawn—although these rationalists professedly recognized in Scripture a real divine revelation, mingled with local and temporary elements. It deserves to be noted here that the former, the theology of the *Aufklärung*, was, like that of the deists, destined to a shortlived notoriety; whereas the solid, accurate, and scholarly researches of the rationalist critics of Germany, undertaken with no merely polemical spirit, not only form an epoch in the history of theology, but have taken a permanent place in the body of theological science. Ere *rationalismus vulgaris* fell before the combined assault of Schleiermacher's subjective theology and the deeper historical insight of the Hegelians, it had found a refuge successively in the Kantian postulates of the practical reason, and in the vague but earnest faith-philosophy of Jacobi.

In England, though the deists were forgotten, their spirit was not wholly dead. For men like Hume and Gibbon the standpoint of deism was long left behind; yet Gibbon's famous two chapters might well have been written by a deist. Even now, between scientific atheism and speculative agnosticism on the one hand and church orthodoxy on the other, many seem to cling to a theology nearly allied to deism. Rejecting miracles and denying the infallibility of Scripture, protesting against Calvinistic views of sovereign grace and having no interest in evangelical Arminianism, the faith of such inquirers seems fairly to coincide with that of the deists. Wherever religious indifferentism is rife, the less generous forms of deism are still alive. And even some cultured theologians, the historical representatives of latitudinarianism, seem to accept the great body of what was contended for by the deists, though they have a fuller appreciation of the power of spiritual truth, and a truer insight into the ways of God with man in the history of the world.

The deists displayed a singular incapacity to understand the true conditions of history; yet amongst them there were some who pointed the way to the truer, more generous interpretation of the past. When Shaftesbury wrote that "religion is still a discipline, and progress of the soul towards perfection," he gave birth to the same thought that was afterwards hailed in Lessing's *Erziehung des Menschengeschlechtes* as the dawn of a fuller and a purer light on the history of religion and on the development of the spiritual life of mankind.

See Leland's *View of the Principal Deistical Writers*, 2 vols. 1754; Lechler's *Geschichte des Englischen Deismus*, 1841; Rev. John Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, 3 vols. 1870–72; Leslie Stephen, *History of English Thought in the 18th Century*, 2 vols. 1876. (D. P.)

DEJANIRA, the wife of Hercules. See HERCULES.

DEKKER, JEREMIAS DE (1610–1666), a Dutch poet, was born at Dort in 1610. He received his entire education from his father, a native of Antwerp, who, having embraced the reformed religion, had been compelled to take refuge in Holland. Entering his father's business at an early age, he found leisure to cultivate his taste for literature and especially for poetry, and to acquire without assistance a competent knowledge of English, French, Latin, and Italian. His first poem was a paraphrase of the Lamentations of Jeremiah (*Klaagliedern van Jeremias*), which was followed by translations and imitations of Horace, Juvenal, and other Latin poets. The most important of his original poems were a collection of epigrams (*Puntdichten*) and a satire in praise of avarice (*Lof der Geldzucht*). The latter is his best known work. Written in a vein of light and yet effective irony, it is usually ranked by critics along with Erasmus's *Praise of Folly*. Dekker died at Amsterdam in November 1666. A complete collection of his poems, edited by Brouerius van Nideck, was published at Amsterdam in 1726 under the title *Exercises Poëtiques* (2 vols. 4to). Selections from his poems are included in Siegenbeck's *Proeven van nederduitsche Dichtkunde* (1823), and from his epigrams in Geijsbeek's *Epigrammatische Anthologie*, 1827.

DEKKER, THOMAS, dramatist. It is impossible to make out, from the scanty records of Dekker's personal life, what manner of man he was. His name occurs frequently in Henslowe's *Diary* during the last year of the 16th century; he is mentioned there as receiving loans and payments for writing plays in conjunction with Ben Jonson, Chettle, Haughton, and Day, and he would appear to have been then in the most active employment as a playwright. The titles of the plays on which he was engaged from April 1599 to March 1599–1600 are *Troilus and Cressida*, *Orestes Fures*, *Agamemnon*, *The Stepmother's Tragedy*, *Bear a Brain*, *Pagge of Plymouth*, *Robert the Second*, *Patient Grissel*, *The Shoemaker's Holiday*, *Truth's Supplication to Candlelight*, *The Spanish Moor's Tragedy*, *The Seven Wise Masters*. At that date it is evident that Dekker's services were in great request for the stage. He is first mentioned in the *Diary* two years before, as having sold a book; the payments in 1599 are generally made in advance, "in earnest" of work to be done. In the case of three of the above plays, *Orestes Fures*, *Truth's Supplication*, and the *Shoemaker's Holiday*, Dekker is paid as the sole author. Only the *Shoemaker's Holiday* has been preserved; it was published in 1600. It would be unsafe to argue from the classical subjects of some of these plays that Dekker was then a young man from the university, who had come up like so many others to make a living by writing for the stage. Classical knowledge was then in the air; playwrights in want of a subject were content with translations, if they did not know the originals. However educated, Dekker was then a young man just out of his teens, if he spoke with any accuracy when he said that he was threescore in 1637; and it was not in scholarly themes that he was destined to find his true vein. The call for the publication of the *Shoemaker's Holiday*, which deals with the life of the city, showed him where his strength lay. To give a general idea of the substance of Dekker's plays, there is no better way than to call him the Dickens of the Elizabethan period. The two men were as unlike as possible in their habits of work, Dekker having apparently all the thriftlessness and impecunious shamelessness of Micawber himself. Dekker's Bohemianism appears in the slightness and hurry of his work, a strong contrast to the thoroughness and rich completeness of every labour to which Dickens applied himself; perhaps also in the exquisite freshness and sweetness of his songs, and the natural charm of stray touches of expression and description in his plays. But he was like Dickens in the bent of his genius towards the representation of the life around him in